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One of the fundamental developmental tasks that adolescents face is how to negotiate their individual autonomy and connectedness to the family. This dissertation includes two studies that employed the daily diary approach to examine how adolescents maintain the important sense of connectedness to their families in their every day lives. The goal of Study 1 was to examine how adolescents \((N = 297; M_{\text{age}} = 16.39 \text{ years}; 43\% \text{ males})\) from diverse ethnic backgrounds (44% Latino; 25% Asian; 41% European) balanced their leisure time with family in conjunction with time commitments with friends and schoolwork on the same day. In general, adolescents’ time with friends impinged upon their leisure time with family, whereas more time spent on schoolwork went hand in hand with greater family leisure. Whereas females experienced difficulty negotiating time with family and friends on the same day, males and adolescents from Latino families were better able to maintain time with family, friends and schoolwork all on the same day. Spending time with family reinforced adolescents’ daily sense of family membership;
however, competing demands between family and friends on the same day were linked to feelings of distress especially for females. Overall, Study 1 demonstrates the daily behavioral processes that adolescents undertake to stay connected to their families, yet also meet their needs for autonomy and independence. The goal of Study 2 was to understand how familial conditions at home promote adolescents’ family connectedness by way of adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their families. In the two-year longitudinal study, participants included 421 Mexican-American parent-adolescent dyads (adolescents: $M_{\text{age}} = 15$ years, 50% males; parents: $M_{\text{age}} = 42$ years, 83% mothers). Although adolescents provide emotional support to parents and other family members at similar rates, parents’ daily familial stressors encouraged adolescents to provide emotional caregiving to other family members, rather than to their parents. This daily contingency between parental stressors and adolescents’ emotional caregiving was especially pronounced among parents with poor physical health. Furthermore, adolescents who endorsed strong family obligation values displayed the greatest inclinations to provide emotional support to their families on days marked by parental need. And on days when adolescents provided support to their family, they experienced elevated feelings of family membership. Provision of emotional support was not concurrently or longitudinally linked to adverse psychological well-being. Overall, Study 2 demonstrates that adolescents’ provision of emotional support is a culturally relevant and meaningful activity for Mexican-American youth.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental developmental tasks that adolescents face is how to negotiate their individual autonomy and connectedness to the family (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Kagitcibasi, 2005; Phinney, Kim-Jo, Osorio, & Vilhjalmsdottir, 2005; Smollar & Youniss, 1989). The normative pursuit towards greater independence is believed to contribute to significant transformations in family relationships during adolescence. For instance, adolescents spend increasingly less time with their family across the teenage years (Lam, McHale, & Crouter, 2012; Larson & Richards, 1991; Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck, & Duckett, 1996) and perceive diminished feelings of emotional closeness, support, and warmth from their parents (Helsen, Vollebergh, & Meeus, 2000; McGue, Elkins, Walden, & Iacono, 2005; Steinberg, 1988). As such, adolescents begin to disengage from their family, both physically and psychologically. However, these changes are short-lived (Paikoff & Brooks-Gunn, 1991; Shearer, Crouter, & McHale, 2005; Steinberg & Silk, 2002; Tsai, Telzer, & Fuligni, 2012) and reflect the normative developmental processes that adolescents engage in to forge an identity of their own and exercise their independence. Despite adolescents’ individuation from the family, the family continues to have a significant presence in adolescents’ lives and impact on their psychosocial development and adjustment. Positive family relationships are linked to a host of healthy youth outcomes (Crouter, Head, McHale, & Tucker, 2004; Duncan, Duncan, & Strycker, 2000; Hofferth & Sandberg, 2001). Therefore, how do adolescents maintain the important sense of connectedness to their families during this critical developmental period when their needs for autonomy and independence become increasingly salient?

Although interests and research on family relationships during adolescence continue to grow, the majority of studies are based on adolescents’ general appraisals of family relationships.
For instance, many scholars have aimed to characterize different dimensions (e.g., cohesion, conflict) of parent-child relationships and chart the normative changes in family relationships over time (Lam et al., 2012; Larson et al., 1996; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979; Tsai et al., 2012). Less empirical work has focused on capturing the behavioral manifestations underlying these broad relational constructs (e.g., cohesion, conflict) that are frequently used. And given that many of these studies are based on traditional self-report questionnaires, they only capture a static view of adolescents’ relationships with their families at a given point in time. Thus, there is limited understanding on the dynamic nature of family relationships.

