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ABSTRACT

Research on racial-ethnic socialization experiences among ethnically diverse youth from their perspective is limited. Additionally, little is known about the relationship between specific racial-ethnic socialization messages and positive youth outcomes such as subjective well-being. This study sought to examine the prevalence of specific types of racial-ethnic socialization messages in a group of ethnically diverse high school students. The study also examined the role of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages on youth’s ethnic identity development and private group esteem. The study also examined the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem in the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth. Findings emerging from the study revealed that cultural socialization messages were more prevalent than preparation for bias messages and females reported receiving more cultural socialization messages than their male counterparts. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that cultural socialization in messages were particularly salient in youth’s ethnic identity development and private group esteem. Mediation analyses revealed that ethnic identity completely mediated the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and satisfaction with life. Ethnic identity and self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and youth’s positive and negative affect. A discussion of the results, limitations, and implications for future research are provided.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census Bureau data projections, children of color will represent over 50% of the U.S. school population (U.S. Census Bureau Department of Education, 2004). These demographic trends transcend the school system and are reflective of the overall demographic changes in the United States. For example, it is anticipated that by 2050, the number of Latinos will grow to 98 million, African Americans to 59 million, and the number of Asian and Pacific Islanders will increase to 38 million (Henderson, 2000; Spradlin & Parsons, 2008). Additionally, the number of multiracial individuals in the United States is increasing rapidly as indicated by the results of the 2000 Census showing that 2.4% of the population reported more than one race.

Ethnically diverse youth are often exposed to overt and subtle forms of stereotypes, prejudice, and oppression due to their membership in particular ethnic minority groups. Adolescence represents a critical developmental period and identity development is a universal developmental task for all youth. However, identity formation and one of its components, ethnic identity, is particularly salient for ethnic minority youth. For ethnically diverse youth, ethnic identity formation pertains to their beliefs, feelings, and thoughts regarding their ethnic group. Furthermore, ethnic identity development facilitates youth’ awareness regarding membership to an ethnic group and
their understanding of what it means to be a member of their group. Parents of ethnically diverse adolescents also face the task of preparing their children to navigate a diverse society and learn how to cope with negative experiences that their children may experience throughout their lives.

Racial-ethnic socialization pertains to messages about race and ethnicity that ethnically diverse youth have received and continue to receive through multiple sources; parents, peers, teachers, media, etc. Socialization processes, particularly conversations between parents and children, are salient to youth’s identity development. These socialization experiences assist youth in integrating their lived experiences with their perceptions about their group membership in their self-appraisals and identity formation.

Parents and children engage in socialization processes from an early age continuing through the transition into adolescence and young adulthood. Although socialization of children is an important aspect in all parent-child interactions, it is primarily salient for minority children and youth. Racial-ethnic socialization is a vital component of the socialization process and refers to the process of transmitting messages about race and ethnicity from parents to their children (Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993; Hughes & Johnson, 2001; Knight & Marshall, 1995; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Furthermore, racial-ethnic socialization practices help minority children and youth cope with unique challenges stemming from their minority status in the society and the overt and covert forms of oppression and discrimination in their lives. These preparatory processes begin at a young age and ethnic minority children are continuously socialized and prepared to navigate the diverse contexts they often live in (e.g. neighborhoods,
school, peer groups). Additionally, racial-ethnic socialization processes teach children and youth how to cope with current and prospective encounters with stereotypes, oppression, and discrimination in their lives. By the time they approach adolescence, ethnic minority youth begin to integrate their own experiences of being member of their ethnic group along with their socialization experiences provided by their parents, family members, peers, etc.

During adolescence, ethnically diverse youth are also expected to successfully resolve the task of identity formation (Erikson 1968; Marcia, 1985). For minority children, racial/ethnic identity is a salient component of identity. With the emergence of abstract reasoning abilities among other cognitive abilities, adolescents are actively engaged in reflecting about their group membership while also considering others’ perceptions about their group. Racial identity is often viewed as a component of one’s self-concept and pertains to the individual’s membership within a race (Neblett, Smalls, Ford, Nguyen, & Sellers, 2009; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998). Furthermore, racial identity consists of two core dimensions: the importance placed on race when defining oneself (centrality) and the individual’s interpretations of what it means to be a member of that race (private regard) (Sellers et al., 1998). While racial identity is often a term that is primarily used for the African American group, ethnic identity is often used to include a number of different ethnic groups, including African Americans. Ethnic identity is a complex construct which encompasses the individual’s sense of belonging and commitment to an ethnic group (Phinney, 1996; 1992; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Ethnic identity development is particularly salient for members of minority
groups and research has shown that ethnic identity plays an important role in several academic and psychosocial youth outcomes (Phinney 1992; Quintana 1998; Quintana & Vera, 1999).

Both racial-ethnic socialization and identity development play an important role during adolescence and these processes are dynamic, complex, and multidirectional. Therefore, understanding the interplay of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development and their impact on psychological outcomes among ethnically diverse youth is critical. Racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development processes are associated with several psychological and academic outcomes among ethnic minority youth. For example, research has shown that processes of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development are protective factors for adolescents’ well-being especially for minority youth (Bowman & Howard, 1985; McHale, Crouter, Kim, Burton, Davis, Dotterer, & Swanson, 2006; Yip & Fuligni, 2002). More specifically, youth socialization experiences that emphasize the salience of race/ethnicity and cultural pride are associated with positive levels of self- and group-esteem (McHale et al., 2006). However, not all racial-ethnic socialization messages yield positive psychological outcomes for ethnically diverse youth. For example, preparation for bias, another aspect of racial/ethnic socialization, may foster a disidentification or viewing one’s group less positively (Steele & Aaronson, 1995). Additionally, research has shown that processes of racial/ethnic identity development exacerbate the impact of racism (Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003).
Influences of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development on adolescents’ psychological well-being vary across different age groups and little is known about these associations during early and middle adolescence (Rivas-Drake, Hughes, & Way, 2009). Furthermore, empirical evidence regarding gender differences in racial-ethnic socialization messages has revealed mixed findings. These inconsistencies result from several methodological differences among studies including different age group samples, reliance on self-report and cross-sectional data, and wide variability in defining and measuring constructs of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development.

Although research on racial-ethnic socialization practices identifies these processes as bidirectional, more emphasis is given to parent’s influence on preparing and delivering messages about race and ethnicity to their children. Little is known about the role that children and youth play in these transactions (Hughes et al., 2006; Hughes & Chen, 1999). Several authors have argued that a phenomenological perspective which captures youth’s perceptions of their own racial-ethnic socialization experiences is critical in examining the prevalence and the implications of these processes among ethnically diverse youth (Spencer, 1997; Swanson, Spencer, Harpalani, Dupree, Noll, Ginzburg, & Seaton, 2003). This perspective emphasizes the important role that youth play in selecting, initiating, and maintaining conversations about race and ethnicity with parents and other sources of socialization. In other words, youth assume a proactive role in engaging in racial-ethnic socialization practices. Additionally, youth are selective in internalizing socialization messages that they receive from different sources, and utilize
their own encounters with racial/ethnic differences in these racial-ethnic socialization experiences. This is particularly true for minority youth who often have first-hand experiences of discrimination and oppression in their daily lives (Stevenson, Cameron, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2002). Therefore, examining these processes from the youth’s perspective offers important information in understanding how children and youth are prepared to encounter and navigate diversity in multiple contexts such as home, schools, classrooms, and neighborhoods.

Research has also shown that racial/ethnic socialization processes have a positive impact on ethnic identity development especially among minority children and youth. Understanding the nature of the relationship between racial/ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development is particularly important when examining psychological outcomes such as subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth.

Statement of Problem

Literature on racial/ethnic socialization practices and ethnic identity development among minority youth is based on research that is comparative and group specific (Hughes, 2003; Hughes et al., 2009). In contrast, empirical evidence regarding intragroup variability of these processes remains limited. While information about experiences of socialization and ethnic identity development across different ethnic groups provides information about the uniqueness of these experiences for different groups, research that examines the variability of these experiences within these groups is also needed (García Coll, Akerman, & Chichetti, 2000; Swanson et al., 2003).
Additionally, research on racial-ethnic socialization processes is primarily focused on parent’s experiences and accounts of their children’s racial and ethnic socialization experiences. However, more information is needed to examine these processes from the youth’s perspective (Hughes et al., 2006; Hughes et al., 2009). Although during childhood, parents play an important role in initiating and maintaining conversations about the salience of race and ethnicity with their children, by the time they reach adolescence, youth are no longer mere recipients of those messages, rather, they are proactive and deliberate in initiating and maintaining conversations about race and ethnicity with their parents and others.

Thirdly, research on gender differences in racial-ethnic socialization processes among ethnically diverse youth consists of mixed results. Some studies have revealed gender differences in racial-ethnic socialization messages for one group (e.g., African American adolescents) although replication of these findings for other groups’ remains limited (Hughes et al., 2006; Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, Bámaca, & Guimond, 2009).

Finally, little attention is given to the influences of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development on positive youth outcomes (García Coll, et al., 1996; Swanson et al., 2003). The majority of literature focuses on the protective role of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development among ethnically diverse youth and yet, little is known how these processes influence well-being and positive outcomes in this group. Additionally, the majority of empirical evidence on this topic examines the buffering role of racial-ethnic socialization practices on negative psychological outcomes (e.g., negative mood symptoms, youth delinquent behavior, school dropout, etc.).
Conversely, little is known about the relationships between racial-ethnic socialization and positive outcomes such as subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth. Furthermore, little is known about the potential influences of ethnic identity, and self-esteem in the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization processes and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth.

This study attempts to address these gaps in literature in three major ways. First, the study will examine the intragroup variability of racial-ethnic socialization messages among ethnically diverse high school youth. Special attention will be given to examining gender similarities or differences in racial-ethnic socialization processes among ethnically diverse adolescents. Understanding racial-ethnic socialization processes among ethnically diverse youth provides information that is unique for each group while also demonstrating the complexity and variability of these processes between and within these groups. Second, the study will examine the content and frequency of racial/ethnic messages from the youth’s perspective and explore the influences of these messages on adolescents’ ethnic identity development and group esteem. Third, the study will assess the mediating role of ethnic identity development and self-esteem in the relationship between racial/ethnic socialization and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse groups of high school students.

**Background and Rationale**

Literature on racial and ethnic socialization processes has grown significantly in the last two decades for several reasons including the rapid changes in the demographic landscape in the United States. Given these anticipated changes, significant attention has
been given to understanding how the young generation is socialized and prepared to live in a diverse society. As a result, research has emerged as an attempt to understand how children encounter and negotiate diversity in multiple settings such as home, schools, classrooms, and neighborhoods (Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006; Stevenson, McNeil, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2005).

Research has also shown that ethnic minority youth often face multiple forms of overt and covert devaluation, bias, and prejudice which often lead to negative consequences in areas of mental health (Harrell, 2000; Kessler, Mickelson, & Williams, 1999; Nyborg & Curry, 2003; Williams, Neighbors, & Jackson, 2003), school engagement (Oyserman, Harrison, & Bybee, 2001), and academic achievement (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002).

As a result, topics of race, ethnicity, and coping with discrimination are prevalent in conversations that children have with significant adults in their life and this is particularly true among parents and children in ethnic minority groups. Racial-ethnic socialization practices are often viewed as key elements in understanding how minority children and youth are socialized by their parents to prepare and cope with discrimination and also successfully navigate diversity in their lives.

Initially, research focused on racial socialization processes in the African American community as a way to understand and describe how parents prepared their children to cope with barriers and negative stereotypes and using these practices as ways to instill racial pride and promote self-esteem (Richardson, 1981; Spencer, 1983; Tatum, 1997). In the last two decades, research on racial socialization expanded to understand
these processes among Asian, Latino, recent immigrants (Pessar, 1995; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001) and multiethnic groups. Until recently, the majority of empirical evidence on racial-ethnic socialization practices focused on parent’s perspectives of these processes although a phenomenological approach that focuses on youth’s perspectives is strongly recommended (Spencer et al., 2003). Additionally, information that examines intragroup variability is limited and findings regarding gender similarities or differences are mixed (Hughes et al., 2006).

*Ethnic Identity*

Identity development is considered a central task in adolescence and ethnic identity is a key component of this process for ethnically diverse adolescents (Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzi, & Saya, 2003). Although racial/ethnic attitudes and concepts (e.g., awareness about skin color and group differences) are formed through childhood through observations and socialization practices, ethnic identity development culminates during adolescence. During this period, adolescents shift their focus from learning about ethnic labels to understanding the significance of group membership (Spencer et al., 2003). As a result, ethnic identity provides individuals with information about membership in a particular segment of the population and distinguishing members of one group from others who belong to other groups. Examining ethnic identity in adolescence is particularly important because young individuals actively participate in search of ethnic identity and this meaning making process is an important part of the adolescent’s self-concept (Phinney, 1992; Quintanna 1998). Ethnic identity is often referred to as an individual’s self-ideas about his or her own ethnic group. Additionally, ethnic identity is
comprised of four dimensions consisting of ethnic self-identification, ethnic constancy, ethnic knowledge, and ethnic preferences (Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993).

Research on ethnic identity among minority youth has shown that there is a link between group identity and other variables such as self-esteem and group-esteem (Crocker et al., 1994) coping with prejudice and discrimination (Spencer, 1983), psychological distress (Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, & Notaro, 2004), and academic outcomes (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Wiegfield & Eccles, 1994).

**Psychological Functioning Among Ethnically Diverse Youth**

Psychological functioning for this paper includes subjective well-being (life satisfaction and positive and negative affect) and self-esteem (individual and group). Research across ethnically diverse samples has documented the link between ethnic identity and positive well-being (Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2001; Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Umaña-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002). Specifically, youth with high levels of ethnic identity have also been found to report high levels of quality of life which is a key marker of subjective well-being. Additionally, research that has examined ethnic identity across developmental stages, has shown that ethnic identity at higher statuses (e.g., achievement) is associated with positive adjustment outcomes and low levels of anxiety, negative affect among youth (Kiang, Yip, Gonzalez-Backen, & Witkow, 2006). However, while the positive link between ethnic identity development and youth psychological well-being is well documented, less is known about the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization experiences and youth subjective well-being. Despite
the fact that research has shown that racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity among ethnically diverse youth are positively related, there is more evidence regarding the association between ethnic identity and subjective well-being, and less is known about the role of ethnic identity and self-esteem in the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth. Furthermore, even when these relationships are explored, youth outcomes are often operationalized from a deficit-based perspective using indices such as negative mood, depressive and anxiety symptoms, and lack of prosocial behaviors (García Coll et al., 1996).

Additionally, while measurement of self-esteem provides important information about a person’s overall evaluative attitude towards the self (Rosenberg, 1965), it does not provide information about other aspects of that person’s social identity, particularly views regarding membership to different social groups (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, religion, etc.) (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Yet, for individuals who belong to minority groups, group membership is an important aspect of the individual’s sense of self. For example, research with ethnically diverse youth examining the relationship between collective group esteem and psychological well-being variables (e.g., life satisfaction, depressive symptoms, hopelessness), has shown that collective self-esteem predicts psychological well-being even after controlling for individual levels of self-esteem (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994). This finding suggests that research focusing on the association between family and contextual variables such as racial-ethnic socialization and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth is important and should include both individual and group aspects of youth’s self-esteem.
Purpose of the Study

Racial/ethnic socialization and ethnic identity are often examined along with their psychosocial and academic correlates among children and youth. The presence of racial-ethnic socialization experiences and a strong sense of ethnic identity help youth develop a strong sense of self-esteem, optimal levels of psychological functioning and academic achievement. For example, positive racial-ethnic socialization experiences and ethnic identity development are often viewed as protective factors that buffer the negative effects of discrimination and marginalization for diverse youth (Contrada et al., 2001; Harrell, 2000). However, empirical literature tends to reflect a deficit-based approach resulting in limited research that examines relationships between racial-ethnic socialization experiences and positive outcomes and competencies among ethnically diverse youth. Additionally, ethnic identity is often viewed as an important process that influences the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and psychological outcomes. However, the influence of ethnic identity on these relationships is unclear for several age groups particularly early and middle adolescence.

In summary, racial-ethnic socialization processes are salient phenomena during adolescence and they are especially important for ethnic minority youth. This study attempts to understand prevalence of racial-ethnic socialization messages, their relationship with psychological correlates (ethnic identity and subjective well-being), and the influence of ethnic identity and self-esteem on these relationships among ethnically diverse adolescents.
Research Questions

Specific questions that are addressed by this study are as follows:

**Question 1.** Are there intragroup differences in racial-ethnic socialization messages, particularly cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages, among ethnically diverse youth? Based on prior research, it is hypothesized that:

*Research Hypothesis 1.a.* Cultural socialization messages are different for male and female students across ethnicity groups after controlling for participants’ age.

*Research Hypothesis 1.b.* There are gender differences in preparation for bias messages after controlling for participants’ age.

**Question 2.** What is the influence of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages on ethnic identity and group esteem? Based on prior research it was hypothesized that:

*Research Hypothesis 2.a.* Preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages play a positive role on ethnic identity development among ethnically diverse youth.

*Research Hypothesis 2.b.* Preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages play a positive role on beliefs about one’s own ethnic group (private collective esteem) among ethnically diverse youth.

**Question 3.** Do ethnic identity and self-esteem mediate the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth? Based on reviewed literature, it was hypothesized that:

*Research Hypothesis 3.1.a.* Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life.
Research Hypothesis 3.1.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life.

Research Hypothesis 3.2.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life.

Research Hypothesis 3.2.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life.

Research Hypothesis 3.3.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.3.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.4.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.4.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.5.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.5.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.6.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect.

Research Hypothesis 3.6.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect.
Research hypotheses regarding the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem on the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being are illustrated in Figure 1. These hypotheses did not specify partial or complete mediation given limited previous research on this topic.

Figure 1. Illustration of hypothesized mediation models
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Understanding the Uniqueness of Ethnically Diverse Youth

For many decades, research on developmental trajectories of ethnically diverse youth was built on traditional models of examining and understanding “normative processes” of all youth. However, this line of traditional youth development literature had several conceptual and methodological shortcomings and they are briefly summarized in this section.

Several authors have expressed concerns regarding the absence of appropriate conceptual models that focus on ethnic minority youth. First, little is known about the ecological factors, the presence of risk and protective factors and their influence on identity development trajectories among ethnically diverse youth. As a result, there is limited theoretical and empirical literature that focuses on social contexts of ethnically diverse youth and the deleterious effects of social mechanisms such as stereotypes, oppression, and discrimination on these ecologies and ultimately, youth development (Swanson et al., 2003). Despite the fact that basic developmental processes (e.g., cognitive, social, affect development) are common for children and youth in Western society, there are important core differences in developmental trajectories of ethnic minority and non-minority children and youth. These differences are predominantly a function of the interactions between youth and their proximal and distal contexts.
surrounding them. García Coll and colleagues (1996) suggest that defining and incorporating ecological differences and circumstances (e.g., racism, oppression) that are unique to the development of minority children and youth, is critical in formulating theories of normal development in minority children. Furthermore, these authors suggest that recognizing the “ecological uniqueness” of ethnically diverse youth is key because direct or indirect experiences of stereotypes, discrimination, and oppression, inhibit rather than facilitate youth outcomes.