How do adolescents stay engaged and sustain meaningful relationships with their families? How do adolescents fulfill their roles as family members? What does it mean to be a part of the family? These issues are fundamental in understanding how adolescents actively negotiate their individual autonomy and connectedness with the family. In order to address these key questions, the dissertation is motivated by the need to move beyond global assessments of family relationships and toward the examination of adolescents’ meaningful involvement with their families in their day-to-day lives.

In this dissertation, the overarching goal is to uncover the dynamic nature of family relationships by examining how adolescents maintain connectedness with their families in their everyday lives. The two studies in this dissertation employed a daily diary approach to evaluate the various ways in which adolescents are engaged with their families and the important individual and contextual factors that shape this process. Specifically, I assessed adolescents’ daily leisure time with their family and their provision of familial support. Study 1 explores how adolescents balance their family leisure time in conjunction with their time spent with friends and schoolwork on the same day. Study 2 examines the familial conditions under which
adolescents provide emotional support to their families. By taking a daily diary approach to study family relationships, the dissertation highlights the types of daily opportunities adolescents have to be engaged and connected with their families.

**Study 1: Balancing time with family, friends, and school**

Study 1 is a daily diary study with adolescents from Latino, Asian and European American backgrounds. In Study 1, the goal was to examine how adolescents balance their family leisure time in conjunction with their time spent with friends and schoolwork on the same day. As adolescents’ social worlds are expanding, opportunities and expectations from friends, school and other domains outside the home can jeopardize adolescents’ time with the family. Although extant research suggests an inverse relationship between adolescents’ time with family and friends (Larson & Richards, 1991; Montemayor, 1982), few studies have systematically examined how adolescents negotiate their time with family, friends and schoolwork all on the same day. Are adolescents’ time with family, friends and schoolwork competing against one another each day or do adolescents manage to balance these demands across the week? Given traditional gender socialization goals at home dictating that females should stay close to the family (Crouter, Head, Bumpus, & McHale, 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006) and differential cultural emphases placed on children’s autonomy development (Kagitcibasi, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). I also sought to examine gender and ethnic differences in this balancing routine. Moreover, adolescents’ own internalization of family values and achievement goals can also influence how they structure their time. Lastly, as this is a period in which adolescents seek autonomy from their family, I investigated whether adolescents experienced family leisure time to be meaningful to them. Does family leisure contribute to their sense of family membership? Or do adolescents find this balancing routine stressful? Findings from this study can demonstrate
the underlying behavioral processes that adolescents undertake to stay connected to their families, yet also meet their needs for autonomy and independence.

**Study 2: Provision of emotional support in response to parental need**

Study 2 is a two-year longitudinal, daily diary study with Mexican-American adolescents and their parents. In Study 2, the goal was to examine Mexican-American adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their family. Latino families are often characterized by strong familism values emphasizing family cohesion and interdependence (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). Thus, I sought to examine how familism values may be reflected in the specific act of providing emotional support to the family and the daily conditions under which they occur. Grounded in a family systems framework that purports that individual development is best understood within the larger family context (Minuchin, 1985; Whitchurch & Constatine, 1993), I investigated whether adolescents’ provision of emotional support was contingent upon their parents’ experience with a familial stressor on a given day. Moreover, I explored whether chronic familial challenges marked by economic strain and parents’ poor physical health would encourage even higher levels of emotional support in response to daily parental need. I also examined how this daily contingency may vary according to adolescent characteristics, including gender, birth order and the endorsement of family obligation values. Lastly, I examined the concurrent and longitudinal impact of providing emotional support on adolescents’ well-being. Adolescents’ provision of emotional support may align with Mexican cultural values placed on family cohesion and interdependence, thereby reinforcing adolescents’ feelings of family role fulfillment. However, assuming responsibility to provide emotional care for the family can also be a stressful task and contribute to feelings of distress. Findings from this study illustrate how familial stressors can promote adolescents’ engagement in culturally
relevant forms of family connectedness in Mexican-American adolescents’ every day lives.

**Daily Diary Methodology**

In order to best address the research aims of the dissertation, the daily diary methodology was employed to illuminate how adolescents stay engaged with their families in their every day lives. Adolescents (and parents in Study 2) completed a daily diary checklist for 14 consecutive days and reported on specific behaviors (e.g., spending leisure time with family, providing emotional support to family) they engaged in and on feelings (e.g., family role fulfillment, distress) they experienced each day. In this respect, the daily diary approach is a useful method to capture behaviors and feelings that would otherwise appear static in traditional one-time surveys (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Given that diary checklists are completed at the end of each day, the time elapsed between actual experiences and participants’ account of the experience is reduced. Therefore, daily diary reports provide more reliable and valid estimates compared to retrospective accounts through questionnaires that require participants to recall experiences that happened in the last several months or even the past year. Moreover, participants reported on the same behaviors and feelings across multiple days, making the daily diary methodology an excellent tool to capture the day-to-day fluctuations in adolescents’ family interactions, and thereby reflecting the dynamic nature of family relationships.

Of significant value for the dissertation, daily assessments of individuals’ experiences and well-being allow for investigation of whether specific events, behaviors and feelings co-occur with one another on a daily basis. In Study 1, I assessed how adolescents balanced their time with family, friends and studying all on the same day. In Study 2, I examined whether adolescents were more likely to provide emotional support to their families on the same days when their parents faced a familial stressor at home. And in both studies, I investigated whether
spending leisure time with family and providing emotional support to family were related to adolescents’ feelings of family role fulfillment and psychological distress on the same day. Moreover, I was able to examine individual differences in these daily associations. For example, on days when parents were confronted with a stressor at home, are males or females more likely to respond by providing emotional support? As such, sophisticated analyses with daily diary data can reveal variability at both the daily and individual level. Analytic advantages afforded by the daily diary method can help to move empirical work beyond examination of differences at the surface level and to illuminate the complexity underlying family dynamics.

**Overarching Goal**

The overarching goal of the dissertation is to demonstrate how adolescents maintain connectedness with their families during this crucial developmental period when they are simultaneously negotiating greater independence from their parents. Through a daily diary approach, we can study how adolescents confront this developmental task in their everyday lives. Whereas Study 1 explored how opportunities and expectations outside the family domain may challenge adolescents’ maintenance of leisure time with their family, Study 2 uncovered the types of familial conditions that can promote adolescents’ connectedness with the family. Both studies will examine the implications of adolescents’ daily family engagements on their feelings of family membership and psychological distress. Together, this dissertation provides a close examination on how adolescents sustain meaningful relationships with their families.
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Study 1:

Adolescents’ Daily Negotiation of Time with Family, Friends and School
Abstract

This daily diary study examined how adolescents (N=297; \(M_{\text{age}}=16.39\) years; 43% males) balanced their time between family, friends and schoolwork on a daily basis. In general, adolescents’ time with friends impinged upon their leisure time with family, whereas more time spent on schoolwork went hand in hand with greater family leisure. There was great variability in adolescents’ daily maintenance of family leisure time. Whereas females faced the greatest conflicts negotiating time with family and friends on the same day, males and adolescents from Latino families were better able to maintain time with family, friends and schoolwork all on the same day. On days when adolescents spent leisure time with family, they experienced elevated feelings of family membership. However, competing demands between family and friends on the same day were linked to feelings of distress, especially for females. Findings demonstrate the inherent challenges and daily behavioral processes that adolescents undertake to stay connected to their families, yet also meet their needs for autonomy and independence.
Adolescents’ Daily Negotiation of Time With Family, Friends, and School