Another key limitation of traditional youth development research pertains to the understudy of developmental competencies of ethnically diverse youth. According to García Coll and colleagues (1996), developmental competencies represent the functional competencies of a child at a particular point in their development and the abilities and skills that they use while interacting with multiple contexts. These developmental competencies transcend the typical and important skill areas such as social, emotional, and cognitive development. Developmental competencies for ethnically diverse youth reflect youth’s ability to cope with the effects of racism, stereotypes, and prejudice that they experience in their environment. As a result, theorists and researchers argue that developmental competencies should include skills and abilities beyond the traditional ones to include skills such as the adolescent’s ability to navigate multiple contexts and cultures, cope with racism, overt and subtle discrimination, develop a strong sense of self despite multiple negative influences from the environment, and develop bicultural competencies (García Coll et al., 1996; Swanson et al., 2003). Culture-specific and bicultural competencies allow ethnically diverse youth to learn the codes from each
culture (mainstream and their own) and use them to master the tasks and activities called
upon in each of them (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993).

Additionally, research on ethnically diverse youth is rarely focused on
understanding processes of normative development of minority children and youth
(García Coll et al., 1996). Instead, research on ethnically diverse youth places a strong
emphasis on outcomes rather than processes of normative development across ethnically
diverse youth.

Despite the fact that White and youth of color share similar developmental
processes and challenges, there are salient differences between the two groups (Spencer
et al., 2003). However, until recently research on ethnically diverse youth has often
considered White youth to be the “norm” and thus, embracing all the privileges deriving
from this status (Spencer et al., 2003). A study by Perry (2001) showed how White youth
viewed themselves as the norm and the standard from which other groups should be
viewed. The normalization of whiteness in research practices is a strong limitation in
understanding the unique experiences and development of diverse youth. Specifically,
conceptual frameworks that use White children and youth as the standard for normal
development raise the important concern that in doing that, researchers are
decontextualizing the competencies of minority children and youth who experience
unique and different sociocultural contexts (García Coll et al., 1996). Additionally,
another limitation of this approach pertains to the use of stress buffering models among
middle-class White youth and considering them as normative samples while regarding
stress responses from ethnically diverse youth as pathological and a deviation from the norm (Spencer, 2003).

Several development theorists have argued that the individual’s social position, which derives from the social stratification system of any given society, plays an important role on several developmental outcomes (García Coll et al., 1996). The social stratification system is constructed on several assumptions such as social class, race, ethnicity, gender, the degree of social mobility, etc. The complex and multidimensional nature of each of these constructs and the interactions among them, makes it difficult for researchers to integrate them in theoretical frameworks and apply them in developmental research (Spencer et al., 2003). Additionally, understanding developmental processes among ethnically diverse youth is complicated by the complex nature of social stratification mechanisms that influence youth’s proximal and distal ecologies. García Coll and colleagues (1996) suggest four core social stratification mechanisms that influence youth developmental outcomes: racism, prejudice, discrimination, and oppression. Racism refers to systematic and pervasive assumptions about the superiority of certain races and the consequent discrimination against other races (García Coll et al., 1996). While racism pertains to social attitudes and treatment based on race, prejudice, discrimination, and oppression may be experienced as a function of race, ethnicity, social class, and gender. Additionally, racism consists of different forms such as institutionalized or symbolic racism and manifests itself in various ways ranging from opposing affirmative action, low expectations of teachers regarding their students’

*Prejudice* refers to the preconceived judgment or opinion (often pejorative) about a person regardless of whether that person has the characteristics or attribute. In fact, even when presented with information that a person does not have the attribute, the prejudiced individual does not integrate the new evidence into his or her perception or their conceptual framework (Duckitt, 1992). Rather, the person is viewed as an exception and different from their group.

*Discrimination* is viewed as a manifestation of prejudice and is comprised of any actions or behaviors that deny the individual or groups of people equal treatment (Bowman & Howard, 1985). Discrimination is also manifested in overt and subtle forms and employment practices are a common form of discrimination for women and minorities.

*Oppression* is another mechanism of social stratification which impacts youth development and outcomes. Oppression pertains to the systematic use of power and authority to treat a group of people unjustly and in a devalued manner. Research on internalization of the experiences of devaluation and feelings of oppression, has shown negative outcomes in areas of negative perceptions about self- and in-group members (Stevenson et al., 2002; Wong et al., 2003). As a result, there has been an emergence of literature that focuses on identifying protective factors that buffer the negative impact of discrimination, oppression, and prejudice on youth’s lives.
Racial-Ethnic Socialization

Given the prevalence of prejudice, discrimination, and oppression present in multiple contexts, minority parents face the task of raising children in socially toxic environments and preparing them to cope with these challenging encounters in their lives. Research on parent racial-ethnic socialization processes emerged to examine and to understand these practices. This line of research revealed that ethnically diverse parents and their children participate in socialization processes that help children successfully negotiate several developmental tasks during childhood and adolescence. Parental socialization pertains to processes during which parents prepare their children to accept adult roles and responsibilities in society. These preparation processes consist of transmission of values, beliefs, and ideas that help children develop competencies that facilitate adequate functioning in the society (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Harrison, Wilson, Pine, Chon, & Buriel, 1990). A key component of socialization is racial socialization which refers to implicit and explicit, verbal and nonverbal teachings that minority parents use to prepare children to cope with racism through the development of a positive racial identity and raising them to be physically and emotionally healthy in oppressive and toxic environments (Stevenson, 1993). Racial-ethnic socialization often serves as buffer against prejudice and discrimination that minority youth face and helps them develop a positive in-group identity (Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003).

Constructs of racial socialization and ethnic socialization are often used interchangeably in research that focuses on parent-child transactions. Historically, racial socialization was used to understand how African American parents foster a positive
sense of self-esteem in their children while preparing them to cope with and overcome racial barriers in their environments (Boykin & Toms, 1985; Peters, 1985, 2002; Spencer, 1983; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990; Tatum, 1987; Thornton et al., 1990). On the other hand, *ethnic socialization* emerged from research conducted with other minority groups (e.g., Latino, Asian, immigrants) and focused on a broad range of issues such as children's identity achievement, in-group attitudes, cultural retention, and experiences of youth while coping with pressures to assimilate in the dominant society (Knight, Bernal, Cota, et al., 1993; Ou & McAdoo, 1993; Quintana & Vera, 1999).

Since the emergence of research on these phenomena, constructs of racial and ethnic socialization have often been used interchangeably despite significant differences in operationalizing and measuring them (Hughes et al., 2006). The debate in differences and the overlap between racial and ethnic socialization mirrors the one about race and ethnicity which are constructs that are mistakenly used interchangeably (Ponterotto et al., 2006; Quintana et al., 2006). While *race* is socially constructed and is value laden, *ethnicity* refers to cultural practices of a group of people who share a unique social and cultural history transmitted from one generation to another (Helms, 2007; Ponterotto, 2006). Many researchers argue that racial categorization occurs in a context characterized by racially structured and discriminatory practices between individuals (Hitlin, Brown, & Elder, 2006). Spencer et al. (2003) view race as the everyday lived experience of individuals and the meaning they ascribe to those experiences. Additionally, these lived experiences are also filtered through experiences of racism, structural and economical inequalities, stereotyping, and oppression. Similarly, instead
of using racial groups and categories, Helms (2007) argues that the term *racial-group membership* is viewed as a meaningful construct that describes “different group-level racial socialization experiences that vary according to whether the group is accorded an advantaged or disadvantaged status in society” (p. 236). This construct suggested by Helms is conceptually similar to ethnicity which pertains to the individual’s perceptions and attitudes towards his or her own ethnic group. An important question that derives from examination of similarities and differences between race and ethnicity pertains to racial and ethnic socialization practices; do they converge or are they separate distinct phenomena? Raising this question is important because when reviewing literature on ethnic and racial socialization, it is important to examine whether these phenomena are similar or pertain to different and unique processes. According to McNeil (1999) there are differences between ethnic (intragroup) and racial (intergroup) socialization.

Specifically, *ethnic socialization* pertains to group-specific themes that include messages that promote group identity and group membership. On the other hand, *racial socialization* pertains to messages that focus on intergroup strategies and ecological constraints. However, distinguishing socialization that is strictly racial or ethnic can be ambiguous and artificial therefore, *racial-ethnic socialization* is a more encompassing term that will be used throughout this study. This decision is based on the argument that racial and ethnic socialization processes share similar characteristics such as parents’ goals to instill messages about their racial-ethnic group to their children and the active role that children and youth play in these processes. In their comprehensive overview of literature on racial and ethnic socialization practices, Hughes et al. (2006) argue that both
terms “cover the same conceptual territory” and they both refer to information transmitted from adults to children regarding race and ethnicity.

According to Stevenson and colleagues (2002), racial socialization pertains to communication, interactions, and behaviors between parents and youth and these processes include divine, affective-symbolic, and phenomenological strategies that protect youth from discrimination and psychologically toxic environments. Several authors have posited the idea that racial socialization processes are unique and vary across parent-child dyads. For example, some conversations between parents and their children and youth focus on aspects of history, heritage, and culture; other conversations focus on cultural pluralism and acceptance; others bypass race-related messages in favor of a “color blind” approach (Hughes & Chen, 1997). These authors have attempted to create a typology of racial socialization messages that parents communicate to their children. However, one limitation of their study pertains to the reliance on self-reported measures and the exclusive focus on parent-child conversations about race without focusing on transmission of messages about the importance of race from an intergenerational approach. Information about racial socialization practices that transcend parent-child dyad is limited and there is little empirical evidence that examines the influences of other family members on these processes. The majority of research on racial socialization focuses on the family unit, particularly parents, as key actors in imparting messages about race and ethnicity to their children. Other important sources of familial racial-ethnic socialization messages include extended family members, siblings, peers, and fictive kin. Collectively, parents, family, and non-family members teach
children the social meaning and consequences of ethnicity and race (Brown, Tanner-Smith, Lesane-Brown, Ezell, 2007). Additionally, research on racial-ethnic socialization has also identified other sources of information that help children and youth become socialized in a diverse society. Some of these sources include contexts such as community, and neighborhoods as important players in socializing youth about the salience of race and ethnicity in their lives. According to Stevenson et al. (2002) racial and cultural socialization strategies include “parent-, community-, society, and peer-directed interactions and adolescent-internalized processes” (p. 475).

**Typology of Racial-Ethnic Socialization Processes and Messages**

Several authors have identified several racial-ethnic socialization tasks that ethnic minority parents should accomplish to ensure positive and adaptive functioning in their children (Boykin, Toms, Hughes & Chen, 1997). Some core racial-ethnic socialization messages include *cultural socialization* (teaching children about their racial or ethnic heritage and history, promoting customs, values, and traditions); *preparation for bias* (helping children gain awareness about discrimination and preparing them to cope with it); *promotion of mistrust* (preparing children to be wary during interracial interactions and cautious about barriers to success); and *egalitarianism and salience about race* (explicitly encouraging children to value individual attributes over racial group membership and preparing youth to develop skills needed to thrive in dominant, mainstream settings (Hughes et al., 2006; Hughes & Chen, 1997, 1999). However, one limitation of these studies pertains to the fact that despite the variability of racial-ethnic socialization messages, the majority of them focus on one or two types of messages (i.e.
cultural socialization). As a result, there is limited empirical evidence about the frequency and types of other racial-ethnic socialization messages such as egalitarianisms and salience about race. Additionally, little is known about other forms of racial-ethnic socialization messages that transcend verbal messages shared between parents and their children. More recently, research on racial-ethnic socialization processes has focused on nonverbal messages that are part of these practices (Neblett, Smalls, Ford, Nguyên, & Sellers, 2009). For example, recent research has focused on examining socialization behaviors such as parents purchasing literature and art to instill racial-ethnic pride to their children, subscribing to various magazines etc. The majority of this recent research has examined racial socialization behaviors among African American parents and little is known whether other ethnic minority parents engage in similar practices with their children.

**Demographic Correlates of Racial-Ethnic Socialization Processes**

Research on racial-ethnic socialization has examined predictors of parents’ racial and ethnic socialization practices (Stevenson, 1994; Thornton, Chatters, Taylor, & Allen, 1990), sociodemographic and ecological correlates of these practices (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Hughes & Johnson, 2001), and the outcome of these practices among youth (Constantine & Blackmon, 2002; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993; Marshall, 1995; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990; Stevenson, Reed, Bodison, & Bishop, 1997). For example, in a comprehensive review of empirical literature on racial-ethnic socialization practices, Hughes et al. (2006) found out that demographic factors such as children’s age and
gender, parents’ socioeconomic status, and immigration status were commonly used in studies examining racial-ethnic socialization processes.

In a comprehensive review of racial-ethnic socialization studies, Hughes and colleagues (2006), concluded that content and frequency of racial-ethnic socialization messages increased with the child’s age. These authors indicated that by middle school and early adolescence, parents and their children engage in conversations pertaining not only to issues of cultural socialization and racial pride, but also more complex societal phenomena such as discrimination or preparation for bias (Hughes et al., 2006). However, there are few studies that have examined racial-ethnic socialization messages across age groups. These processes tend to be more frequently researched among late adolescence and little is known about the prevalence and correlates of these processes in early and middle adolescence (Hughes, Rivas-Drake, Witherspoon, & West-Bey, 2009).

Additionally, empirical research on this topic has several methodological issues in areas such as restricted age ranges in samples used. Furthermore, there is a wide variability in the measures used to examine racial-ethnic socialization processes and some measures do not differentiate what types of messages are used in parent-child transaction (Hughes & Johnson, 2001).

As stated earlier, children’s gender is another important variable when examining racial-ethnic socialization processes. The majority of studies that have looked at the role of gender in these processes have focused primarily on African American children and youth. Several studies have examined the impact of racial socialization on mental health outcomes and gender differences have been found to exist across mental health
correlates. For example, Stevenson and colleagues (1997) found that cultural pride messages were related to lower aggressive and situational anger expression and higher depressive symptoms among boys. On the other hand, protective racial socialization (more oppression-focused) beliefs and proactive (less oppression-focused) beliefs were associated with lower depressive symptoms and higher anger expression scores among girls. One of the limitations of this study, also a common one found in this body of literature, pertains to researchers’ focus on direct racial socialization messages without focusing on indirect or tacit messages that are also often part of racial socialization processes. Additionally, findings emerging from those studies have also suggested mixed results (Hughes et al., 2006). For example, some studies have suggested that girls receive more messages about racial pride and achievement whereas boys receive more messages about dealing with negative stereotypes and coping with racism (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Thomas & Speight, 1999). However, other studies have demonstrated nonsignificant gender differences in racial-ethnic socialization experiences of minority children and youth (Hughes & Chen, 1997; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). One methodological limitation of these studies pertains to restricted age ranges in the samples used. Another limitation pertains to limited research that examines the interplay of age and gender on racial-ethnic socialization processes. All the studies mentioned above did not examine the combined influence of gender and age when examining racial-ethnic socialization processes among youth.

*Immigration status* is another important variable influencing racial-ethnic socialization processes for ethnically diverse parents and their youth. Research has
shown that the frequency of racial-ethnic socialization practices is higher among families that recently migrated versus those who have been in the United States for a long time (Knight et al., 1993; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). In a recent article focusing on immigrant youth and their acculturation and adaptation experiences, Berry, Phinney, Sam, and Vedder (2006), found that immigrant youth who were involved in both cultures (their own and host culture) were more psychologically adjusted. However, this comprehensive study did not examine the role of parent socialization that could potentially facilitate or inhibit adjustment and adaptation experiences among immigrant youth.

Some studies have also examined the role of parents’ socioeconomic status in racial-ethnic socialization processes. For example, Hughes et al. (2006) suggest that parent’s characteristics such as socioeconomic status and parent’s identification with one’s group also influence racial-ethnic socialization processes. Additionally, Hughes and Chen (19970 found out that frequent racial-ethnic socialization messages particularly those focusing on cultural socialization and preparation for bias, were more prevalent among parents in professional and managerial jobs compared to their counterparts working in non-managerial positions. However, studies that consisted of small samples and restricted ranges in socio-economic status did not reveal significant differences (Phinney & Chavira, 1995).
Influences of Contexts on Racial-Ethnic Socialization

In addition to demographic characteristics, contextual variables such as neighborhoods and discrimination experiences have been identified as important distal factors that influence racial-ethnic socialization experiences. Research on neighborhood influences on racial-ethnic socialization processes, has shown that urban and nonurban neighborhoods are challenging environments that urge adolescent males to replace their vulnerabilities with heightened levels of masculine identities in order to achieve and maintain respect (Stevenson, 1997). Research has demonstrated that social contexts and neighborhoods in particular, play an important role in racial and ethnic socialization processes (Caughy, Nettles, O’Campo, & Lohrfink, 2006). For example, African American parents who believe that their children encounter prejudice in their neighborhoods are more likely to socialize their children on how to cope with discrimination whereas African American parents who believe that they are raising children in unsafe neighborhoods are more likely to socialize their children in ways that promote mistrust of others (Caughy et. al., 2006). This line of research has also demonstrated the indirect role that contexts such as neighborhoods play in the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and psychological outcomes in children. In their study, Caughy and colleagues (2006) found that neighborhood characteristics moderated the relationship between racial socialization practices and behavioral outcomes among children. Studies that have examined the influence of neighborhoods on racial-ethnic socialization practices have shown that preparation for bias messages are more prevalent in integrated neighborhoods. Findings from this study suggested that
racially-ethnically diverse neighborhoods influence the type of messages that parents use to engage in socialization practices with their children.

Additionally, several studies have examined the influence of neighborhood racial composition and community relationships on adolescents’ racial socialization (Demo & Hughes, 1990; Stevenson et al., 2005). Focusing on the impact of neighborhood safety, diversity, and racism experiences on youth socialization processes, Stevenson and colleagues (2005), found that cultural pride socialization was prevalent in highly diverse neighborhoods especially among girls who reported no racism experiences and receiving more cultural pride socialization than boys. These authors posit the idea that parents of sons in culturally diverse neighborhoods may be more inclined to discuss protective coping strategies due to the negative societal messages of African American males (Stevenson et al., 2003; Stevenson et al., 2005). This finding mirrors previous evidence suggested by Thomas and Speight (1999) in that girls receive more messages regarding racial pride socialization, whereas boys are more likely to receive messages about coping with racial barriers. However, research on the influences of neighborhoods and broader ecological contexts on racial-ethnic socialization practices and their psychological correlates remains limited (Swanson et al., 2003). Additionally, research on this topic tends to be limited in that it rarely integrates the combined influence of perceived discrimination and racial-ethnic composition of neighborhoods on racial-ethnic socialization practices. Additionally, little is known about neighborhood effects for affluent youth of color and related psychological outcomes (Swanson et al., 2003).
Correlates of Racial-Ethnic Socialization

Racial-ethnic socialization experiences have a strong influence on youth’s ethnic identity (Hughes et al., 2006). Specifically, messages such as cultural socialization and racial/ethnic pride increase children and youth’s awareness about their group while also fostering favorable in-group attitudes. For example, Marshall (1995) suggests that children who receive more racial-ethnic socialization messages are less likely to endorse racial identity views characteristic of the encounter stage (Cross, 1991). Conversely, adolescents who received more messages about awareness of racism, endorse more characteristics of advanced stages of ethnic-racial identity development (Stevenson, 1995). Additionally, cultural socialization has been associated with positive outcomes in areas of identity exploration, positive in-group attitudes, and group-oriented behaviors across different samples (Demo & Hughes, 1990; Nelson & Quintana, 2005; Umana-Taylor & Fine, 2004). However, other studies have not revealed significant relationships between racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development among minority youth (Demo & Hughes, 1990). Additionally, little is known about the relationship of racial-ethnic socialization practices and ethnic identity development across multiethnic youth. Also, studies examining the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and self-esteem have revealed inconsistent findings that are often attributed to conceptual and methodological differences across different studies (Hughes et al., 2006). Research has also focused on the relations between racial-ethnic socialization and the ability to cope with prejudice and discrimination among minority youth. Spencer (1983) suggested that racial-ethnic socialization experiences facilitate youth’s ability to recognize and cope
with stereotypes and discriminations. More specifically, messages pertaining to preparation for bias play an important role in fostering awareness and coping abilities, seeking support, and using prosocial problem-solving strategies (Hughes et al., 2006; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Additionally, cultural socialization messages promote youth’s resilience and protect their self-esteem. In a study that examined the relationship between parental racial socialization and domain specific self-esteem (e.g., home, school, peer), Constantine and Blakcmon (2002) found that socialization messages focusing on cultural pride were positively correlated with Black adolescents’ peer self-esteem whereas mainstream racial socialization messages were negatively associated with school self-esteem. However, one limitation of this study pertains to generalizability issues given the fact that students in the sample were enrolled in a predominantly Black parochial school in the northeast region of the United States.