Establishing autonomy, yet maintaining connectedness to the family is a key developmental task during adolescence (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Kagitzibasi, 2005; Smollar & Youniss, 1989). As adolescents experience greater social opportunities and expectations from friends, school and other domains outside the home, their time spent in leisure with their family may become more compromised. Indeed, it is well established that children spend increasingly less leisure time with their family over the course of the adolescent years (Lam, McHale, & Crouter, 2012; Larson & Richards, 1991; Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck, & Duckett, 1996). Despite a breadth of studies that have documented children’s time use across important domains, including family, friends and school (e.g., Hardway & Fuligni, 2006; McHale, Crouter, & Tucker, 2001; Montemayor, 1982; Witkow, 2009), few studies have systematically examined how adolescents negotiate their leisure time with family in conjunction with time spent with their friends and studying in their day-to-day lives. Are adolescents’ time with family, friends and schoolwork competing against one another each day or do adolescents find a way to balance these demands across the week? The examination of how adolescents structure their daily time use with family in the face of demands from friends and school can demonstrate the underlying behavioral processes that adolescents undertake to stay connected to their families, yet also meet their needs for autonomy and independence.

In the current daily diary study with adolescents from Latino, Asian and European backgrounds, we examined how adolescents’ leisure time with their family is maintained in the face of growing social desires and expectations to spend time with friends and on schoolwork, and whether there may be any gender or ethnic variation in these processes. We also explored how adolescents’ family values and academic expectations further shaped how they structured
their time across these three domains. Lastly, we examined how adolescents’ efforts to balance their daily time with family, friends and studying were associated with their sense of family membership and feelings of stress on the same day.

**Adolescent Time Use: A Balancing Act in Their Everyday Lives**

The study of adolescent time use is an important contribution to the understanding of children’s socialization experiences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Larson & Verma, 1999; McHale et al., 2001). Existing studies have utilized various forms of time sampling methodologies to document the amount of time adolescents spend across diverse contexts (e.g., family, friends, schoolwork). Great attention on adolescents’ time with family has centered on their engagement in household chores (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997; Crouter, Head, Bumpus, & McHale, 2001; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009), but less focus has been placed on adolescents’ leisure time with family. Additionally, findings from time-use studies often reflect adolescents’ time spent in each of their activities individually, rather than in conjunction with one another. Therefore, studies have overlooked the potential within-person associations between adolescents’ time spent in their activities, undermining the reality that adolescents engage in multiple activities each day. As such, we are limited in our understanding about how adolescents may compartmentalize their time among important and potentially competing commitments on a day-to-day basis – for example, to what extent is adolescents’ time with family constrained or facilitated by their time spent with friends and studying on the same day?

Findings from cross-sectional and longitudinal studies provide evidence for an inverse relationship between time spent with family and friends (Larson & Richards, 1991; Montemayor, 1982). As children spend less time with family, they spend increasingly more time with their peers across the adolescent years. Surprisingly few studies have examined how adolescents’ time
spent studying may interfere with their time devoted towards family leisure, despite the increased significance in high school students’ academic performance towards college enrollment. In one study, Fuligni, Yip & Tseng (2002) found that adolescents’ time spent on schoolwork impinged upon their participation in household chores, but their time spent in leisure with family was not measured. On the one hand, it is possible that both time spent with friends and studying would both impose on adolescents’ time with their families. On the other hand, socializing with friends may occur outside of the home, whereas studying that is done after school may be more likely to be completed at home, where there may continue to be opportunities to spend leisure time with family. As such, it is possible that time spent studying interferes less with family leisure time, compared to time spent with friends, on any given day.

Gender and Ethnic Variation in Adolescents’ Daily Maintenance of Family Leisure Time

Given that adolescent time use is a reflection of children’s socialization experiences, researchers have highlighted important individual and cultural differences in adolescents’ everyday activities (e.g., Larson & Verma, 1999; Fuligni & Stevenson, 1995; Montemayor, 1982). As such, there is good reason to believe that there also would be variation in how adolescents negotiated their daily time use with family, friends and schoolwork. For example, traditional gender role expectations that encourage females to spend more time at home than males (Crouter et al., 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006) can constrain females’ engagement in other activities, such as socializing with friends. In fact, Montemayor (1982) found an inverse relationship between the average amount of time spent with parents and peers for females, but not for males, suggesting that females may experience greater conflict in balancing their time between family and friends, whereas the lack of association for males may implicate their ability to better balance and spend time in the two activities on the same day. It has also been noted that
females spend more time studying than males (Feliciano, 2012; Fuligni & Stevenson, 1995). Together, these findings may suggest that time spent with friends and studying may impinge upon family leisure time more so for females, than for males.

Furthermore, differential cultural socialization goals regarding youths’ development of autonomy and individuation from the family has been implicated in how adolescents from diverse ethnic backgrounds spend their free time. Whereas contemporary American values encourage autonomy development, Latino and Asian families place greater emphasis on family interdependence and cohesion (Kagitcibasi, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Cross-cultural studies reveal that youth from the United States spend a large proportion of their free time socializing with peers, whereas adolescents from Asian countries spend most of their time on schoolwork (Fuligni & Stevenson, 1995; Larson & Verma, 1999). These differential trends in time use are linked to adolescents’ behavioral autonomy expectations, with children from Asian families expecting to achieve behavioral autonomy (e.g., going to parties, dating) at a later age compared to their European American peers (Feldman & Rosenthal, 1991; Fuligni, 1998; Stewart, Bond, Deeds, & Chung, 1999; Supple, Ghazarian, Peterson, & Bush, 2009). Given the emphasis on family and school, we expected that adolescents’ family leisure time would be less constrained by studying and friends among Asian and Latino adolescents, compared to their peers from European backgrounds.

Socialization Values and Expectations

Beyond gender and ethnic variation, further understanding about the types of values and expectations that adolescents endorse can reveal specific family socialization goals that influence how adolescents negotiate their time with family. For instance, the importance placed on family interdependence can be manifested in family obligation values to spend time with and assist their
family (Fuligni, Tseng & Lam, 1999). These values encourage children to spend leisure time with their family, including having meals and spending weekends and holidays together, and also to assist with household tasks at home. Given the emphasis placed on family connectedness, strong family obligation values can protect adolescents’ leisure time with the family from being compromised by additional demands, particularly commitments (e.g., socializing with peers) that involve spending time away from the family. Therefore, we expected that adolescents who endorse strong family obligation values would be more likely maintain their time with family, even when they have concurrent commitments with peers and schoolwork on the same day.

Additionally, increased expectations to perform well in high school in order to meet competitive college acceptance standards can necessitate great time commitments towards studying. The extent to which adolescents value academic success can also influence how adolescents prioritize studying in their day-to-day lives. In a daily diary study, Witkow (2009) found that high achieving students spent less time with friends on weekdays compared to weekends and were less likely to spend time with friends on days when they had a lot of studying to do. Among their low-achieving peers, their amount of time with friends did not vary according to the day of the week nor whether they had studying to do on that same day. These results provide support that adolescents with stronger orientations towards academic achievement practice greater self-discipline in prioritizing their time towards school over socializing with their peers (Duckworth & Seligman, 2005). To our knowledge, no studies have examined how adolescents’ achievement orientations would influence the extent to which studying and time with friends may compete with adolescents’ leisure time with family. In the current study, we examined how adolescents’ perceived parental achievement expectations (e.g., doing well in school to meet parental expectations) shape the ways in which time with peers and studying will
impinge upon their time with family. Based on previous findings, we expected that students with high achievement expectations would prioritize their studies over family leisure. Given that less academically oriented students have stronger inclinations to socialize with peers, we also expected that adolescents’ leisure time with family will be more constrained by time with peers among adolescents with lower, than higher, achievement expectations.

**Rewarding or Stressful Nature of Adolescents’ Maintenance of Family Leisure Time**

Although many studies have linked family leisure to positive youth adjustment, including better school performance and less behavioral problems (Crouter, Head, McHale, & Tucker, 2004; Duncan, Duncan, & Strycker, 2000; Hofferth & Sandberg, 2001; McHale et al., 2001), it is unclear how adolescents’ maintenance of leisure time with family, particularly in conjunction with desires and expectations to socialize with friends and complete schoolwork, is related to their immediate well-being. Particularly during the period of adolescence when youth are figuring out how to best meet their developing needs for autonomy and relatedness to the family (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Kagitcibasi, 2005), how adolescents’ structure their time can have important implications for their well-being. In this study, we examined whether adolescents experienced both positive (i.e., feelings of family membership) and negative (i.e., psychological distress) feelings on days when they spent time with family, in addition to time spent with friends and schoolwork.