*Racial-Ethnic Socialization Processes from Adolescents’ Perspectives*

According to several phenomenological theories, children are active participants in understanding, interpreting, and constructing meaning regarding their racial/ethnic status and its impact on their lives. Stevenson and colleagues (2002) posit the idea that racial socialization beliefs and experiences are two distinct phenomena. In other words, these researchers argue that what adolescents believe about their group membership and messages that they receive from parents among other sources, are two distinct phenomena. The rationale for this argument pertains to the fact that racial socialization processes are influenced by both parents’ and adolescents’ personal and indirect encounters with racism (societal oppression experiences) and by discussion of race within
the family (Spencer et al., 2002). Exploring the content and depth of conversations about race within the family system from the adolescent’s perspective is an important and yet, an understudied area of research on youth racial socialization processes. This important issue has been recently addressed via research that incorporates both parents’ and adolescents’ perspectives on racial-ethnic socialization experiences (Hughes et al., 2009). However, one limitation of this study pertains to measuring the quality of the race discourse within families without including adolescents’ perceptions of those discourses. On the other hand, studies that have examined youth’s perceptions of racial-ethnic socialization messages have indicated positive impact on youth’s psychological functioning. For example, studies focusing on racial-ethnic socialization and youth outcomes have revealed positive relationships between messages regarding racial barriers and greater levels of self-efficacy, self-esteem, racial identity development, and socioemotional well-being (Bowman & Howard, 1985; Stevenson, 1995, Stevenson et al., 1995). However, one key limitation of these studies has to do with placing a primary focus on between-group differences and a lesser emphasis on examining intragroup variabilities. To this date, understanding intragroup differences remains a prevalent limitation of literature on ethnically diverse youth development (García Coll, Akerman, & Cicchetti, 2000; Spencer et al., 2003).

Limitations in Racial-Ethnic Socialization and Ethnic Youth Research

As stated earlier, there is significant overlap between racial and ethnic socialization processes and this convergence has often led to empirical research that examines these processes simultaneously. However, despite the choice of examining
racial and socialization processes along a continuum for different minority and non-minority groups, one should be familiar with challenges that arise when racial and ethnic socialization are used interchangeably in empirical literature. These challenges are both conceptual and methodological (Spencer et al., 2003). Conceptual limitations pertain to the variability of defining and measuring constructs of racial and ethnic socialization across different studies, whereas methodological difficulties arise from using cross-sectional self-report data (Hughes et al., 2009). Additionally, the complexity and the intersection of race and ethnicity as constructs are often addressed through different disciplines; e.g., anthropology examining cultural differences, sociology examining structural racism, and psychology examining racial identity issues. This has led to a compartmentalization of research that focuses on ethnically diverse youth whereas empirical literature that integrates various disciplines is limited (Spencer et al., 2003).

Additionally, it is important to recognize etic (general to all groups) and emic (specific to a particular cultural group) perspectives on socialization and human development (García Coll, Akerman, & Cichetti, 2000). Youth development is characterized by normative developmental experiences that are common to all youth as well as developmental phenomena that are unique and subjective to ethnic minority youth. For example, ethnic minority youth are often regarded as nonnormative or pathological samples whereas their White counterparts are viewed as normative and standard of comparison (Swanson et al., 2003). Additionally, emphasis on negative outcomes rather than positive characteristics perpetuates the deficit-oriented perspective and thus, fails to examine resilience, coping strategies, and competencies that are
important phenomena in the development of ethnic minority youth. Particularly, information on racial-ethnic socialization influences on development of competencies among minority youth remains scarce (Spencer et al., 2003). Other limitations in this body of literature include lack of cultural competencies in conducting meaningful research with ethnic minority youth (Spencer et al., 2003). Furthermore, limited cultural competencies (e.g., assuming that adolescence is a universal phenomenon for all youth) in ethnic youth research leads to gaps in understanding normative developmental experiences of minority youth and as a result, perpetuating stereotypical assumptions (Spencer et al., 2003).

In addition to conceptual challenges, there are methodological challenges to understanding racial-ethnic socialization processes among ethnically diverse youth. One challenge pertains to the variability of instruments and measurement approaches. Specifically, it is often times difficult to synthesize information emerging from using different measurement approaches such as open-ended questions, close-ended binary questions, and survey-type questions (Hughes et al., 2006). Each of these measurement approaches offers advantages and limitations. For example, use of open-ended questions provides information about the salience of a particular racial/ethnic socialization topic. On the other hand, these types of questions provide limited information about the range of messages that parents convey to their children. Similarly, close-ended binary questions offer information about the prevalence of specific dimensions of racial/ethnic socialization (e.g., whether messages are conveyed from parents to children or not), whereas survey-type questions provide information about the frequency and/or the
strength of these messages during racial/ethnic socialization practices (Hughes et al., 2006). Furthermore, little is known about received racial-ethnic socialization messages from youth’s perspectives and their influence on psychological outcomes.

Finally, little is known about socialization processes among nonminority children and youth and the impact of these processes on their identity development and psychological outcomes. Given the rapid demographic changes in today’s society, children from the majority group also need to be socialized on issues of race, privilege, and globalization of the country and the world. However, information regarding how racially dominant children are socialized with regard to racial privilege remains limited (Spencer, 2006). More specifically, empirical evidence is limited in areas that examine the influence of cultural and racial privilege on the development of nonminority children and how privilege impacts the development of minority and nonminority youth.

According to Spencer (2006) children who are not part of a minority group are also exposed to socially-constructed cultural contexts. Furthermore, children from non-minority groups grow up in contexts in which their culture, race, or ethnicity are considered privileged over other cultural and racial groups. However, this privilege is unfortunately not acknowledged and lack of recognition of this aspect of group membership has implications for broad environmental experiences for this segment of youth and their minority counterparts. For example, research has shown that children and youth in the privileged group are often unaware of their privileged status and the benefits that derive from having a privileged status in this society (Quintana et al., 2007). Research has also shown that there are intragroup differences in White racial identity
development and different racial identity statuses are associated with different attitudes towards members of other groups (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2006). Only few studies have examined the negative implications of privilege among nonminority youth and how privilege influences inter-group relationships between minority and nonminority youth (Luthar & Becker, 2002; Luthar & Lattendresse, 2002; Spencer, 2006). These studies have urged the importance of understanding how minority and nonminority youth are socialized and prepared to live in an increasingly diverse society. Furthermore, these studies acknowledge the importance of understanding socialization experiences among nonminority youth as way to examine the dynamics of between-group interactions but also preventing inequalities and discrimination in the future generations. Finally, little is known about the experiences of racial-ethnic socialization among multiethnic youth (Hamm, 2001; Hughes et al., 2006; Spencer, 2006). In summary, studies focusing on racial-ethnic socialization experiences among non-minority and multiethnic youth are limited and information about how this segment of the population is prepared to navigate an increasingly diverse society remains limited.

*Ethnic Identity Development Frameworks: The Interplay of Contexts and Individual Experiences*

As discussed earlier, identity development is a complex and dynamic process that does not evolve in a vacuum. To better understand the unique experiences of ethnic identity development across ethnically diverse youth, both ecological and individual perspectives need to be considered. This dual perspective on both individual and contextual variables offers several advantages. First, integrating ecological with
individual factors facilitates a better understanding of proximal and distal contexts and the bidirectional transactions processes between the adolescent and his or her contexts.

Proximal and distal contexts and their influence on youth’s development are often examined through ecological models, especially Bronfenbrenner’s ecological model (1989). According to this ecological framework, the individual is part of multiple contexts and human development occurs throughout person-contexts transactions. Additionally, context plays an important role in developmental processes of youth (Bronfenbrenner, 1984; Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003). Furthermore, transactions between the individual and his/her contexts are ongoing, dynamic, and circular. These transactions consists of the microsystem, which pertains to the interaction of the individual with the immediate environment such as home, school, family, etc. The mesosystem, refers to interactions between the individual’s microsystems whereas the exosystem, refers to the distal and indirect influences on the individuals life. Finally, the macrosystem, represents broader socio-political influences in the individual’s development such as the government, the economy, financial market, mass media, etc.

In summary, contexts are key factors that play an important role in youth’s development. Additionally, youth are active participants in their interactions with their contexts perceived through their own filters. An integrative model proposed by García Coll et al. (1996) suggests that social stratification variables such as race, social class, ethnicity, and gender play an important role in shaping the environmental contexts in which youth development occurs and these contexts in turn, offer a unique ecological niche for the adolescent’s development. Therefore, identity development particularly
among ethnically diverse youth should be examined and understood through a phenomenological approach. This framework is briefly summarized below.

According to the Phenomenological Variant of Ecological Systems Theory (PVEST), human development for youth of all ethnicities reflects the interplay of identity, culture, and experience (Spencer, 1995, Spencer, Dupree, & Hartmann, 1997). According to this theoretical framework, the individual is proactive and engages in meaning making efforts while interacting with multiple contexts in his/her environment. Additionally, this model accounts for similarities and differences in individual-context transactions and meaning-making experiences among youth from different ethnic groups. This conceptual framework consists of five core components. The net vulnerability level consists of characteristics in one’s environment that may pose challenges in the individual’s development. Those risk factors can be countered with protective factors that may also be present in a given context. In the absence of protective factors, these risks (e.g., poverty, discrimination, etc.) can lead to adversarial outcomes. The net vulnerability level poses challenges not only for ethnic minority youth, but also for their White counterparts because privilege can also prevent non-minority youth from developing positive coping skills (Spencer et al., 2003). The second component of this model consists of the net stress engagement and pertains to individual’s lived experiences that challenge his or her well-being. Encounters with challenging situations such as experiences of racism in overt and subtle ways, cause distress for minority youth and available support can buffer or alleviate their negative impact. In other words, while the net vulnerability level pertains to potential risk and protective factors in the context, the
net stress engagement denotes actual and lived experiences where the individual experiences distress and is able to access support in the environment.

The third component, reactive coping methods, represents youth’s efforts to respond to stressors along with their supports. According to Swanson and colleagues (2003), reactive coping methods can lead to adaptive or maladaptive coping strategies. Over time, coping strategies that lead to desirable results are replicated and become stable coping behaviors fostering emergent identities, the fourth component in the PVEST model. Emerging identities such as ethnic, gender identity, self- and peer-appraisals are all aspects of one identity and represent the individual’s perception of multiple contexts that s/he is embedded in. Identity development processes also are salient for developing a future orientation yielding positive or negative outcomes. Lifestage specific coping outcomes represent the fifth and last component in PVEST framework where positive outcomes include things such as good health, high levels of self-esteem, and negative outcomes include poor health outcomes, presence of self-destructive behaviors (Spencer et al., 1997; Swanson et al., 2003). In summary, youth’s perceptions of risk and protective factors embedded in their contexts are salient in youth’s self-appraisal process. And, as mentioned earlier, self-appraisal plays a salient role in adolescent’s identity formation. The processes of identity development, particularly ethnic and racial identity development are briefly discussed below.
Racial and Ethnic Identity Development

The construct of identity is widely researched across different disciplines and is often viewed as a subjective feeling of sameness and continuity that provides individuals with a stable sense of self. Identity is considered an evolving process which begins in childhood via observations and reflections and continues through adulthood culminating to resolution or achieved identity. According to Erikson (1968) not all individuals achieve a stable sense of identity and this often leads to role confusions and difficulties in pursuing meaningful goals.

Many theories of identity development have considered the importance of a person’s attitudes towards his or her ethnic group. These attitudes may be positive, negative, or undifferentiated (Reese, Vera, & Paikoff, 1998). Ethnic identity has been conceptualized as a multifaceted construct which is associated with an individual’s sense of belonging and commitment to an ethnic group (Phinney, 1996; Phinney & Ong, 2007). The process of examining and questioning thoughts and feelings associated with group membership is a central task during adolescence; a developmental period when identities are formed and begin to become formalized (Erikson, 1968). Quintana and colleagues (2007) offer a comprehensive definition of the construct of identity describing it as: “… the formation and development of children’s racial, ethnic, and cultural identity including social cognitive processes, the implications of bicultural and multicultural identification, bilingualism and multilingualism, immigration and migration, and acculturation and enculturation processes that support these identity processes” (p. 1130).
Developmental psychologists view identity formation as a salient process during adolescence. Ethnic identity in particular, is viewed as one of the many facets of social identity (Sellers et al., 1998). However, little is known about ethnic identity development in early and middle adolescence (French, Seidman, Allen, & Aber, 2006). Most theories of identity development derive from the intersection of developmental and social psychology and the latter tends to view identity development as the individual’s negotiation of social identity in the broader context along with society’s view of the individual’s membership to a particular social group. However, this perspective does not take into account the process during which the individual moves from one stage of identity development to the next until that person reaches an ideal state of social identity. Additionally, individuals who belong to highly valued groups do not need to modify their social identity whereas membership to socially devalued groups necessitates the need to negotiate the meaning of one’s identity. When faced with the task of identity negotiation as a result of membership to socially devalued groups, Tajfel and Turner (1986) suggest several alternatives. *Individual mobility* pertains to situations during which the individual physically leaves the group and when changing group membership is not possible (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity), the individual psychologically disengages from his or her group. *Social creativity* pertains to the group as a whole attempting to redefine the meaning of their group membership by comparing their own group with another group alongside one superior attribute or by altering the values attributed to group from negative to positive. Another alternative refers to *social competition* in which the group as a whole opposes
the current system attempting a change in the hierarchy and distribution of power in the system (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Along with research focusing on social identity and ethnic identity in particular, another line of research has examined the influence of ethnic identity on the relationship between minority status and psychological variables such as self-esteem. For example, Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) suggest that an individual can feel good about his or her self (self-esteem) and also feel good about being a member of a group (group-esteem). In an attempt to measure collective self-esteem Crocker and Luhtanen found out that individuals who were high in collective self-esteem were more prone to engage in strategies to restore their sense of social identity compared to their counterparts who endorsed low levels of collective self-esteem. As a result, individuals who used individual mobility as a way to cope with devalued group status would have a low group-esteem compared to those who utilized social competition or social creativity as strategies to deal with their membership status. Prior to these findings, research on the effects of stereotypes and oppression on self-esteem among members of socially devalued groups was mixed. In fact, some researchers argued that members of socially devalued groups in the United States internalized their experiences of oppression yielding adversarial effects on several areas such as self-esteem (Tajfel, 1978). However, in an extensive meta-analysis based on studies that examined self-esteem, Twenge and Crocker (2002) found out that African Americans reported similar or higher levels of self-esteem compared to European Americans. Since then, researchers have examined the mediating role of ethnic
identity as way to understand the relationship between membership in a socially devalued group and several mental health outcomes.

The Structure and Development of Ethnic Identity

Overall, ethnic identity encompasses the individual’s thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and behaviors associated with ethnic group membership. Ethnic identity is particularly salient in adolescence and identity formation is a central task for adolescents to resolve and achieve (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1980). Exploration and commitment are two core components of ethnic identity statuses in that: “Exploration with regard to ethnicity involves learning about one’s group and its implications for one’s life. Commitment refers to a decision regarding the meaning of one’s ethnicity and the way one will live as a group member (Phinney, Jacoby, & Silva, 2007, p. 479).

Despite the prominent use of the term “ethnic identity” in psychological literature, there is no standard definition and limited agreement on the nature of ethnic identity (Swanson et al., 2003). Some empirical literature views ethnic identity as a component of social identity whereas other research considers whether someone self-identifies and sees oneself as affiliated with a group. Although self-identification is critical in examining ethnic identity, the latter is not always a linear process. This is particularly true when one explores ethnic identity among multiethnic or immigrant individuals.

Self-identification is an important aspect of identity development. Racial and ethnic self-identification pertains to a sense of awareness about one’s ethnic/racial self and group (Bernal, Knight, Ocampo, Garza & Cota, 1993; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). Furthermore, self-identification is influenced by individual (cognitive) and social
(environmental) variables (Spencer, 1984). As mentioned earlier, self-identification spans throughout development; it emerges in a young age (as young as age 3 among African American children) and accuracy of self-identification increases substantially during adolescence (Aboud & Doyle, 1995, Spencer, 1984).

Research has shown that ethnic identity and attitudes toward other groups are considered to remain somewhat stable over short and moderate time intervals (Bachay, 1998). Although most of the research is focused on late adolescence (predominantly with high school and college age samples), most theories of ethnic identity development assume that development of an ethnic identity begins in childhood and continues to evolve in early and late adolescence. Additionally, although theories of ethnic identity development describe this process as a chronological and progressive one, it should not be assumed that ethnic identity is a linear process. Instead, encounters with different social and historical contexts and situations, and variability in ethnic identity development trajectories among members of the same ethnic group, are indicative of the complexity, fluidity, and the dynamic nature of ethnic development processes (Cross, 1978; Phinney, 1992; Phinney, Cantu, & Kurtz, 1997).

According to Phinney (1992), ethnic identity is comprised of four components: (1) self-identification (an individual uses an ethnic label to identify herself/himself), (2) ethnic behaviors and practices (the individual engages in activities and practices characteristic of his/her ethnic group), (3) affirmation and belonging (the individual experiences ethnic pride and positive feelings toward his/her ethnic group), and (4) ethnic identity achievement (spanning from low levels of awareness about group
membership to exploration, commitment, and meaning grounded in a secure sense of self as a member of that ethnic group). According to Phinney (1992), the last two components of ethnic identity (affirmation and belonging, and ethnic identity achievement) are salient features of the construct of ethnic identity especially during adolescence.

As mentioned earlier, ethnic identity development is a fluid and dynamic process and several stage-like models explain its course of development. According to Phinney (1996), adolescent ethnic identity development can be conceptualized through three stages: (1) diffusion or foreclosure, in which adolescents conform to the values of the dominant culture and their ethnic identity is unexamined; (2) moratorium or exploration during which the adolescent encounters a critical incident or crisis which then leads to asking questions and searching for ethnic identity; and (3) ethnic identity achievement during which the adolescent accepts his or her own ethnic identity and develops an acceptance of the ethnicity of others. As a result of ethnic identity achievement, the adolescent is able to recognize cultural and power differences between the dominant group and his or her group (Phinney, 1996).