Opportunities to bond during family leisure can promote adolescents’ feelings of family membership. Deriving a sense of family membership on days when adolescents spend activities with family could suggest that adolescents continue to find leisure time with family meaningful even during this period when they begin to develop strong relationships outside the home. However, findings from time-sampling studies (Larson & Richards, 1991; Larson et al., 1996)
have shown that adolescents’ positive affect (e.g., happiness, cheerfulness, friendliness) during family interactions weakened during early adolescence (i.e., 5th-9th grades), although they later increased by mid- and late-adolescence (i.e., 9th grade-12th grade). Perhaps, these feelings of disengagement are due to internal conflicts that adolescents feel in dividing their time with family and other social activities that are more salient, and perhaps even more satisfying, to them. In fact, adolescents felt happier when they were socializing with peers, as opposed to their families (Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003). Youth may find greater enjoyment interacting with friends because these socialization opportunities meet their developmental goals for autonomy and peer acceptance. Therefore, it is possible that although family leisure time may promote feelings of family membership, the competing desires to also spend time with friends or to meet school demands can make this negotiation process stressful. Consequently, adolescents may also experience feelings of distress in meeting potentially conflicting desires to spend time with family, friends and schoolwork on the same day.

**Current Research Aims.** In this daily diary study, we sought to address the following research aims: (1) How do adolescents negotiate their leisure time in the face of potentially competing demands from friends and school and are there ethnic and gender variations? (2) How do adolescents’ family obligation values and academic achievement expectations shape the way they structure their time and (3) How are adolescents’ time spent with family associated with their same day feelings of family membership and psychological distress?

To provide a comprehensive examination of the variability and contingent nature of adolescents’ daily time with their family in the face of commitments with friends and studying each day, we explored adolescents’ daily negotiation of their time with family, friends and studying in two systematic ways. The first was to understand the likelihood that adolescents
spent *any* leisure time with family on the same days in which may have also spent any time with friends and on schoolwork. This first approach represents the proportion of days across the week that adolescents spent time with family, friends and on schoolwork. The second approach took into consideration the actual amount of leisure time with family that may be constrained or facilitated by the amount of time spent with friends and studying on the same day. That is, on days when adolescents spent time with friends and on schoolwork, did they spend less or more time in leisure time with their family? This approach allowed us to understand how adolescents allocated their time across these three activities on the same day.

In order to understand how adolescents balanced their time with family, friends and studying on a daily basis, we examined the daily associations between time with friends and studying predicting time with family on the same day. A negative daily association would indicate that the activities are conflictual and compete for adolescents’ time on the same day. For example, we expected that on days when adolescents spend more time with friends, they would spend less time with family. A positive daily association would suggest that activities are non-conflictual, and instead, may go hand in hand with one another. For example, on days that adolescents spend more time on schoolwork, they may also spend more time with family. A lack of a daily association indicates that activities are independent of each other such that adolescents may maintain their time with family, regardless of time commitments in other activities.

In our analyses, we controlled for whether or not it was a school day, which largely coincides with weekday and weekends, because school hours comprise the majority of adolescents’ time on weekdays and impacts their available time to spend in activities outside of school (Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003; Larson & Richards, 1991). Parental work was also controlled for to account for parents’ availability to be in involved in family leisure with their
children (Crouter & Maguire, 1998). Lastly, we controlled for parents’ education level because family socioeconomic status can reflect the types of activities parents incorporate into their family routines (Crouter, et al., 2004; Larson & Verma, 1999). Follow up analyses examined whether adolescents’ negotiation of their daily activities may vary according to important characteristics, including family structure (i.e., single- versus dual-parent household) and adolescents’ generational status.

Methods

Participants

The current study included 297 adolescents ($M_{age} = 16.39$ years, $SD = 0.74$; 43% males) from the 10th and 11th grades and their primary caregivers ($M_{age} = 45.52$, $SD = 6.98$; 91% mothers, 8% fathers, 1% grandmother). The primary caregiver self-identified as the adult who spent the most time with the adolescent and knew the most about their daily activities. Adolescents were from Latino (44%), Asian (25%) and European (41%) American backgrounds. Adolescents came from diverse generational backgrounds: 12% were of the first generation (i.e., adolescent was foreign-born), 42% were of the second generation (i.e., adolescent was born in the U.S., but at least one parent was born outside of the U.S.) and 45% were of the third generation (i.e., adolescent and parents both were born in the U.S.). Whereas first generation adolescents came from Latino ($N = 8$) and Asian ($N = 28$) backgrounds only, second (Latino: $N = 71$, Asian: $N = 44$, European: $N = 9$) and third generation participants included adolescents who came from all three ethnic backgrounds (Latino: $N = 51$, Asian: $N = 1$, European: $N = 82$). The majority of parents (80.9%) had at least a high school education. About two-thirds (67.7%) of the adolescents lived in two-parent households.

Procedure
Participants were recruited from four high schools in the Los Angeles area. Two of the schools served predominantly students from Latino and European backgrounds and families of middle to upper-middle class socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., 22% - 23% of students received free or reduced lunch). The other two schools included mainly students from Latino and Asian backgrounds from lower- to middle-class families (i.e., 71% - 88% of students received free or reduced lunch).

During the school year, research staff visited 10th and 11th grade classrooms to give a brief presentation about the study and to distribute an informational flyer. Around the same time of the classroom presentations, the same flyers were also mailed to the students’ home to ensure that parents also received information about the study. Interested families were called to obtain consent from the primary caregiver and assent from the adolescent to participate in the study.

Interviewers visited the participants’ homes, where adolescents completed a self-report questionnaire on their own and their parent participated in an interview with a research staff who guided parents through a similar questionnaire and recorded their responses. Questionnaires included items that assessed their family background, family values, school experiences and psychological well-being, and took approximately 45-60 minutes to complete. Next, adolescents and parents were provided with a 14-day supply of diary checklists to complete every night before going to bed for the subsequent two-week period. Each diary checklist was 4 pages long and took approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete each night. To ensure timely completion of the diary checklists, participants were instructed to fold and seal the completed diary checklists and to stamp the seal with an electronic time stamper. The time stamper imprinted the current date and time and was programmed with a security code so that participants could not alter the correct date and time. At the end of the two weeks, interviewers returned to the home to collect
the diary checklists. Adolescents received $50 and parents received $80 for participating in the study. Participants were also told that if inspection of the data indicated that they had completed the diaries correctly and on time, they would be rewarded with a pair of movie passes. The time-stamper monitoring and incentives resulted in high rates of compliance, with 97% (adolescent) and 95% (parents) of the diaries being completed and 98% (adolescents) and 99% (parents) of the diaries being completed on time (i.e., before noon the next day).

Measures

**Daily diary checklists.**

**Time with family.** Adolescents indicated whether they “ate a meal with your family” and “spent leisure time with your family” and how much time they spent in each activity. An index of family time (0 = no, 1 = yes) was created to assess whether adolescents participated in either of the two activities. The amount of leisure time adolescents spent with their family was measured by summing the total time in hours across both activities. Across the 14 days of the study, adolescents spent time with their family on 70.20% (SD = .28.59%) of the days and on average, they spent 1.34 hours (SD = 1.15) with their family each day.

**Time with friends.** Adolescents reported on whether (0 = no, 1 = yes) and how long they “spent time with friends outside of school.” On average, adolescents spent 43.17% (SD = 27.13%) of the days with friends and an average of 1.30 (SD = 1.25) hours with their friends each day.

**Time on schoolwork.** Adolescents reported on whether (0 = no, 1 = yes) and how long they “studied or did homework while not in school.” Across the duration of the study, adolescents spent 43.16% (SD = 30.48%) of the days on schoolwork and spent an average of 0.81 hours (SD = 0.95) each day studying.
**Family role fulfillment.** On a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*) scale, adolescent responded to the following statement “How much did you feel like a good son/daughter today?”

**Psychological distress.** Adolescents’ daily distress was assessed with items from the Profile of Mood States (POMS; Lorr & McNaire, 1971), a widely used measure in previous daily diary studies of stress and psychological well-being (Bolger & Zuckerman, 1995). Adolescents used a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*) to indicate the extent to which they felt distressed, which tapped anxious and depressive feelings (items: sad, hopeless, discouraged, on edge, unable to concentrate, uneasy, nervous). We averaged across the seven items to create a daily index of adolescents’ feelings of psychological distress. This measure had good internal consistency (\(\alpha = .80\)).