Researchers have often times attempted to understand and examine core components of ethnic identity (e.g., political attitudes, language, self-identification, social networks, cultural attitudes) across different groups (Phinney, 1992). As a result, several measures have been developed and used to assess key components of ethnic identity in different groups such as African American, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans (Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Stracuzzi, & Saywa, 2003). Given the variety of measures
that are used to examine ethnic identity among different groups, questions have been raised whether it is possible to understand and measure ethnic identity as a general phenomenon that is relevant across different groups (Phinney, 1992; Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, & Oxford, 2000). This argument mirrors the debate among cross-cultural psychologists who argue that complex phenomena such as ethnic identity should be understood by considering universal (etic) and culture specific (emic) aspects of this phenomenon (Phinney, 1992). Those who argue that ethnic identity development consists of unique trajectories for different minority groups have examined this issue through a within-group approach (Cockley, 2007). Conversely, other researchers argue that ethnic identity transcends unique groups and can be examined using a between-group approach (Phinney & Ong, 2007). The latter approach allows for a general understanding of the process of ethnic identity development and its correlates across members of different ethnic groups. Furthermore, an encompassing model of ethnic identity model that transcends specific groups facilitates the assessment and understanding of the unique experiences of individuals who identify themselves as multiethnic/multiracial (Spencer, et al., 2000).

*Examining the Convergence between Racial Identity and Ethnic Identity*

Similar to the ambiguities that arise when racial socialization and ethnic socialization are used interchangeably, the constructs of racial and ethnic identities are often confounded (Cokley, 2007; Helms, 2007; Trimble 2007). Helms posits the argument that studies of racial identity focus on individuals’ responses to racism and “racial identity measures are designed to assess the differential impact of racial dynamics
on individuals’ psychological development” (p. 236). In contrast, studies of ethnic identity have predominantly focused on measuring one’s sense of belonging to an ethnic group and paying attention to variables such as cultural heritage, values, tradition, and language. Additionally, as French and colleagues (2006) point out, ethnic identity development is a central part of adolescence whereas racial identity development is a complex process that unfolds during adulthood. Additionally, another conceptual limitation pertains to the frequent use of “racial identity” and “ethnic identity” interchangeably. Several researchers have argued that there is considerable overlap between the two and that during identity development, ethnic identity and racial identity are close to each other (Hughes et al., 2006; Swanson et al., 2003).

Despite the differences, racial identity and ethnic identity share several common and unifying characteristics. First, both constructs refer to a sense of belonging to a group, learning about one’s group, and are associated with cultural behaviors, values, and attitudes toward one’s own group (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Additionally, both processes of ethnic and racial identity development involve movement from one stage to another. For example, according to Phinney (1989) individuals progress through the stage of (a) unexamined identity to (b) ethnic identity search and finally, to (c) achieved ethnic identity. Similarly, according to Cross’s (1971) model of Nigrescence, African American individuals move from a state of unawareness about their racial membership (preencounter) to other stages during which the individual experiences a wide-opening experience (encounter), explores what it means to be Black (immersion-emersion), becomes confident and proud of his/her identity (internalization), and with a positive
group-esteem, works towards elevating the oppressed status of African Americans and eliminating racism in the United States (internalization-commitment). However, this process is not always linear and Cross (1991) argues that it is possible for individuals to stagnate in one stage or even return to previous stages upon experiencing a new encounter.

Furthermore, Quintana and colleagues (2007), emphasize the importance of measuring racial and ethnic identity directly rather than using an individual’s group membership to infer and make assumptions about one’s identity. In other words, using categories such as “Asian”; “Hispanic”; “Black”, or “Caucasian” does not imply that one is fully identifying with one particular group. Rather, these researchers argue that measures of ethnic and racial identity development should tap into information about one’s identification with a particular group. For example, several measures of racial and ethnic identity development, pay attention to individual’s involvement in social activities with members of one’s ethnic and racial group and participation in the cultural traditions of that group, as indicative of a particular identity (Cross, 1991; Phinney, 1992).

Psychosocial Correlates of Ethnic Identity among Ethnically Diverse Youth

Similar to inconsistent agreement regarding the definition of ethnic identity, some limitations also exist with regard to examining influences of ethnic identity on psychological and academic outcomes. Several authors argue that assessing youth’s ethnicity as a categorical variable provides limited information about one’s membership to one group and the individual’s perceptions regarding positive or negative outcomes associated with that group membership (Swanson et al., 2003). Despite the limitations
emerging from the use of ethnic identity as a categorical variable, there are several studies that demonstrate strong associations between ethnic identity development and psychological correlates among ethnically diverse youth.

For example, there is ample research evidence that shows a relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem. According to the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) members of the same group differentiate their group from others and evaluate their group more favorably. In this way, an individual’s identity is an important source of self-esteem. However, according to Tajfel (1981), if an ethnic minority group is viewed negatively by the society members of that group may also view themselves negatively. Yet, empirical evidence indicates the contrary and suggests that African American and Latino adolescents do not differ or score higher in self-esteem measures when compared to their White counterparts (Crocker & Major, 1989; Hughes & Demo, 1989; Martinez & Dukes, 1991). Research has also shown that ethnic identity buffers the negative consequences of prejudice and discrimination among Mexican American adolescents (Quintana & Vera, 1999). In their study of 2nd and 6th graders, these authors found that ethnic knowledge was strongly and positively associated with understanding ethnic prejudice. Additionally, this study revealed that the influence of ethnic behaviors on understanding ethnic prejudice was only partial and that ethnic knowledge mediated this relationship. Findings from this study also suggested that parent racial-ethnic socialization messages were predictive of children’s ethnic knowledge which in turn, was predictive of children’s level of understanding of ethnic prejudice. This finding suggests
that ethnic identity plays an important role in the relationship between parent’s racial socialization messages and children’s level of understanding of ethnic prejudice.

**Self-Esteem and Group-Esteem among Ethnically Diverse Youth**

Self-esteem is often viewed as one’s feelings of self-worth and self-respect (Rosenberg, 1965) and research has shown that self-esteem is strongly and positively related to several measures of well-being. For example, research has shown that self-esteem is strongly associated with one’s satisfaction with life (Diener, 1984) and positive affect (Phelham & Swann, 1989). As mentioned earlier, according to social identity theory posited by Tajfel and Turner (1979) self-concept is comprised of two distinct parts: *personal identity* which refers to how individuals view themselves, and *social identity* which refers to how individuals view the group they belong to. Furthermore, Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) suggest that social identity can be furthered understood through the individual’s view about membership to a particular social group (collective identity) and the value placed on one’s social group (collective self-esteem). Despite the fact that social identity theory clearly differentiates between personal and social identity, most of the research focuses on the personal aspect of one’s identity, particularly self-esteem. However, information on self-esteem provides limited information about other aspects of one’s social identity and this becomes particularly relevant when examining social identity among individuals across ethnic minority groups whose social statuses (e.g., gender, race, and ethnicity) often place them in socially devalued positions. Additionally, considering self-esteem as the only aspect of one’s social identity poses significant challenges when examining individuals’ social identity across different
cultures. For example, as Twenge and Crocker (2002) point out, individualism and collectivism are associated with different views of the self. Particularly, the individual in Western societies is viewed to have a stable sense of self that remains the same across different situations and interpersonal relations. On the other hand, in collectivist cultures, the individual’s self is viewed as more fluid and context-dependent.

*Racial-Ethnic Socialization, Ethnic Identity, and Well-Being among Ethnically Diverse Youth*

Several studies have examined the role of ethnic identity on several mental health outcomes among members of minority groups. For example, Phinney (1989) found that an achieved identity status is related to high levels of self-esteem, ego identity, and healthy family and peer relationships. Additionally, research on ethnic identity and mental health in African American and Latino youth has shown that a positive sense of group membership in a specific ethnic group is associated with positive mental health outcomes and psychological functioning (Caldwell et al., 2004; Greig, 2003; Spencer et al., 2006). Research conducted with Navajo youth has also shown that high levels of Navajo cultural identity aid in reducing levels of depression and in contrary, perceived discrimination is a significant predictor of depression. In their study of college-age Latino students, Chávez and French (2007) found that the presence of stereotypes among students in their sample was associated with high anxiety levels and low levels of positive affect. Additionally, findings from their study revealed that parental socialization did not moderate the negative influence of perceived discrimination on psychological outcomes among these students. However, findings from this study have not been replicated with a
younger age sample. In a study conducted by Kiang and her colleagues (2006), high levels of ethnic regard among adolescents in their sample were associated with high levels of daily happiness and low levels of daily anxiety. Additionally, these authors found that ethnic identity buffered the negative impact of daily stressors and daily happiness among youth in their sample. However, in this study, ethnic regard did not buffer the negative influence of daily stressors on youth’s levels of anxiety. This study’s findings emerged from a sample comprised of youth from Mexican and Chinese backgrounds and as the authors point out, research with other ethnic groups is needed to examine the impact of different aspects of ethnic identity on youth’s subjective well-being. In another study examining the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem in the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and youth behavioral and academic outcomes, Hughes and colleagues (2009) found that cultural socialization messages were more strongly associated with academic than with behavioral outcomes and that indirect effect of ethnic identity and self-esteem was small although statistically significant. Additionally, preparation for bias messages were negative associated with self-esteem, ethnic affirmation, and behavioral outcomes. However, as mentioned earlier, this study operationalized behavioral outcomes as the presence/absence of delinquent behavior among youth in this sample and did not examine youth’s positive psychological functioning.
Subjective Well-Being among Ethnically Diverse Youth

Positive psychology has particularly focused on understanding and examining an important phenomenon such as individual’s subjective well-being. Subjective well-being is defined as the individual’s global judgment of his/her life satisfaction and the presence of positive and negative affect. The global judgment of one’s life satisfaction represents the cognitive component whereas positive and negative affect represent the affective component of this phenomenon (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Additionally, the cognitive component of subjective well-being represents the individual’s appraisal of his or her life whereas the affective component represents a hedonic evaluation guided by emotions and feelings. Since the emergence of positive psychology which employs a strengths-based perspective and emphasizes positive developmental outcomes, research on adolescent development has also focused on wellness and positive functioning particularly among ethnic minority youth. This focus on positive developmental outcomes is particularly important in understanding how ethnically diverse youth successfully cope with challenging situations and negotiate a positive ethnic identity. Specifically, research has shown that coping behaviors that are commonly used during encounters with negative experiences are positively related to subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1999). This has important implications in understanding how ethnic minority youth cope with experiences of discrimination and stereotypes and the association between coping behaviors and their subjective well-being.

The majority of research on subjective well-being has focused on adults and college-age individuals and less is known about subjective well-being among
adolescents, particularly ethnically diverse youth (McCullough, Huebner, & Laughlin, 2000). Only recently research has examined subjective well-being and its correlates among ethnically diverse youth (Morgan, Vera, Gonzalez, Conner, Bena Vacek, & Dick Coyle, 2009). In their study, Morgan and colleagues examined the relationship between components of subjective well-being and several individual, family, school, peer, and neighborhood variables among urban adolescents of color. Findings from this study suggest that family variables play a significant role in predicting overall life satisfaction and negative affect whereas individual, school and peer variables played a positive role on positive affect. This study offered a comprehensive understanding of the influence of individual and contextual factors on youth’s subjective well-being while utilizing Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological framework. One important implication from this study pertains to the need to further explore the influence of individual and family factors on different aspects (e.g., cognitive, affective) of subjective well-being. Similarly, another study revealed that family and individual factors played a significant and positive role on urban adolescents of color, suggesting that more research is needed to understand the mechanisms that explain the relationship between individual, family variables, and subjective well-being (Vera et al., 2008). Findings from these studies suggest that individual and family factors play an important role in youth’s subjective well-being. Yet, information on the relationships between family variables such as racial-ethnic socialization and subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth remains limited. Therefore, examination of racial-ethnic socialization processes and their relationship to
youth’s subjective well-being is important because little is known about specific family variables that contribute to youth’s subjective well-being.

In summary, uncovering the processes that lead to optimal outcomes for ethnically diverse youth is very critical and this study attempts to examine the prevalence of racial-ethnic socialization messages and their relationships with ethnic identity development and subjective well-being in a high school sample comprised of ethnically diverse youth.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on quantitative data gathered from self-reported questionnaires administered to high school students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. This section contains information about sample characteristics, measures comprising the questionnaire, and recruitment procedures.

Sample Characteristics

The sample for this study consisted of 145 high school students recruited during a summer school program (n = 53) and during the Fall 2009 semester (n = 92). There were 67 (46.2%) males and 78 (53.8%) female adolescents in this study. The majority of participants identified themselves as Latino/a (n = 104, 71.7%). The rest of the sample was comprised of African American (n = 24, 16.6%) and “Other” (n = 17, 11.7%). The “Other” category consisted of individuals who identified themselves as biracial (n = 9, 6.2%), Caucasian (n = 2, 1.4%), Asian American (n = 3, 2.1%), and mixed (n = 3, 2.1%). Participant average age was 14.9 (SD = 0.8), ranging from 14 to 17 years old.

Additionally, 76 students (52.8%) reported being in 9th grade, 46 students (31.9%) reported being in 10th grade, and 22 students (15.3%) reported being in 11th grade. 107 students in the sample stated that they lived with both of their parents (73.8%), 25 students (17.2%) reported living with mother only, a smaller segment of the sample reported living with father only (n = 4, 2.8%), a family member/guardian (n = 4, 2.8%) or
other (n = 5, 3.4%). Finally, the majority of students in this sample (129 students, 89%) stated that they participated in the free lunch program.

**Measures**

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Participants in this study were asked to complete a brief questionnaire consisting of demographic information such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, grade level, number of adults living in the household, number of caretakers involved in the adolescent’s care, and whether they qualified/participated in the free-lunch program offered at their schools.

**Ethnic Identity**

*Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure* (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) is a 14-item measure that assesses three aspects of identity: (1) positive ethnic attitudes and sense of belonging (5 items); (2) ethnic identity achievement (7 items); and (3) ethnic behaviors or practices (2 items). The scale also includes six additional items that assess other-group orientation. Items are rated on a 4-point scale: 1-*strongly agree* and 4-*strongly disagree*. Scoring is based on reversing negatively worded items, summing across items, and obtaining the mean. Scores range from 4 (high ethnic identity) to 1 (low ethnic identity) (Phinney, 1992). Phinney reported overall reliability coefficients of .81 and .90 for high school and college samples, respectively. In this study, the reliability estimate for the 14-item measure was .79.

**Racial-Ethnic Socialization**

*Racial Socialization Scale* (Hughes, 1998). This scale consists of 22 items developed for the Early Adolescent Development Study conducted by the author of this
scale. The scale consists of three subscales: Cultural socialization subscale comprised of 11 items (example of an item: “you should be proud to be the race that you are”), Preparation for Bias comprised of five items (example of an item: “You may have a hard time being accepted in this society because of your race”), and Promotion of Mistrust consisting of seven items. This scale was obtained from a dissertation study (Sykes, 2003). Participants were asked to report how frequently their parents engaged in racial socialization practices using a 3-point scale (1 = Never; and 3 = A lot of times).

Coefficient alphas for the Cultural Socialization and Preparation for Bias subscales reported in a dissertation that utilized this scale were .86 and .81, respectively (Hughes & Johnson, 2001). In this sample, reliability estimates of the two subscales, Preparation for Bias and Cultural Socialization, were .77 and .81, respectively.

**Psychological Correlates**

*Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory* (Rosenberg, 1986). This is a self-reported measure of self-esteem which has been widely used with multiethnic samples. The scale consists of 10 items that provide an overall index of global self-esteem. Items in this scale reflect participant’s overall feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance. The items are answered on a four-point scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” Scores in this measure range from 0 to 30. Scores between 15 and 25 are within normal range; scores below 15 suggest low levels of self-esteem. Coefficient alphas for this scale range from .77 to .88 (Rosenberg, 1965). The reliability estimate obtained from sample in this study was .72.
**The Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES)** (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). This measure is widely used to assess one’s positive or collective identity and consists of 16 items asking respondents to reflect on their social group membership based on variables such as sex, race, religion, and ethnicity. The CSES consist of four subscales: (1) Membership Esteem, which assesses the individual’s sense of worth about being a member of his/her social group; (2) Private Self Esteem, which assesses personal judgments of how good one’s social groups are; (3) Public Self Esteem, that assesses the individual’s perceptions of how positively others view one’s social group; and (4) Importance to Identity, which assesses the importance of social group membership to one’s self-concept. Luhtanen and Crocker have reported internal consistencies ranging from .70 to .80 across the four subscales. Only one scale, Private Self Esteem was used for this study and reliability estimate obtained was .71.

**Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).** The PANAS is a 20-item brief scale intended to examine predominant affective states. The measure consists of two subscales (10 items each) measuring positive and negative affect respectively. Scores range from 10–50 for each subscale, with higher scores reflecting more frequent emotions in each category. Past research has shown that the PANAS has adequate internal consistency in adult and adolescent samples (Watson et al., 1988). Reliability estimates obtained in this study were .89 and .86 for Positive Affect and Negative Affect subscales, respectively.

**Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Dienner, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).** This scale consists of five items that are designed to measure global cognitive judgments
of satisfaction with one’s life. Participants are asked to rank each item (e.g. “in most ways my life is close to my ideals” on a 7-point scale (7-strongly agree; 1- strongly disagree). High scores indicate that life is going well in multiple domains (work/school, family, personal development) whereas low scores indicate one’s dissatisfaction about current life. Dienner et al. (1985) reported coefficient alphas ranging from .80 to .87. In this study, coefficient alpha estimate was .83.

Procedures

Requests to conduct research with high school students were submitted to the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of Loyola University Chicago and Chicago Public School, respectively. After approval was obtained, the researcher started recruiting prospective students during June-November 2009. First, parents and students were recruited through a summer school program held at Loyola University Chicago in July 2009. The summer program seeks to socialize high school students from underserved communities in the Chicago area to college life through series of didactic and experiential activities. Students in this program attended different workshops that focused on enhancing critical thinking skills, developing future academic goals and aspirations, and providing hands-on experiences in areas such as college application, essay preparation, etc. Parent consent forms were sent to parents of students participating at this summer program. Students whose parents consented to allow their children to participate in this study were asked to review the assent form and decide whether they wanted to participate in this study. Students who declined participation in this study were provided with reading materials on topics of cultural diversity that was part of the workshop curriculum.
for this program. Fifty-three students (9th-11th grade) representing three high schools in the Chicago area participated during the first data collection wave of the study.

During the second data collection phase, the researcher collaborated with a group of Loyola faculty and undergraduate students who offer tutoring classes to high school students in a predominantly Hispanic community in the city of Chicago. Tutoring classes were offered on Saturdays during September-November 2009. The researcher collected parent consent forms in late October 2009 and proceeded with data collection during three consecutive Saturdays in November 2009. High school students whose parents did not consent participation in the study were encouraged to work on tutoring materials chosen for that particular week. Similarly, students who did not want to participate in the study were encouraged to work on study materials offered during that week.

The researcher attempted to recruit students from another high school in a northern suburb that is known for its ethnically diverse student population. However, partnership with this prospective school was not successful and the researcher was unable to obtain further survey data from another ethnically diverse high school.

The same self-reported questionnaire was used during two data collection phases. Average completion time was 25 minutes and completed questionnaires were collected and stored separately from consent and assent forms to ensure participants’ anonymity in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The research variables in this study included preparation for bias (PB), cultural socialization (CS), ethnic identity (EI), individual self-esteem (ISE), collective self-esteem (CSE), positive and negative affect (PA; NA), and satisfaction with life (SWL). Table 1 presents information for each research variable including means, standard deviation, minimal and maximal values, and reliability estimates. Bivariate correlations among study variables including preparation for bias, cultural socialization, ethnic identity, individual self-esteem, private self-esteem, positive and negative affect, and satisfaction with life are presented in Tables 2 and 3 for overall sample (n = 145) and Latino/a subsample (n = 104), respectively.

Plan for Analyses

Prior to analysis, estimates from research instruments measuring preparation for bias, cultural socialization, ethnic identity, individual and collective self-esteem, positive and negative affect, and satisfaction with life were examined to screen for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and extreme values. Estimates from predictor and outcome variables were screened for univariate outliers using graphic plots and z-score values greater than 3.29. Multivariate outliers were detected by using Mahalanobis distance at p < 0.001 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Additionally, examination of relationships between study variables such as preparation for bias, cultural socialization, ethnic identity
and private group-esteem, did not reveal multicollinearity concerns in multiple regression analysis. Prior to performing multiple regressions, assumptions regarding normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals were examined.

**Analyses**

**Descriptives**

Means and standard deviations for all major variables included in the study are provided in Table 1 for the full sample and for the Latino/Latina subsample. Preparations for bias messages were more frequently reported among adolescent males in both the large sample and in the Latino/Latina dataset. Conversely, cultural socialization messages were more prevalent among female adolescents in both datasets.

**Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency for Study Variables for Total Sample and Latino/a Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>1.18 (.1.18)</td>
<td>3.00 (3.00)</td>
<td>2.35 (2.31)</td>
<td>.38 (.38)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>1.00 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.80 (2.80)</td>
<td>1.71 (1.62)</td>
<td>.47 (.45)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.43 (1.43)</td>
<td>4.00 (3.93)</td>
<td>2.89 (2.84)</td>
<td>.434 (.44)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Group Esteem</td>
<td>2.50 (2.50)</td>
<td>7.00 (7.00)</td>
<td>5.23 (5.22)</td>
<td>1.078 (1.10)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>12.00 (12.00)</td>
<td>26.00 (26)</td>
<td>18.70 (18.58)</td>
<td>2.76 (2.78)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>1.40 (1.40)</td>
<td>4.90 (4.70)</td>
<td>3.04 (3.03)</td>
<td>.618 (.63)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.40 (1.40)</td>
<td>4.90 (4.90)</td>
<td>3.14 (3.13)</td>
<td>.60 (.59)</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td>6.00 (6.00)</td>
<td>35.00 (35.00)</td>
<td>23.40 (23.31)</td>
<td>2.59 (2.52)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Estimates in parenthesis refer to the Latino/a group.

In preparation for subsequent analyses, intercorrelations among variables for the entire sample were examined and they are displayed in Table 2. At the bivariate level, preparations for bias messages were associated with most of study variables including
ethnic identity, self-esteem, and subjective well-being (satisfaction with life, positive and negative affect.) Cultural socialization messages were associated with ethnic identity, private group-esteem, satisfaction with life, positive and negative affect.

Table 2

*Intercorrelations among Study Variables: Cultural Socialization, Preparation for Bias, Ethnic Identity, Private Group Esteem, Self-Esteem, Positive and Negative Affect, and Satisfaction with Life (Total Sample)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>.300*</td>
<td>.596*</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 3 shows intercorrelations among variables among for the Latino/Latina subsample. Preparation for bias messages were associated with ethnic identity, positive and negative affect whereas cultural socialization messages were associated with ethnic identity, private group-esteem, satisfaction with life, positive, and negative affect.
Table 3

Intercorrelations among Study Variables: Cultural Socialization, Preparation for Bias, Ethnic Identity, Private Group Esteem, Self-Esteem, Positive and Negative Affect, and Satisfaction with Life (Latino/a Subsample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.599**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Group Esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>.248*</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Examining Group Differences in Racial-Ethnic Socialization Messages

The first goal of this study was to examine the effects of gender and ethnicity on racial-ethnic socialization experiences particularly, cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages among high school youth. Two sets of analyses addressed this objective. First, a 2 (gender) X 3 (ethnicity: African American, Latino/a, Other) between-subjects analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed on socialization experiences focusing primarily on cultural socialization messages. Independent variables consisted of gender (male, female) and ethnicity (African American, Latino/Latina, and Biracial/Mixed/Other categories). Age was the selected covariate for this analysis. The
second analysis consisted of a 2 X 3 analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with gender and ethnicity as independent variables, age as a covariate, and preparation for bias as the outcome variable.

Basic assumptions for ANCOVA analyses such as assumption of normality of sampling distributions, linearity, homogeneity of variance, homogeneity of regression, and reliability of covariates, were evaluated yielding satisfactory results (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Additionally, selection of covariates in the analyses followed several assumptions regarding the error terms including the assumptions that errors are independent; they are normally distributed, and have homogenous variance across the groups formed by the independent variables.

**Research Hypothesis 1.a.** Cultural socialization messages are different for male and female students across ethnicity groups even after controlling for participants’ age.

First, it was hypothesized that there were gender differences in cultural socialization messages among high school adolescents in this study. After adjustment for age, cultural socialization messages varied significantly with gender as summarized in Table 4, with $F(1, 144) = 5.7, p < .05)$. However, the strength of the relationship between cultural socialization messages and gender was weak, with partial eta squared $= .04$. 
Table 4

Summary of ANCOVA Results for Cultural Socialization Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.742(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>5.705</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>18.998</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>816.749</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>20.740</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.742(^a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender estimates and pairwise comparisons are displayed in Table 5 demonstrating that female participants received more cultural socialization messages than their male counterparts. No statistically main effect of ethnic group membership was found. However, this finding should be interpreted with caution given the unequal sample size for each ethnic group. Additionally, there was no statistically significant interaction between gender and ethnic group membership after adjustment for the covariate. The interaction between gender and ethnicity was not statistically significant and was removed from the model. Similarly, the interaction between gender, ethnicity, and age of participants was not statistically significant and the interaction term was also removed from the final model.
Table 5

*Estimates and Pairwise Comparisons for Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M (SE)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% CI for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.3 (.055)</td>
<td>- .148*</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>- .271, -.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.4 (.050)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on estimated marginal means

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
a. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Age, the covariate for this analysis, was significantly associated with cultural socialization messages (F (1, 139) = 4.3, p < .05). The strength of the relationship between age and cultural socialization messages was also weak, with partial eta square = .038. A close examination of cultural socialization messages across the age variable, revealed that the frequency of cultural socialization messages was similar for 14 and 15 year old students M$_{14\,\text{y/o}}$ = 2.3 and M$_{15\,\text{y/o}}$ = 2.4, respectively). On the other hand, the frequency of cultural socialization messages increased among 16 and 17 years old students (M$_{16\,\text{y/o}}$ = 2.5 and M$_{17\,\text{y/o}}$ = 2.6, respectively.) However, differences in these age group means were not statistically different.

Given the fact that ethnicity was not a statistically significant main effect for cultural socialization messages for the overall sample, a subsequent ANCOVA analyses was conducted to examine the impact effect of gender on cultural socialization messages within the Latino/a subsample (n = 104). This analysis did not reveal statistically significant main effect of gender on cultural socialization messages (F = 1.8, p > .05) (see Table 6). The means for both males and females in this subsample were similar (M$_{\text{male}}$ = 2.2; M$_{\text{female}}$ = 2.3) revealing no gender differences in cultural socialization messages
among Latino/a adolescents in the study. Additionally, examination of cultural socialization messages and participants’ age in the Latino/a sample, did not reveal statistically significant differences; the mean of cultural socialization messages was similar (M = 2.2) for 14, 15, and 16 years old Latino/a high school students in the study.

Table 6

**Summary of ANCOVA Results for Cultural Socialization Messages (Latino/a Subsample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>.498&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1.836</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14.682</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corrected</td>
<td>573.504</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Observed</td>
<td>15.180</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research Hypothesis 1.b.* There are gender differences in preparation for bias messages after controlling for participants’ age.

Secondly, the study hypothesized gender differences in preparation for bias messages after controlling for participants’ age in the sample. This hypothesis was not supported from the ANCOVA analysis using gender and ethnic group membership as factors, preparation for bias messages as the outcome, and age as the covariate (Table 7). After adjustment by age, preparation for bias messages did not vary significantly with gender F (1, 144) = .15, p > .05). However, preparation for bias messages varied significantly with ethnic group membership F (2, 144) = 5.7, p < .05) indicating that
preparation for bias messages received by ethnically diverse youth differed according to their ethnic group membership.

Additionally, interaction terms between factors and between factors and covariate were not statistically significant. Age, the covariate in this analysis did not provide statistically unique adjustment when examining received preparation for bias messages among high school students who participated in the study. Examination of preparation for bias messages across the age variable, revealed that the frequency of preparation for bias messages increased with age and 17 years old adolescents reported receiving more frequently preparation for bias messages than their younger counterparts ($M_{17\text{y/o}} = 1.9; M_{14\text{y/o}} = 1.7$, respectively). However, differences in these age group means were not statistically different. The means for each of age group were $M_{14\text{y/o}} = 1.5, M_{15\text{y/o}}$ and $M_{16\text{y/o}} = 1.6$, respectively.

Table 7

Summary of ANCOVA Results for Preparation for Bias Messages (Total Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model Intercept</td>
<td>3.433$^a$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>5.732</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>29.221</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>454.272</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>32.654</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To address the limitation of unequal sample size among ethnic groups, subsequent ANCOVA analysis was conducted with the Latino/a group (n = 104). This analysis revealed that there was no main effect of gender on preparation for bias messages between Latina high school students and their male counterparts (see Table 8). On the other hand, this analysis demonstrated that there was a significant main effect of the covariate age on preparation for bias messages within this group (F(1, 104) = 5.2, p < .05). In summary, male and female adolescents in the Latino/a dataset did not differ in preparation for bias messages that they received as part of their racial-ethnic socialization experiences.

Table 8

Summary of ANCOVA Results for Preparation for Bias Messages (Latino/a Subsample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1.056a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>19.911</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295.592</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>20.967</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age was an important covariate in this analysis. However, ANOVA analysis and subsequent post hoc analysis (Bonferroni) using age as the factor and preparation for bias as the dependent variable in the Latino/a subsample, did not reveal statistically significant results (see Table 9). This finding suggests that the frequency of preparation for bias messages among Latino/Latinas in this study increased with age although there were no
statistically significant differences in preparation for bias messages among adolescents across the age categories (14, 15, and 16 years old).

Table 9

*Estimates and Pairwise Comparisons for Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>M (SE)</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% CI for Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5077 (.07)</td>
<td>14 -15 y/o</td>
<td>-.14073</td>
<td>.10119</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>-.387, .105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6484 (.07)</td>
<td>14 -16 y/o</td>
<td>-.25379</td>
<td>.11115</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.524, .016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7615 (.08)</td>
<td>15 -16 y/o</td>
<td>-.11306</td>
<td>.11174</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>-.385, .159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Role of Preparation for Bias and Cultural Socialization Messages on Ethnic Identity and Private Group Esteem*

Sequential regressions were employed to determine if inclusion of information regarding cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages explained additional variance in ethnic identity beyond that afforded by demographic variables such as gender, age, and ethnicity (model 1).

*Research Hypothesis 2.a.* Preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages play a positive role on ethnic identity development among ethnically diverse youth.

It was hypothesized that preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages explained significant variance in ethnic identity development among ethnically diverse youth beyond demographic variables. Tables 10-11 display correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), the semipartial correlations, sr², R², and adjusted R² after entry of all independent variables (gender, age, ethnicity, cultural socialization, preparation for bias and interactions among them). During step 1, demographic variables
(age, gender, ethnicity) were entered. During step 2, preparation for bias messages were entered in the model followed by cultural socialization messages (step 3) and the interplay between preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages (step 4). The R statistic was significantly different from zero at the end of steps one through three. After step 3 where all the independent variables and interactions among them were entered in the equation, $R^2 = .41$, $F (1, 137) = 51.0$, $p < .05$. The adjusted $R^2$ value of .38 indicates that more than a third of the variability in ethnic identity development was predicted by cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages. After step 1, with demographic variables (age, ethnicity, gender) in the equation, $R^2 = .07$, $F (4, 139) = 2.7$, $p < .05)$. After step 2 with preparation for bias messages added to prediction of ethnic identity by demographic variables, $R^2 = .19$, $F (1, 138) = 20.9$, $p < .05$. Addition of preparation for bias messages to the equation with demographic variables resulted in a significant increment in $R^2$. After step 3, with cultural socialization messages added to the prediction of ethnic identity by demographic variables and preparation for bias, $R^2 = .41$, $F (1, 137) = 51.03$, $p < .05$. This finding suggests that over a third of variability in ethnic identity was explained by cultural socialization messages. While preparation for bias contributed modestly to the prediction of ethnic identity development, cultural socialization messages were more salient in this equation. Furthermore, adding the interaction term between preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages into the model (step 4) did not offer further prediction of ethnic identity development $R^2 = .41$, $F (1, 136)$, $p > .05$. This finding suggests that socialization messages, particularly those focusing on the salience of youth’s race/ethnicity, group’s culture, and values (cultural
socialization), play an important role on youth’s beliefs, attitudes, and practices toward their ethnic group.

Table 10

Summary of Sequential Regressions for Demographic Variables, Preparation for Bias, and Cultural Socialization Messages on Ethnic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Ethnic Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.494, 3.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.012, .163</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.010, .291</td>
<td>.174*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.345, .194</td>
<td>-.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.399, .039</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.329, 2.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.034, .131</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.029, .292</td>
<td>.185*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.336, .167</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.296, 121</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.191, .480</td>
<td>.370*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>-.061, 2.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.060, .084</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.043, .187</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Black</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.309, .123</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.248, .109</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.084, .342</td>
<td>.235*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.417, .736</td>
<td>.506*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>-1.201, 2.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.056, .089</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.038, .194</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Black</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.320, .113</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.254, .105</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>-.138, 1.263</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.325, 1.290</td>
<td>.709*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB*CS</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.437, .143</td>
<td>-.492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For Step 1, $R$-squared = .07; for Step 2, $R$-squared = .19; $\Delta R$-squared = .12; for Step 3, $R$-squared = .41, $\Delta R$-squared = .21; for Step 4, $R$-squared = .41, $\Delta R$-squared = .004. *$p < .05$. 
Given the large representation of Latino/Latina adolescents in the study sample (n = 104), regressions were also performed to examine the influence of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages, in addition to demographic variables, on ethnic identity development among Latino/a youth. Table 11 shows that $R^2$ was not significantly different from zero when demographic variables (age, gender) were first entered in the model. After step 2 with preparation for bias messages added to the prediction of ethnic identity by demographic variables, $R^2 = .14$, $F (1, 100) = 12.1$, $p < .05$. At this step, it appeared that preparation for bias messages resulted in a significant increment in $R^2$. At step 3, cultural socialization messages were also added to this model and $R^2 = .39$, $F (1, 99) = 41.1$, $p < .05$. This finding demonstrates that addition of cultural socialization messages explained over a third of variance in ethnic identity development among Latino/Latina high school youth. The last step in this model consisted of adding the interaction term between preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages into the model (step 4), $R^2 = .439$, $F (1, 98)$, $p > .05$. In summary, this subset of analyses conducted with the Latino/Latina sample, revealed similar results that emerged from analyses of the entire sample. Specifically, preparation for bias and particularly, cultural socialization messages explained considerable variance in Latino/Latina youth’s ethnic identity development. However, cultural socialization messages in particular, were important predictors in the model suggesting that messages focusing on the salience of ethnicity, heritages, and traditions, are important in development of ethnic identity among Latino/a youth.
Table 11

Summary of Sequential Regressions for Demographic Variables, Preparation for Bias, and Cultural Socialization Messages on Ethnic Identity for the Latino/a Subsample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.156, 3.484</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-0.048, .174</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.005, .345</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.334, 3.493</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.087, .128</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.003, .335</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.143, .518</td>
<td>.332*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>-.261, 2.456</td>
<td>.532*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-0.093, .089</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.036, .247</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.009, .340</td>
<td>.175*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.430, .815</td>
<td>.532*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>-1.340, 2.939</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.092, .094</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.034, .253</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>-0.638, 1.341</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.106, 1.354</td>
<td>.624*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB*CS</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.485, .336</td>
<td>-.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For Step 1, $R$-squared = .042; for Step 2, $R$-squared = .147; $\Delta R$-squared = .105; for Step 3, $R$-squared = .397, $\Delta R$-squared = .25; for Step 4, $R$-squared = .397, $\Delta R$-squared = .001. *$p$ < .05.

Sequential regressions were also employed to determine if inclusion of information regarding cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages explained additional variance in private collective esteem beyond that afforded by demographic variables such as gender, age, and ethnicity (model 2).
Research Hypothesis 2.b. Preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages play a positive role on beliefs about one’s own ethnic group (private collective esteem) among ethnically diverse youth.

Preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages were hypothesized to play a positive role on beliefs about one’s own ethnic group (private group esteem) among ethnically diverse youth. Table 12 shows that $R^2$ was not significantly different from zero at the end of the first and second step. At the end of step 1, with only the independent demographic variables (age, gender, ethnicity) entered in the equation, $R^2 = .01$, $F(4, 139) = .67$, $p > .05$. After step 2, with preparation for bias messages added to prediction of private collective esteem by demographic variables, $R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 138) = .29$, $p > .05$. Addition of preparation for bias messages to the equation with demographic variables did not result in a statistically significant change in $R^2$. After step 3, with cultural socialization messages added to the prediction of private collective esteem by demographic variables and preparation for bias, $R^2 = .14$, $F(1, 137)= 18.9$, $p < .05$. Addition of cultural socialization messages suggested that a small variance (14%) in private collective esteem was explained by cultural socialization messages. Furthermore, adding the interaction term between preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages into the model (step 4) did not offer further prediction of private collective esteem $R^2 = .14$, $F(1, 136), = .28$ $p > .05$. 
Table 12

Summary of Sequential Regressions for Demographic Variables, Preparation for Bias, and Cultural Socialization Messages on Private Group Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Private Group Esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.935</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>1.532, 8.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.214, .233</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.067, .651</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>-.624, .752</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>-.567, .552</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.015</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>1.591, 8.438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.208, .245</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.071, .649</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>-.623, .757</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Latino/a</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>-.609, .534</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.505, .288</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>.738, 7.246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.264, .166</td>
<td>-.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.221, .472</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>-.598, .700</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>-.543, .700</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.720, .054</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.576, 1.536</td>
<td>.373*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>.101, 9.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.274, .161</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.233, .161</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Black</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>-.586, .161</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity. Latino/a</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.537, .544</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>-.895</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>-.3008, .544</td>
<td>-.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Socialization</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>-.771, 2.140</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB*CS</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>-.637, 1.110</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. For Step 1, R-squared = .019; for Step 2, R-squared = .021; ΔR-squared = .002; for Step 3, R-squared = .14, ΔR-squared = .11; for Step 4, R-squared = .11, ΔR-squared = .002. *p < .05.*

Similar to the earlier subset of analyses for the Latino/Latina subsample (n = 104), a sequential regression examined the additional influence of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages on Latino/Latinas’ private regard of their ethnic group.
Table 13 shows that at the end of step 1, with demographic variables (age, gender) entered in the equation, $R^2 = .03$, $F (2, 101) = 1.5, p > .05$. At the end of the second step, preparation for bias messages were added to prediction of private collective esteem by demographic variables, $R^2 = .03$, $F (1, 100) = .06, p > .05$. After step 3, with cultural socialization messages added to the prediction of private collective esteem beyond the influence of demographic variables and preparation for bias messages, $R^2 = .20$, $F (1, 99) = .21, p < .05$. This finding suggests that in the Latino/Latina dataset, a modest variance (20%) in private collective esteem was explained by cultural socialization messages received by youth in this group. Furthermore, adding the interaction term between preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages into the model (step 4) did not offer further prediction of private collective esteem $R^2 = .21$, $F (1, 98), = 1.4, p > .05$.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step and Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion: Private Group Esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.246</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>-.070, 9.353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.304, .259</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.790, .809</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.263</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>1.135, 9.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.304, .259</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender. Female</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.057, .811</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>-.429, .550</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.609</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>-.223, 7.441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.326, .189</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining the Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Racial-Ethnic Socialization Messages and Subjective Well-Being

In order to test a theoretically plausible hypothesis regarding the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem on the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being, a test of mediation was performed using the procedure recommended by Baron and Kenny (1984) along with the Sobel Test and the Boostrapping method (Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Sobel, 1982). According to Baron and Kenny (1986) four conditions must be met in order to demonstrate mediation: (1) the independent variable must be significantly related to the dependent variable; (2) the independent variable must be significantly related to the mediating variable; (3) the mediating variable must be significantly related to the dependent variable after controlling for the independent variable; and (4) the strength of the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable must be significantly reduced when the mediating variable is added to the model. In this last step,
full mediation occurs if the variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable is reduced to zero when the mediator is added to the model. Conversely, partial mediation occurs when variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable is reduced while remaining statistically significant different from zero.

To test whether ethnic identity mediates the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and psychological correlates, unstandardized regression coefficients and standardized errors were used from the following associations: racial-ethnic socialization and subjective well-being; racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity, ethnic identity and subjective well-being. In this model, racial-ethnic socialization is the independent variable, ethnic identity is the hypothesized mediator variable, and subjective well-being is the dependent variable. Additionally, another set mediation tests included racial-ethnic socialization messages as the independent variable, self-esteem as the hypothesized mediator, and subjective well-being as the dependent variables. The Sobel test was used to test the significance of the indirect effect. The Sobel test addresses the key question whether or not the total effect of racial-ethnic socialization on subjective well-being is significantly reduced upon the addition of ethnic identity and self-esteem in the model. In addition, the Bootstrapping method was used to counter the fact that the sample size was relatively small and the Sobel test requires larger samples. This method allows for bootstrapping the sampling distribution of path $c'$ (see Figure 1) and derive a confidence interval with the empirically derived bootstrapped sampling distribution (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). In this study, this procedure was accomplished by taking a large number
(1000) of the sample (n =145), sampling with replacement, and computing the indirect effect (path c’), in each sample.

Research Hypothesis 3.1.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life.

Mediation analyses were used to examine the potential influence of ethnic identity on the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life. Mediation steps recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) were used in combination with the Sobel Test and the Bootstrapping method to test the size and significance of the hypothesized mediation effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The output was generated using the following command:

Sobel = y=satisfaction with life/x=preparation for bias/m=ethnic identity/boot=1000.

The first three rows in Table 14 show unstandardized coefficients for regression equations required to test mediation as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986). The first row represents the effect of preparation for bias on satisfaction with life and this effect is statistically significant (β=2.3, p < .05); students who frequently received messages on preparation for bias also reported being more satisfied with their lives. The second row represents the effect of preparation for bias on ethnic identity beliefs and this effect is also statistically significant from zero (β=0.3, p < .05); students who frequently received messages targeting preparation for bias also endorsed higher levels of ethnic identity beliefs. The third row in Table 14 shows the effect of ethnic identity beliefs on satisfaction with life while controlling for preparation for bias messages. This path was also statistically significant from zero (β=3.8, p < .05). Students who endorsed higher
levels of ethnic identity beliefs were more satisfied with life. Finally, the fourth row in
this table displays the effect of preparation for bias messages on satisfaction with life
after controlling for ethnic identity achievement levels. This effect is not statistically
different from zero ($\beta=1.0$, $p > .05$), indicating no relationship between preparation for
bias and satisfaction with life after controlling for ethnic identity achievement levels.
This finding suggests that ethnic identity completely mediates the relationship between
preparation for bias messages and satisfaction with life in this sample.

Additionally, results from the Sobel test displayed in Table 14 demonstrate the
indirect effect of preparation for bias on satisfaction with life (see Figure 1). This test
confirms findings derived from the four mediation steps (Baron & Kenny, 1986),
suggesting that ethnic identity completely mediates the relationship between preparation
for bias and satisfaction with life ($z=2.4$, $p < .01$). Additionally, results from the
Bootstrapping method (number of resamples = 1000) indicate that the bootstrapping
estimate lies between .191 and 2.63 with 95% confidence. Because zero is not included
in the 95% confidence interval, it is concluded that the indirect effect is significantly
different from zero ($p < .05$).

The hypothesized mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between
preparation for bias and satisfaction with life was also examined in the Latino/Latina
subsample (n =104). Mediation analyses followed the same steps outlined earlier utilizing
Baron and Kenny mediation steps, Sobel Test, and the Bootstrapping procedure. This
mediation hypothesis was supported in this subset of analyses; ethnic identity completely
mediated the relationship between preparation for bias messages and satisfaction with life
among Latino/Latina youth. Specifically, as shown in Table 14, the effect of preparation for bias messages on satisfaction with life after controlling for ethnic identity achievement levels, was not statistically significant from zero ($\beta=1.3$, $p > .05$).

Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was significant ($z = 1.9$, $p < .05$) and 95% confidence intervals did not include zero.

Table 14

The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Satisfaction with Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>2.3972*</td>
<td>1.1372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3529*</td>
<td>.0696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>3.8831*</td>
<td>1.3312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>1.0266</td>
<td>1.2039</td>
<td>1.3706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino dataset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>2.6374*</td>
<td>1.4749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3336*</td>
<td>.0929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>3.7853*</td>
<td>1.5334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>1.3746</td>
<td>1.5276</td>
<td>1.2627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-preparation for bias; m-ethnic identity; y-satisfaction with life. *p < .05.

Research Hypothesis 3.1.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life.

Self-esteem was also hypothesized to mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life in the large sample. Mediation analyses included Baron and Kenny mediation steps along with the Sobel test and the
Bootstrapping procedure. These steps showed that self-esteem completely mediated the relationship between preparation for bias messages and satisfaction with life among high school students who participated in the study. Specifically, as shown in Table 15, the effect of preparation for bias messages on satisfaction with life after controlling for self-esteem levels, was not statistically significant from zero ($\beta=1.2, p > .05$). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was significant ($z = 2.4, p < .05$) and 95% confidence intervals did not include zero.

On the other hand, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life in the Latino/a subsample. Specifically, as shown in Table 15, the effect of preparation for bias messages on self-esteem, was not statistically significant from zero ($\beta=2.6, p > .05$). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was not significant ($z = 1.8, p > .05$) and 95% confidence intervals included zero. This finding suggests that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and satisfaction with life within the Latino/a dataset.
Table 15

The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Satisfaction with Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>2.3972</td>
<td>1.1372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.4011</td>
<td>.4697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.8463</td>
<td>.1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>1.2116</td>
<td>1.1020</td>
<td>1.1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>2.6374</td>
<td>1.4749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.2894</td>
<td>.5971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.9647</td>
<td>.2263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>1.3935</td>
<td>1.3953</td>
<td>1.2438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-preparation for bias; m-self-esteem; y-satisfaction with life. *p < .0

Research Hypothesis 3.2.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life.

Mediation analyses were used to examine the potential influence of ethnic identity on the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life. Mediation steps recommended by Baron and Kenny (1986) were used in combination with the Sobel Test and the Bootstrapping method to test the size and significance of the hypothesized mediation effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The output was generated using the following command:

Sobel = y=satisfaction with life/x=cultural socialization/m=ethnic identity/boot=1000.
The first row in Table 16 shows that the effect of cultural socialization on satisfaction with life is statistically different from zero (β=4.41, p < .05), students who reported receiving cultural socialization messages also reported being satisfied with their lives. The second row represents the effect of cultural socialization on ethnic identity beliefs and this effect is also statistically significant from zero (β=0.67, p < .05); students who frequently received messages focusing on the salience of race in their lives also endorsed higher levels of ethnic identity beliefs. The third row in Table 16 shows the effect of ethnic identity beliefs on satisfaction with life while controlling for preparation for cultural socialization messages. This path was also statistically significant from zero (β=3.12, p < .05) suggesting that students who endorsed higher levels of ethnic identity beliefs were more satisfied with life. Finally, the fourth row in this table displays the direct effect of cultural socialization messages on satisfaction with life after controlling for ethnic identity achievement levels. This effect is not statistically different from zero (β=2.29, p > .05), indicating no relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life after controlling for ethnic identity achievement levels. This finding suggests that ethnic identity completely mediates the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life levels in this sample. Further, results from the Sobel test confirmed findings from Baron and Kenny (1986) steps suggesting that ethnic identity completely mediates the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life (z= 2.11, p < .05). Additionally, results from the Bootstrapping method (number of resamples = 1000) indicate that the bootstrapping estimate lies between .03 and 1.98 with 95% confidence. Because zero is not included in
the 95% confidence interval, it is concluded that the indirect effect is significantly
different from zero (p < .05).

Similar to the subset of mediation analyses conducted earlier, the hypothesized
mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between cultural socialization
messages and satisfaction with life was examined in the Latino/Latina subsample (n
=104). Mediation analyses followed the same steps outlined earlier utilizing Baron and
Kenny mediation steps, Sobel Test, and the Bootstrapping procedure. This mediation
hypothesis was not supported in this subset of analyses; ethnic identity did not mediate
the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life among
Latino/Latina youth. Specifically, as shown in Table 16, the effect of ethnic identity on
satisfaction with life while controlling for cultural socialization messages, was not
statistically significant from zero (β=3.2, p > .05). Additionally, the indirect effect from
Sobel test was not significant (z = 1.7, p > .05) and 95% confidence intervals included
zero. In summary, the hypothesis of ethnic identity partially mediating the relationship
between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life was not supported for
the Latino/Latina subsample.
Table 16

**The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Satisfaction with Life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>4.4113*</td>
<td>1.4037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.6774*</td>
<td>.0763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>3.1224*</td>
<td>1.5207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>2.2962</td>
<td>1.7287</td>
<td>2.1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>4.2843*</td>
<td>1.7084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.7011*</td>
<td>.0928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>3.2055</td>
<td>1.8029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>2.0371</td>
<td>2.1109</td>
<td>2.2473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-cultural socialization; m-ethnic identity; y-satisfaction with life. *p < .05

Research Hypothesis 3.2.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life.

Examination of the hypothesized mediating role of self-esteem on the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life (Table 17), showed that the effect of cultural socialization messages on self-esteem (step 2) was not significant (β=1.1, p > .05). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was not significant (z = 1.6, p > .05) and 95% confidence intervals included zero. This finding suggests that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life among ethnically diverse youth in the study.

Similarly, mediation analyses revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life within the
Latino/a dataset. Table 17 shows that the effect of cultural socialization messages on satisfaction with life while controlling for self-esteem was not statistically different from zero (\(\beta=2.8, p > .05\)). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was not significant (\(z = 1.8, p > .05\)) and 95% confidence intervals included zero. In summary, the hypothesis of self-esteem partially mediating the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life was not supported for the Latino/Latina subsample.

Table 17

*The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Satisfaction with Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>4.4113*</td>
<td>1.4037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.1069</td>
<td>.6014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.8237*</td>
<td>.1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>3.4995*</td>
<td>1.3335</td>
<td>.9118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>4.2843*</td>
<td>1.7084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.5148</td>
<td>.7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.9289*</td>
<td>.2239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>2.8772</td>
<td>1.6228</td>
<td>1.4071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-cultural socialization; m-self-esteem; y-satisfaction with life. *p < .0*

*Research Hypothesis 3.3.a.* Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect.
Mediation analyses using Baron and Kenny (1986) recommended steps revealed that the effect of ethnic identity (hypothesized mediator) on positive affect (criterion variable) was not significant when controlling for preparation for bias (the independent variable). Table 18 shows that the unstandardized coefficient for this path was not statistically significant different from zero ($\beta=0.22$, $p = .06$). The Sobel test also revealed the same result ($z = 1.6$, $p = .09$) and 95% confidence interval included zero. Therefore, the hypothesis that ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect was not retained in this study.

However, the mediation hypothesis was retained when examining the mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between preparation for bias messages and positive affect in the Latino/Latina sample. Mediation analyses followed the same steps outlined earlier utilizing Baron and Kenny mediation steps, Sobel Test, and the Bootstrapping procedure. As shown in Table 18, the effect of preparation for bias messages on positive affect was significantly different from zero and this effect decreased although remained statistically significant when controlling for the mediating effect of ethnic identity on this relationship ($\beta=3.4$, $p < .05$). The Sobel test also revealed a significant indirect effect ($z = 2.0$, $p < .05$). In conclusion, ethnic identity partially mediated the relationship between preparation for bias messages and positive affect among Latino/Latina adolescents in this sample.
Table 18

**The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Positive Affect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4439*</td>
<td>.1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3529*</td>
<td>.0696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.2217</td>
<td>.1210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.3657*</td>
<td>.1095</td>
<td>.0783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4652*</td>
<td>.1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3336*</td>
<td>.0929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.3556*</td>
<td>.1370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.3466*</td>
<td>.1364</td>
<td>.1186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-preparation for bias; m-ethnic identity; y-positive affect. *p < .05

**Research Hypothesis 3.3.b.** Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect. Mediation analyses revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect. Specifically, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect in the overall sample. Specifically, as shown in Table 19, the effect of self-esteem on positive affect after controlling for preparation for bias messages was not statistically significant from zero ($\beta = 0.3$, $p > .05$). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was not significant ($z = 1.5$, $p > .05$) and 95% confidence intervals included zero. This finding suggests that...
self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect among ethnically diverse students in this study.

Similarly, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect within the Latino/a sample. Specifically, as shown in Table 19, the effect of preparation for bias messages on self-esteem, was not statistically significant from zero ($\beta=0.4$, $p > .05$). Additionally, the indirect effect from Sobel test was not significant ($z = 1.3$, $p > .05$) and 95% confidence intervals included zero. This finding suggests that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and positive affect within the Latino/a dataset.

Table 19

The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Positive Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4439*</td>
<td>.1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.4011*</td>
<td>.4697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0345</td>
<td>.0179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.3956*</td>
<td>.1038</td>
<td>.0483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Latino dataset       |             |      |       |      |     |       |      |      |
| b(YX)                | .4652*      | .1321|       |      |     |       |      |      |
| b(MX)                | 1.2894*     | .5971|       |      |     |       |      |      |
| b(YM.X)              | .0428       | .0216|       |      |     |       |      |      |
| b(YX.M)              | .4100*      | .1332| .0552 | .0400 | 1.3825 | -.023 | .0552 | .0449 |

x-preparation for bias; m-self-esteem; y-positive affect. *p < .05
Research Hypothesis 3.4.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect.

Findings that emerged from this mediation analysis did not support the hypothesis that ethnic identity partially mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect in the large sample (see Table 20). The relationship between ethnic identity and negative affect was not statistically significant different from zero when controlling for preparation for bias messages ($\beta=0.61$, $p = .06$) (Step 3 in Baron and Kenny procedure). Sobel test also revealed nonsignificant results for the hypothesized indirect effect. Therefore, the hypothesis that ethnic identity partially mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect was not retained in this study.

Table 20

*The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Negative Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4465*</td>
<td>.0999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3529*</td>
<td>.0696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0602</td>
<td>.1203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.4253*</td>
<td>.1088</td>
<td>.0212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4830*</td>
<td>.1206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.3336*</td>
<td>.0929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.1958</td>
<td>.1277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.4177*</td>
<td>.1272</td>
<td>.0653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-preparation for bias; m-ethnic identity; y-negative affect. *p < .05
Research Hypothesis 3.4.b. Self-esteem mediates the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect.

Mediation analysis that addressed this research hypothesis revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect in the large sample. Specifically, the relationship between self-esteem and negative affect while controlling for preparation for bias messages was not statistically different from zero (β=0.3, p > .05) and the indirect effect was not significant (z = 1.5, p > .05) with 95% confidence intervals including zero (see Table 21).

A similar finding emerged when examining the hypothesized mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between preparation for bias messages and negative affect in the Latino/Latina subsample. Specifically, the relationship between ethnic identity and negative affect when controlling for preparation for bias messages, was not statistically significant different from zero (β=0.19, p >.05). The Sobel test of the indirect effect also revealed z = 1.3, p > .05 with 95% confidence intervals including zero. Similar to the analysis conducted for the overall sample, the hypothesized mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between preparation for bias and negative affect was not supported in the Latino/Latina dataset. Additionally, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias messages and negative affect within this subsample (see Table 21). Specifically, the relationship between preparation for bias and self-esteem was not statistically different from zero (β=0.9, p >.05) and the indirect effect was not significant (z = 0.4, p > .05) with 95% confidence
intervals including zero. In summary, this set of analyses revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias messages and negative affect.

Table 21

*The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Preparation for Bias Messages and Negative Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4465*</td>
<td>.0999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.4011*</td>
<td>.4697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0327</td>
<td>.0176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.4008*</td>
<td>.1021</td>
<td>.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.0930</td>
<td>.1206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.2894*</td>
<td>.5971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0464</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.1932</td>
<td>.1207</td>
<td>.0598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-preparation for bias; m-self-esteem; y-negative affect. *p < .05

**Research Hypothesis 3.5.a.** Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect.

Mediation analyses using Baron and Kenny (1986) recommended steps revealed that the effect of ethnic identity (hypothesized mediator) on positive affect (criterion variable) was not significant when controlling for cultural socialization messages (independent variable). Table 22 shows that the unstandardized coefficient for this path was not statistically significant different from zero (β=0.17, p = .21). The Sobel test also revealed nonsignificant indirect effect (z = 1.2, p = .21) and 95% confidence interval
included zero. The same set of hypothesis was examined in the Latino/Latina subsample. The third step in the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure revealed that the effect of ethnic identity on positive affect while controlling for cultural socialization messages was not statistically different from zero $\beta=0.26$, $p > .05$) (see Table 22). Additionally, the Sobel test revealed a nonsignificant indirect effect ($z = 1.6$, $p > .05$) and 95% confidence interval included zero. Therefore, the hypothesis that ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect was not retained in this study for the overall sample and the Latino/a dataset.

Table 22

| The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Positive Affect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Direct and total effects | Indirect effects | Bootstrap results for indirect effect |
| | Coefficient | S.E. | Value | S.E. | Z | 95 CI |
| | | Data | S.E. |
| **Total sample** | | | | | | |
| b(YX) | .5066* | .1292 | | | | |
| b(MX) | .6774* | .0763 | | | | |
| b(YM.X) | .1766 | .1413 | | | | |
| b(YX.M) | .3870* | .1606 | .1197 | .0972 | 1.2305 | .0709 | .1197 | .0911 |
| | | | | | | Data | S.E. |
| **Latino dataset** | | | | | | |
| b(YX) | .5846* | .1539 | | | | |
| b(MX) | .7011* | .0928 | | | | |
| b(YM.X) | .2699 | .1628 | | | | |
| b(YX.M) | .3954* | .1906 | .1892 | .1178 | 1.6063 | -.0417 | .1902 | .0034 |

x-cultural socialization; m-ethnic identity; y-positive affect. *p < .05

**Research Hypothesis 3.5.b.** Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect.
Mediation analysis addressed this research hypothesis revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization and positive affect in the large sample (see Table 23). Specifically, the relationship between cultural socialization messages and self-esteem was not statistically different from zero (β=1.1, p > .05) and the indirect effect was not significant (z = 1.3, p > .05) with 95% confidence intervals including zero. Similarly, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and positive affect in the Latino/a dataset (see Table 23). Specifically, the relationship between cultural socialization messages and self-esteem was not statistically different from zero (β=1.1, p > .05) and the indirect effect was not significant (z = 1.3, p > .05) with 95% confidence intervals including zero. In summary, ethnic identity and self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and positive affect within the Latino/a dataset.
Table 23

*The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Positive Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.5066*</td>
<td>.1292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.1069</td>
<td>.6014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0414*</td>
<td>.0177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.4608*</td>
<td>.1287</td>
<td>.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.5846*</td>
<td>.1539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.5148*</td>
<td>.7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM.X)</td>
<td>.0417</td>
<td>.0214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX.M)</td>
<td>.5214*</td>
<td>.1553</td>
<td>.0632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-cultural socialization; m-self-esteem; y-positive affect. *p < .05

Research Hypothesis 3.6.a. Ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect.

Finally, the study hypothesized that ethnic identity partially mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect. As shown in Table 24, examination of the mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect did not reveal statistically significant results when using Baron and Kenny and Sobel test procedures (β=0.03, p > .05; z = .26, p > .79). Therefore, the hypothesis that ethnic identity mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect was not retained in this study.
The hypothesized mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between cultural socialization messages and negative affect was not supported in the Latino/Latina dataset. The third mediation step (Baron & Kenny, 1986) showed that the effect of ethnic identity on negative affect while controlling for cultural socialization messages was not statistically significant from zero (β=0.1, p > .05). Table 24 also shows statistically nonsignificant results from the Sobel test (z = 1.0, p > .05) and 95% confidence interval included zero.

Table 24

*The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Negative Affect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4186*</td>
<td>.1294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.6774*</td>
<td>.0763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.0377</td>
<td>.1422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>.3931*</td>
<td>.1616</td>
<td>.0255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4464*</td>
<td>.1460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>.7011*</td>
<td>.0928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.1682</td>
<td>.1555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>.3285</td>
<td>.1821</td>
<td>.1179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-cultural socialization; m-ethnic identity; y-negative affect. *p < .05

**Research Hypothesis 3.6.b.** Self-esteem mediates the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect.
Mediation analysis revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization and negative affect in this sample (see Table 25). Specifically, the relationship between cultural socialization and self-esteem was not statistically different from zero ($\beta=1.1$, $p > .05$) and the indirect effect was not significant ($z = 1.3$, $p > .05$) with 95% confidence intervals including zero.

Additionally, mediation analyses for the Latino/a subsample revealed that self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and negative affect. Specifically, Table 25 shows that the relationship between cultural socialization messages and self-esteem was not statistically different from zero ($\beta=0.9$, $p > .05$) and the indirect effect was not significant ($z = 0.5$, $p > .05$) with 95% confidence intervals including zero. In summary, ethnic identity and self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and negative affect within the Latino/a sample.
Table 25

The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Cultural Socialization Messages and Negative Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct and total effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Bootstrap results for indirect effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4186*</td>
<td>.1294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.1069</td>
<td>.6014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.0416*</td>
<td>.0177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>.3712*</td>
<td>.1289</td>
<td>.0461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latino dataset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX)</td>
<td>.4464*</td>
<td>.1460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(MX)</td>
<td>1.5148*</td>
<td>.7017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YM,X)</td>
<td>.0901</td>
<td>.0201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b(YX,M)</td>
<td>.3705</td>
<td>.1456</td>
<td>.0758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x-cultural socialization; m-self-esteem; y-negative affect. *p < .05.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

One of the goals of this study was to examine racial-ethnic socialization messages among ethnic diverse high school youth. Previous research has examined these practices by using parents’ reports whereas this study offered evidence regarding types and frequency of racial-ethnic socialization messages from youth’s perspective. Specifically, the current study sought to examine prevalence of two particular types of racial-ethnic socialization messages pertaining to the salience of traditions, heritage, and values of one’s ethnic group (cultural socialization) and awareness about discrimination and stereotypes that youth may encounter due to ethnic group membership and ways to cope with them (preparation for bias). The study also sought to examine which of those messages was more salient for ethnic diverse high school youth and the role of gender and age in racial-ethnic socialization practices. Additionally, the study utilized a positive youth outcome theoretical framework (García et al., 1996; Spencer et al., 2003) to understand the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being variables and the mediating role of ethnic identity and self-esteem in this relationship. The use of between-group and intragroup approaches in the current study revealed similarities and differences in cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages across demographic correlates (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age) and their relationship to adolescents’ subjective well-being and ethnic identity development.
trajectories. Overall, cultural socialization messages played a positive role on adolescent’s ethnic identity development, private group esteem, and subjective-well-being.

Prevalence of Cultural Socialization and Preparation for Bias Messages

A major finding of this study pertains to the fact that ethnic diverse youth reported that they received more messages about the importance of race and ethnicity in their lives (cultural socialization messages) from their parents. Conversely, adolescents reported receiving less frequently messages focusing on encounters with stereotypes and discrimination due to their ethnic group status and strategies to cope with them (preparation for bias messages). This finding suggests that cultural socialization messages are a core part of parent-youth conversations whereas preparation for bias messages were less frequently reported by youth in this sample. This study also provided information regarding racial-ethnic socialization messages across age demonstrating that high school students in 9th, 10th, and 11th grade reported receiving cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages in similar ways. It may be that age differences would emerge if other sources of racial-ethnic socialization experiences such as peers, other family members, and individuals in the community were included in the study. Specifically, the study focused on youth’s perceptions of received racial-ethnic socialization messages from one source (parents) and youth may currently receive these messages from additional important sources in their community. Additionally, the absence of age differences in cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages can be attributed a methodological aspect of this study. Particularly, age was viewed as a
continuous variable and different findings may have emerged if age was treated as a categorical variable.

This study revealed differences in racial-ethnic socialization messages received by high school students. A similar finding regarding higher frequencies of cultural socialization messages over preparation for bias messages was also reported in a study by Neblett et al. (2009) that utilized a youth self-reported measure to assess racial-ethnic socialization among African American youth. This study revealed that ethnically diverse youth in the sample were more frequently exposed to cultural socialization messages and less frequently introduced to preparation for bias messages. Other studies have also shown the presence of infrequent preparation for bias messages among ethnically diverse youth (Hughes et al., 2008; Hughes & Chen, 1997). Additionally, studies that have examined racial-ethnic socialization practices from the parents’ perspective have revealed that cultural socialization messages (emphasizing one’s culture, history, and heritage) are the most common form of racial-ethnic socialization messages (Hughes, 2003). It may be that students who participated in the study receive more cultural socialization messages because of the predominantly homogeneous ethnic community (largely Hispanic) which may offer more opportunities to know, learn, and experience the cultural heritage for Latino/a youth. However, the influence of neighborhood and its ethnic composition was not included in this study.

The current study also revealed that female adolescents in the large sample reported receiving more cultural socialization messages than their male counterparts. This finding is supported by previous research which has shown that ethnically diverse
parents tend to transmit more messages about the importance of their ethnicity, racial identity, culture, and tradition to their daughters than their sons. Similar to findings from the current study, Huynh and Fuglini (2008) found gender differences in cultural socialization messages in their adolescent sample. Additionally, studies focusing on adolescents’ parents and their perspectives on racial-ethnic socialization messages have also shown that female children and adolescents receive more cultural socialization messages than their male counterparts (Howard & Bowman, 1985; Hughes et al., 2009; Thomas & Speight, 1999). It may be that gender differences in cultural socialization messages reflect the traditional role of women as carriers of traditions, values, and norms of cultures in their families across generations.

In contrast, the study did not reveal gender differences in preparation for bias messages among high school students who participated in this study. The lack of gender differences in preparation for bias messages in the large sample and in the Latino/a subsample reinforces the mixed result finding that has been suggested from an already existing body of literature (e.g., Hughes et al., 2006). A similar finding emerged in a study conducted by Huynh and Fuglini (2008) who examined the relationship between ethnic socialization processes and academic adjustment variables across different ethnic groups of 11th graders. In their study, male and female adolescents across different ethnic groups did not differ regarding preparation for bias messages. However, other studies have shown gender differences in these content-specific messages among youth (e.g., Bowman & Howard, 1985; Hughes & Chen, 1997). It may be that differences in findings among studies that have shown gender differences versus those that have not can be
attributed to methodological differences such as use of parent versus youth self-reported measures and unequal sample size (Hughes et al., 2009). Additionally, it may be that parents of youth in this study may have not started yet conversations about discrimination, prejudice, and coping with them with their children.

This study offered insight into the prevalence of racial-ethnic socialization messages within the Latino/a subsample while also examining gender and age differences within this group. This intragroup approach revealed that Latino and Latina adolescents were similarly exposed to messages that emphasized the importance of their ethnicity, tradition, and heritage in their lives (cultural socialization messages). The finding of no gender differences in these messages among Latino/a adolescents may have to do with the fact that the selected school for this study has a large Latino/a student population and is located in a predominantly Latino/a community. It may be that Latino/a students in this study learn about their culture, traditions, values, and norms by simply being part of a predominantly Latino community without necessarily engaging in direct communication about the salience of ethnicity and group membership with their parents. Several authors have pointed out that familial socialization among Latino youth occurs in both overt and covert forms and sources of these messages include familial and non-familial sources (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). The finding of no gender differences in cultural socialization messages within the Latino/a subsample, mirrors findings from previous research (Phinney & Chavira, 1995). This finding suggests that both male and female Latino/a adolescents receive messages about the importance of their ethnicity, cultural, heritage and traditions in their lives.
Additionally, examination of gender differences in preparation for bias messages within the Latino/a subsample revealed that male and female adolescents received similar messages that focus on how to prepare and deal with stereotypes stemming from ethnic group membership (preparation for bias messages). It is possible that adolescents in the Latino/a subsample would report different experiences with preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages if they were exposed to a more ethnically diverse high school and neighborhood. Several authors have pointed out that racial-ethnic socialization messages increase when youth transition from ethnically homogenous school and neighborhoods to more ethnically heterogeneous environments (French et al., 2006). Interestingly, the study did not reveal age differences in cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages in the large dataset and within the Latino/a subsample. In the current study, adolescents were asked to reflect on preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages received from their parents who are viewed as a key source of racial-ethnic socialization messages. It may be that these messages would differ across age groups if participants were asked to reflect on conversations that they may have with other sources of socialization processes such as peers, non-family members, media sources, etc.

*Influences of Cultural Socialization and Preparation for Bias Messages on Adolescents’ Ethnic Identity and Private Group Esteem*

Although both cultural socialization messages and preparation for bias messages play an important role in ethnic identity development among youth, this study revealed that cultural socialization messages in particular, were salient for adolescent’s
understanding of what it means to be a member of their group (ethnic identity) and their feelings towards their group (private group esteem). This finding suggests that discussions centered on adolescents’ ethnic group, its traditions and heritage, are positive influences on youth’s experiences of negotiating their ethnic identity and positive affect toward their own ethnic group. In the current study, this finding emerged after controlling for the influence of demographic factors such as gender, ethnicity, and age in the model. In the present study, youth who received cultural socialization messages, consisting primarily of positive information about the adolescents’ ethnic group, its culture and history, endorsed high levels of ethnic identity development despite their age, gender, or ethnic group affiliation. Specifically, cultural socialization messages accounted for close to 50% of the variability in youth’s ethnic identity and private group esteem. Similar findings emerged from a study of the relationship between parental ethnic socialization and their children’s (2nd and 6th graders) ethnic knowledge which is a facet of ethnic identity (Quintana & Vera, 1999). Despite differences in measuring racial-ethnic socialization messages (parents versus youth-reports) and age differences in samples (children versus adolescents), both studies converge on their finding regarding the presence of a positive and significant relationship between ethnic/cultural socialization and ethnic identity development.

The present study’s findings are also consistent with those that emerged from a study that focused on the relationship between family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development across five different ethnic groups; Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Salvadoran, and Vietnamese (Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). This study
demonstrated positive links between family ethnic socialization experiences and youth’s ethnic identity development. A similar finding was reported in a study by Stevenson and Arrington (2009) who found that African American youth in their sample who received racial pride and preparation for bias messages were more likely to score high on racial identity messages.

A similar finding emerged when examining the influence of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages on ethnic identity development in the Latino/a subsample. Latino/a adolescents who reported receiving frequent messages on the importance of their cultural heritage and strategies to cope with stereotypes and discrimination in their lives, also reported an understanding of their ethnic group membership and their personal affect towards their group. Additionally, an examination of intragroup differences in this subsample, revealed that cultural socialization messages were more salient than the modest contribution of preparation for bias messages on ethnic identity development for Latino/a adolescents. One potential explanation for this finding may pertain to the fact that Latino/a youth reported receiving more information regarding their group’s heritage, traditions, and practices (cultural socialization) than messages focusing on how to cope with experiences of discrimination and stereotypes emerging from their ethnic group membership in their lives (preparation for bias). It may also be that given the positive content of cultural socialization messages, youth integrate messages about the importance of race, ethnicity, their group’s culture and tradition, into their ethnic identity development experiences. On the other hand, preparation for bias messages may be viewed by ethnically diverse youth as challenging their ethnic identity
formation processes and they are less frequently incorporated into such experiences. In summary, examination of two different types of racial-ethnic socialization in the current study, suggested that cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages played a differential role in ethnic identity development in this sample. Specifically, cultural socialization messages were more strongly related to youth psychological outcomes than preparation for bias messages.

The study also revealed that cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages were differently associated with adolescents’ group esteem, particularly their feelings towards their own group (private regard). Findings from the entire sample and the Latino/a subsample, revealed that prevalence of messages about the salience of race, ethnicity, cultural and historical heritage of adolescents’ ethnic group, played an important role in adolescents’ personal affect towards their own ethnic group. Ethnically diverse adolescents, who received messages about the legacy and history of their ethnic group, were more likely to report that they felt a sense of emotional closeness with members of their same group. A similar finding was reported by Rivas-Drake and colleagues (2009) who examined relationships between racial-ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and ethnic discrimination among 6th graders. In the current study, cultural socialization messages helped youth develop a positive sense of belonging and developing group esteem towards their own ethnic group.

On the other hand, the hypothesis that preparation for bias messages would also contribute to explaining adolescents’ personal views toward their ethnic group was not supported in this study. This particular form of youth’s socialization comprised of
messages about the likelihood of experiencing discrimination due to membership to their ethnic group (preparation for bias), was not associated with adolescents’ feelings about their own group. This finding may suggest that despite messages about their group’s devalued social status, ethnically diverse youth do not necessarily adopt negative perceptions or attitudes toward their group. Using a phenomenological framework, it may be that ethnically diverse youth play an active and selective role in racial-ethnic socialization processes and that preparation for bias messages are filtered through youth’s own experiences as youth develop a sense of private regard toward their own group. This finding may also suggest that other variables may buffer the influence of preparation for bias messages on youth’s personal affect toward their own ethnic group. These protective variables may include individual factors such as youth’s developmental competencies and distal factors such as socialization experiences that include the adolescents’ parents, family members, and other positive influences in their neighborhood.

A similar trend was found when examining the influence of preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages on Latino/a adolescents’ personal affect toward their ethnic group. Specifically, while preparation for bias messages did not offer a significant contribution to this hypothesized mode, cultural socialization messages explained a significant portion of variance in Latino/a youth’s private group regard. Additionally, it is important to note that in this study, cultural socialization messages played a more significant role in ethnic identity development than private group esteem. It may be that the content of these messages facilitates youth’s ethnic identity development which is a
central task for ethnically diverse youth and that cultural socialization messages help ethnically diverse youth strengthen their sense of emotional closeness to members of their own ethnic group. The study’s findings are consistent with results that have emerged from research on ethnic socialization processes (often called familial socialization) and ethnic identity trajectories among Latino/a youth. For example, in a study examining family socialization and ethnic identity of Mexican American children, Knight et al. (1993) found that parent socialization messages were significantly related to children’s ethnic identity variables. Additionally, in a study of Mexican-origin adolescents (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004), concluded that adolescents who had received family ethnic socialization messages, were also likely to report exploration of their ethnic identities, had positive feelings about their group membership, and had strong commitment towards their ethnic identity.

*The Influence of Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem in the Relationship between Racial-Ethnic Socialization and Subjective Well-Being*

This study used a strengths-based conceptual framework to examine the influence of ethnic identity and self-esteem on the relationship between socialization messages and youth’s subjective well-being. The focus on youth’s well-being and competencies is advocated by several authors (García Coll et al., 1996; García Coll, Akerman, & Chicchetti, 2000; Spencer et al., 2003). Mediation analyses in this study were conducted based on García Coll and colleagues (1996) conceptual framework of minority youth development characterized by the relationship among adaptive culture, self-system processes, and youth outcomes. Specifically, mediation analyses in this study examined
linkages between youth’s adaptive culture (e.g., racial-ethnic socialization processes), self-system process (ethnic identity and self-esteem), and subjective well-being (satisfaction with life, positive and negative affect). The use of this conceptual framework goes beyond the deficit-oriented approaches commonly used in research with ethnic minority children and youth and revealed important information regarding the indirect influence of ethnic identity and self-esteem in the relationship between youth socialization messages and their subjective well-being.

Both ethnic identity and self-esteem completely mediated the relationship between cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages and youth’s satisfaction with life. This finding suggests that ethnic identity and self-esteem play an important role in the subjective well-being among ethnically diverse youth and they facilitate our understanding of the influence of racial-ethnic socialization messages on youth’s perceptions about their overall satisfaction with their lives. Additionally, this finding suggests that although cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages are associated with satisfaction with life, youth’s ethnic identity development plays a crucial role in this relationship. Consistent with findings on racial-ethnic socialization messages reported earlier, the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life was stronger than the relationship between preparation for bias messages and satisfaction with life. In both situations, ethnic identity played a significant role in mediating the relationship between these two types of messages (preparation for bias and cultural socialization) and satisfaction with life among adolescents in the overall sample. This finding is consistent with evidence from recent research conducted with African
American and Caucasian adolescents (Hughes et al., 2009). In their study, Hughes and colleagues, examined the mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between preparation for bias messages and antisocial behaviors among adolescents and found that this relationship was mediated by ethnic identity (ethnic affirmation). However, authors in this study examined the relationship between preparation for bias and risk factors such as antisocial behaviors among ethnically diverse youth. In the current study, emphasis was given to positive and protective factors such as adolescents’ well-being measured by satisfaction with life, presence of positive affect, and absence of negative affect.

An important finding in this study emerged when examining the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and positive and negative affect. This study revealed that ethnic identity did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and positive/negative affect among adolescents in large sample and in the Latino/a subsample. Additionally, ethnic identity did not mediate the relationship between preparation for bias messages and positive/negative affect. These two important findings suggest that both preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages play an important role in youth’s affect which is an important aspect of subjective well-being. Additionally, although ethnic identity is an important aspect in youth’s subjective well-being, it appears that cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages play an important and unique role on youth’s well-being particularly positive and negative affect.

Interestingly, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between cultural ethnic socialization messages (preparation for bias, cultural socialization) and positive/negative
affect. The only mediation was found when examining the influence of self-esteem on the relationship between preparation for bias messages and satisfaction with life among high school adolescents in this study. Yet, literature on the role of self-esteem among ethnically diverse youth has shown that self-esteem plays a protective role and positively influences the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and youth outcomes such as academic efficacy, academic behavior, and absence of deviant behaviors (Hughes et al., 2009). It may be that the focus of this study was on subjective well-being of ethnically diverse youth and that other variables may better explain the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and youth’s subjective well-being. For example, youth’s own encounters with stereotypes and discrimination and their coping strategies may influence the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and subjective well-being.

**The Mediating Role of Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem in the Relationship Between Racial-Ethnic Socialization Messages and Subjective Well-Being among Latino Youth**

Latino/a youth’s sense of belonging to their ethnic group (ethnic identity), mediated the relationship between messages transmitted to them regarding preparing to face and cope with challenges deriving from their ethnic group membership (preparation for bias) and their perspectives on satisfaction with life and their positive affect. This finding suggests that ethnic identity serves a protective role when youth receive messages regarding potential encounters with stereotypes and prejudice due to their ethnic group membership. Other studies have also shown that ethnic identity plays a protective role on youth outcomes particularly among Latino/a youth (Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). On
the contrary, ethnic identity did not mediate the relationship between cultural socialization messages and satisfaction with life among Latino/high school students in the study. In this subsample, it appeared that frequent messages about the salience of Latin culture, heritage, and traditions were positively associated with youth’s perspectives of satisfaction with their lives and this relationship was not mediated by youth’s ethnic identity attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. One potential explanation for this finding may pertain to the fact that given the overwhelming representation of Latino/Latina students in this sample and the school, ethnic identity did not play a salient role in mediating this link because these students found themselves in a predominantly ethnically homogenous school and community. This ethnic homogeneity in the students’ school and larger contexts may potentially weaken the salience of ethnic identity development. In turn, ethnic identity beliefs, attitudes, and practices, did not mediate the link between cultural socialization and satisfaction with life among youth in this subsample.

A similar finding emerged when examining the potential influence of ethnic identity in the relationship between cultural socialization messages and positive/negative affect. Specifically, the relationship between ethnic identity and subjective well-being (positive and negative affect) was not significant after controlling for preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages. A similar finding was suggested in a study conducted by Smith, Smith, Levine, Dumas, and Prinz (2009). In their study focusing on the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization, self-concept, and behaviors among African American children, these authors found a non significant relationship between ethnic identity and developmental competencies among participants in their sample.
However, studies that have examined the mediating role of ethnic identity on the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization processes and youth’s psychological well-being are limited and offer mixed results. For example, the relationship between ethnic identity and youth behavioral outcomes was found significant among African American youth in a study conducted by Thomas, Townsend, and Belgrave (2003). In their research, these authors found that ethnic identity was related to positive outcomes and when combined with Africentric values ethnic identity predicted a significant portion of variance in behavioral variables identified in their study. Additionally, in a study conducted with children in early and middle childhood, Caughy et al. (2002) found that parents’ cultural socialization messages were related with more prosocial behaviors and fewer negative behaviors.

Similar findings emerged when examining the hypothesized mediating role of ethnic identity in the relationship between cultural socialization messages and positive and negative affect in the Latino/a subsample. In these analyses, it appeared that the relationship between ethnic identity and positive/negative affect was no longer significant after controlling for cultural socialization messages (third step in mediation analysis). As mentioned earlier, it may be that ethnic identity is less salient for adolescents in this subsample given the fact that both the school and the surrounding community in this study were predominantly Hispanic. Additionally, this finding could be potentially different if ethnic identity was examined at each grade or age level in the Latino/a subsample. As suggested by French and colleagues (2006), ethnic identity development
increases with age and is also influenced by other factors that were not examined in this study (e.g., ethnic composition of school and neighborhoods).

Similar to findings that emerged from the large dataset, self-esteem did not mediate the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being among Latino/a youth. It may be that received messages focusing on the salience of race and preparation for bias do not represent an importance source of self-esteem for Latino/a youth and that other variables that were not examined in this study may mediate the relationship between racial-ethnic socialization messages and subjective well-being in this subsample. For example, it may be that preparation for bias and cultural socialization messages may be more related to youth’s sense of group esteem rather than self-esteem and the former was not included as a potential mediator in the study. Additionally, in line with the strengths-based and phenomenological framework that was used for this study, it may be that Latino/a youth play an active and selective role in integrating or buffering conversations about salience of ethnicity and preparation for bias into their views of self and self-worth.

Implications for Practice

Several implications for practice emerge from this study. First, parents of ethnically diverse youth would greatly benefit from accessing and utilizing psychoeducational materials focusing on the importance of initiating and maintaining socialization practices with their children around the importance of race/ethnicity in their lives. Second, ethnically diverse parents and their children can also benefit from psychoeducational information that highlight the role of cultural socialization practices
on identity development experiences of children. These psychoeducational approaches are particularly important when working with ethnically diverse parents and youth in different settings such as schools, community mental health centers, etc. Specifically, therapeutic interventions that target strengthening self-esteem among ethnically diverse youth may also emphasize the relationship between socialization practices and self-esteem. Additionally, these approaches can be used to increase awareness among parents about how conversations that focus on helping children feel good about their group can also translate into adolescent’s feeling good about himself or herself. Finally, when working with ethnically diverse youth, it is important to facilitate their experiences of self-exploration and identity formation through conversations about the racial/ethnic group membership on such experiences. Additionally, as mentioned earlier, ethnically diverse youth may feel empowered when encouraged to initiate or maintain conversations with parents and others (e.g., peers, teachers, siblings) about the salience of race and ethnicity in their lives.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This study has several limitations and they are discussed in this section. First, the study relied on cross-sectional data. Therefore, this type of data does not allow the investigator to establish the causal direction of hypothesized relationships between racial-ethnic socialization messages and their correlates such as ethnic identity and subjective well-being. Additionally, the study relied exclusively on data gathered from self-report measures. For example, racial-ethnic socialization messages received by youth who participated in the study were assessed through a self-report measure. Furthermore, this
measure only examined racial-ethnic socialization messages, primarily cultural socialization and preparation for bias that parents transmitted to youth in the sample. This measure did not assess for racial-ethnic socialization experiences and information received from other sources (e.g., other family members, peers, members in the community). Additionally, this measure did not examine other forms of racial-ethnic socialization processes beyond parent-child conversations (e.g., covert forms of these processes).

Another limitation of this study pertains to unequal sample sizes across ethnic groups. Initially, the researcher intended to recruit participants representing different ethnic backgrounds in an ethnically diverse high school. This potential school site would have offered valuable opportunities to examine intragroup differences in racial-ethnic socialization messages for each group and also uncover similarities and differences regarding these messages across participants representing different ethnic groups. However, agreement to conduct research at this school was not obtained and researcher proceeded with conducting research at another school located predominantly in a Latino/a community. Additionally, the study did not examine subethnic differences within each group, particularly the Latino/a group of adolescents. However, as many authors have suggested, processes of racial-ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development are unique and more attention should be given to subethnic group differences (e.g., Cuban American, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, etc.).

Despite the limitations, the study offered important findings regarding racial-ethnic socialization messages and the role of ethnic identity on the relationship between
racial-ethnic socialization messages and psychological outcomes among ethnically
diverse youth. Additionally, this study is one of few focusing on racial-ethnic
socialization processes in middle adolescence. Furthermore, the study used youth’s
perceptions on racial-ethnic socialization messages instead of focusing on parents’
perspectives about the frequency and types of these messages.

Several implications and future recommendations emerge from this study. First,
future research should examine the prevalence of racial-ethnic socialization processes
beyond the transmission of messages from parents to children and youth. Particularly,
future studies should examine the prevalence of overt and covert socialization messages
from other sources such as other family members, media, peers, etc. Secondly, future
study samples should be sufficiently large to ensure adequate examination of racial-
ethnic socialization experiences between and within each group. Additionally, more
longitudinal studies should be conducted to offer needed information regarding the nature
of racial-ethnic socialization processes over the years along with insights about the
relationship between racial-ethnic socialization and youth outcomes over time.
Furthermore, more studies that measure racial-ethnic socialization and their relationship
to youth outcomes from a competency and a salutogenic perspective would be beneficial.
Empirical research on this topic remains limited compared to literature that focuses on
youth outcomes examined from risk- and deficit- based perspectives. Finally, future
studies should address current conceptual challenges, particularly differences in defining
and measuring racial-ethnic socialization processes across different age and ethnic
groups.
APPENDIX A
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Examining psychological correlates of racial/ethnic socialization and ethnic identity development in a sample of ethnically diverse high school youth

PARENT CONSENT FORM

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
Your child is invited to participate in a research project aimed at exploring psychological correlates of racial/ethnic identity among ethnically diverse high school youth. My name is Denada Hoxha and I am a doctoral candidate at Loyola University Chicago. I am soliciting your child’s participation in this research study as part of my dissertation work under the guidance of Dr. Anita Thomas.

WHAT WILL MY CHILD BE ASKED TO DO?
Your child will complete a paper-and-pencil anonymous survey comprised of questions about the importance of race/ethnicity in his/her life and how it is related to self-esteem and subjective well-being. It takes 15-20 minutes to complete this survey.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS (BAD THINGS) AND BENEFITS (GOOD THINGS) OF THE STUDY?
There are minimal risks for participating in the study. If your child is having some uncomfortable thoughts and/or feelings, I will be available to answer questions or address concerns. While there are no direct benefits for your child, the study will help us better understand how high school youth navigate diversity in their school and their communities.

WHO WILL KNOW ABOUT WHAT WE DID IN THE STUDY?
We will not ask your child to place his name on any form to protect their privacy. Information from the surveys is confidential. Only Dr. Thomas and I will access the surveys which will not have any personal information on them. They will be locked in her office and surveys will be destroyed after 3 years. The information may be used for professional articles, but information will be reported for the group and not your child alone.

ARE THERE SITUATIONS IN WHICH OUR INFORMATION MAY BE RELEASED?
If your child states that s/he is being abused, we are required by law to report it to the Department of Children and Family Services. If your child provides information about hurting him/herself, I am mandated by law to contact the appropriate agencies.

WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS AND MY CHILD’S RIGHTS AS RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS?
Your child’s participation in the research project is voluntary. Your child does not have to answer any question they do not want to, and they can choose to not complete the surveys.
Parents please be aware that under the Protection of Pupil Rights Act. 20 U.S.C. Section 1232(c)(1)(A), you have the right to review a copy of the questions asked of or materials that will be used with your students. If you would like to do so, you should contact Denada Hoxha at 773-693-6354 to obtain a copy of the questions or materials.

If you have any questions at any time, please contact Denada Hoxha at dhoxha@luc.edu or Dr. Anita Thomas, School of Education, Counseling Psychology, at (312)915-7403. If you have questions about your child’s rights as a research participant, you may contact the Compliance Manager in Loyola’s Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

☐ Yes, I agree to have my child participate.
☐ No, I do not give consent for my child to participate.

**Statement of Consent:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above and agree to allow your child to participate in this research study.

____________________________________________   __________________
Parent’s/Guardian’s Signature                                       Date

____________________________________________  ___
Researcher’s Signature                                                   Date
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STUDENT ASSENT FORM

WHAT IS THE STUDY ABOUT? You are being asked to be part of a research project that seeks to explore psychological correlates of racial/ethnic identity among ethnically diverse high school youth. My name is Denada Hoxha and I am a doctoral candidate at Loyola University Chicago. I am asking your participation in this research study as part of my dissertation work under the guidance of Dr. Anita Thomas.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO? You are asked to complete a paper-and-pencil survey which takes 15-20 minutes to complete.

WHAT ARE THE RISKS (BAD THINGS) OF THE STUDY? There are minimal risks involved in completing this survey. Some questions from the survey may cause you to feel uncomfortable about the racial issues. We ask that you try to fully complete all the surveys but if you feel uncomfortable you do not have to answer anything that you do not want to. There will be no punishment if you decide that you do not want to complete the survey.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS (GOOD THINGS) TO TAKING PART IN THE STUDY? There are no direct benefits to participation; however, the project in general can help us learn more about how people your age are prepared to navigate and live in a diverse society. What we learn can help us create programs to help students with their identity development and psychological outcomes such as self-esteem and emotional well-being.

WHO WILL KNOW ABOUT WHAT I DID OR SAID IN THE STUDY? Your name will not be included on any part of the survey. The individual or personal answers you provide on the survey will not be shared with anyone. All the information that you will provide in the survey will remain confidential. We will ask that you do not share information that is stated within the survey outside of this research project. If you complete this anonymous survey and submit it to the researcher, we will be unable to extract anonymous data from the database should you wish it withdrawn. I will store all completed surveys in a locked cabinet and only Dr. Thomas and I will have access to this data. All surveys will be destroyed after 3 years.

There are minimal risks associated with this project. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and refusal to participate in this project will not involve any penalty. Also, you are free to choose not to answer any questions or withdraw from participation without penalty.
If you tell us that you are in danger because someone is hurting/harming you, or that you are in danger because you are hurting yourself or other people, the law requires us to tell the right person or agency. First, we will talk to you alone. Next, if we feel that we need to call an agency, we will call your parents first, and then call the agency. We may ask you to talk to a counselor at your school.

If you have any questions at any time, please contact Denada Hoxha at (847) 693-6354 or Dr. Anita Thomas at (312) 915-7403. Or if you would like to find out more about your rights as a participant in this study, you can contact: Compliance Manager, Office of University Research Services, Loyola University Chicago (773) 508-2686.

I agree to participate in this research project. I have read and understand how this study works and what I will be asked to do. I was given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered.

By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research.

Student’s Name: __________________________

Student’s Signature: __________________________

Date: __________
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STUDY MEASURES
Demographic Questionnaire

1. **Gender:**
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. **Age:** _____

3. **Grade Level:**
   a. 9th grade
   b. 10th grade
   c. 11th grade
   d. 12th grade

   This year’s Graduate Point Average (GPA) _____________
   Last year’s GPA ______________

4. **Race/Ethnicity:**
   a. Black/African American
   b. White/Caucasian
   c. Asian, Asian American
   d. Hispanic/Latino/a
   e. Native American
   f. Biracial (please specify) ______________
   g. Mixed (please specify) ______________

5. **With whom do you currently live?**
   a. Both parents
   b. Mother only
   c. Father only
   d. Another relative or guardian
   e. Other (please specify) ______________

**My parents are:**
   a. Both White
   b. Both Black
   c. Both Hispanic
   d. Both Asian Americans
   h. Racially Mixed (please specify) ______________
   i. Other (please specify) ______________
6. Do you qualify/receive free/reduced lunch at your school?
   __yes
   __no

7. My friends are:
   a. Mostly White
   b. Mostly Black
   c. Mostly Asian Americans
   d. Mostly Latinos/Latinas
   e. Racially Mixed
   f. Other (please specify) ______________

Racial Socialization Scale

How often have your parents said, implied, or shown, in their actions:
1-Never 2-A few times 3-A lot of times

1. People are all equal regardless of their race
2. You should be proud to be the race that you are
3. Taken you to places that reflect your racial or ethnic group like events, museums, or festivals
4. Learning about your race is an important part of who you are
5. You may have a hard time being accepted in this society because of your race
6. People of all races have an equal chance in life
7. Talked to you about important people or events in the history of your racial or ethnic group
8. It is important to appreciate people of all racial backgrounds
9. Some people may treat you badly or unfairly because of your race
10. People of your race have better opportunities than other people of other races
11. People of your race are more likely to be treated poorly or unfairly than people of other races
12. Celebrate or recognize cultural holidays from your racial or ethnic group
13. It is important to have friends of all races
14. Some children may exclude you from activities because of your race
15. American society is fair to all races
16. It is best to have friends who are the same race as you are
17. People of different races have different values and beliefs
18. It is important to know about the history and traditions of your race
19. It is important to get along with people of all races
20. You may experience discrimination and prejudice because of your race
21. It is a bad idea to marry someone who is a different race than you are
22. It is a bad idea to date (or go out with) someone who is a different race than you are
The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In this country, people come from a lot of different 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 Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person in born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity and your ethnic group and how you feel about it and react to it.

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

Write in the number that gives the best answer to each question.

4-Strongly agree 3-Somewhat agree 2-Somewhat disagree 1-Strongly disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own 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 like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.
5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
6. I am happy that I am a member of the group that I belong to.
7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups don’t try to mix together.
8. I am not very clear about the role of ethnicity in my life.
9. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own.
10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group.
11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
12. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.
13. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
14. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments.
15. I don’t try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups.
16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.
17. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups.
18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
19. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own.
20. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

21. Write in the number that gives the best answer to each question.
   
   My ethnicity is
   
   (1) Asian, Asian American, or Oriental
   (2) Black or African American
   (3) Hispanic or Latino
   (4) White, Caucasian, European, Not Hispanic
   (5) American Indian
   (6) Mixed: parents are from different groups
   (7) Other (write in): __________

22. My father’s ethnicity is (use numbers above) __________

23. My mother’s ethnicity is (use numbers above __________

**The Collective Self-Esteem Scale**

We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your memberships in those particular groups or categories, and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about those groups and your memberships in them. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale from 1 to 7:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Neutral
5. Agree somewhat
6. Agree
7. Strongly agree

1. I am a worthy member of the social groups I belong to.

2. I often regret that I belong to some of the social groups I do.

3. Overall, my social groups are considered good by others.

4. Overall, my group memberships have very little to do with how I feel about myself.

5. I feel I don’t have much to offer to the social groups I belong to.

6. In general, I am glad to be a member of the social groups I belong to.

7. Most people consider my social groups, on the average, to be more ineffective than other social groups.
8. The social groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am.

9. I am a cooperative participant in the social groups I belong to.

10. Overall, I often feel that the social groups of which I am a member are not worthwhile.

11. In general, others respect the social groups that I am a member of.

12. The social groups I belong to are unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.

13. I often feel I’m a useless member of my social groups.

14. I feel good about the social groups I belong to.

15. In general, others think that the social groups that I am a member of are unworthy.

16. In general, belonging to social groups is an important part of my self-image.

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale**

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree, circle **SA (Strongly Agree)**
If you agree with the statement, circle **A. (Agree)**
If you disagree, circle **D. (Disagree)**
If you strongly disagree, circle **SD. (Strongly Disagree)**

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

2. At times, I think I am no good at all.

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

6. I certainly feel useless at times.

7. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

**Positive and Negative Affect Schedule**

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to the word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on average. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1-very slightly or not at all  2-a little  3-moderately  4-quit a bit  5-extremely

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction with Life Scale**

Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1 - 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

- 7 - Strongly agree  
- 6 - Agree  
- 5 - Slightly agree  
- 4 - Neither agree nor disagree  
- 3 - Slightly disagree  
- 2 - Disagree  
- 1 - Strongly disagree

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
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