**Questionnaires.**

**Family obligation.** Adolescents completed a measure assessing the extent to which they felt that they should spend time with their families and assist with household tasks (Fuligni et al., 1999). The scale included 12 items such as “spend time at home with your family,” “eat meals with your family” and “help out around the house” (1 = *almost never*; 5 = *almost always*). This scale had good internal consistency (\(\alpha = .85\)).

**Achievement expectations.** Adolescents responded to 4 items about their perceived academic expectations (Fuligni, 1997) such as “My parent would be disappointed if I didn’t get very high grades” and “My parents expect me to be one of the best students in my class” (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). On average, adolescents felt that their parents had moderate to high expectations of them (\(M = 3.36, SD = 0.92\)). This measure had high internal consistency (\(\alpha = .73\)).

**Control variables.**
**Parent work.** Parents indicated whether they “worked at a job, including paid work at home” (yes/no) each day. About two-thirds (65%) of parents worked at least one day and of these parents, they worked an average of 8.87 days ($SD = 3.02$) during the two weeks of the study.

**Parental education.** Parents reported on their own and their partner’s highest level of educational attainment by selecting one of the following categories: 1 = some elementary school, 2 = completed elementary school, 3 = some junior-high school, 4 = completed junior-high school, 5 = some high school, 6 = graduated from high school, 7 = trade or vocational school, 8 = some college, 9 = graduated from college, 10 = some medical, law or graduate school, 11 = graduated from medical, law or graduate school. Educational level was calculated by averaging both parents’ level of education. The majority of our parents had at least graduated from high school (17.8% completed high school, 43.5% went to trade/vocational school or some college, 12.8% graduated from college, and 6.8% attended or graduated from medical, law or graduate school).

**Results**

**Descriptives**

As indicated in Table 1-1, there were significant gender and ethnic differences in adolescents’ proportion of days and average amount of time spent each day with family, friends and schoolwork. Whereas males spent a greater proportion of days with friends compared to females, females spent a greater proportion of days studying than males. Overall, adolescents from European backgrounds spent a greater proportion of days with their families compared to their Asian peers and spent greater average amount of time each day with family compared to both their Latino and Asian peers. Adolescents from European American backgrounds also spent
a greater proportion of days with friends than Latino peers and more amount of time with friends compared to peers from both Latino and Asian families. Although there were no significant ethnic differences in proportion of days spent studying, adolescents from Asian backgrounds spent more time each day studying than their peers from Latino and European backgrounds.

**Analytic Plan**

Analyses were conducted in hierarchical linear modeling (HLM: Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), such that days at Level 1 were nested within individuals at Level 2. The two-level models estimated adolescents’ time with family, friends and studying in two separate ways: (1) the proportion of days that adolescents spent time in these activities and (2) the actual amount of time spent in each activity each day. To examine how adolescents balanced their leisure time with family, friends and studying on the same day, we estimated daily-level associations with friend and study time predicting family time. Friend and study time were included in Level 1 and were person-centered in order to ensure that daily-level associations were independent of individual-level differences. To examine whether these daily level associations varied according to adolescent gender and ethnicity, these characteristics were included in Level 2.

Next, we addressed how adolescents’ family values and achievement expectations may shape the ways in which adolescents balanced their time between family, friends and studying. Family obligation values and achievement expectations were grand-mean centered and included in Level 2 to predict adolescents’ average proportion of days and amount of time spent with family and the daily associations between time with family and friends and between family and studying.

In our last set of analyses, we examined how adolescents’ time with family was associated with their feelings of family role fulfillment and distress on that same day. Time with
family, friends and studying were person-centered and included in Level 1 predicting adolescents’ feelings of family role fulfillment and distress on the same day, in separate models. At Level 2, we included gender and ethnicity to assess whether the daily associations between each of the three activities and well-being varied according to adolescent gender and ethnicity.

All models controlled for whether parents worked each day (person-centered) and whether it was a school day at Level 1 and for parents’ educational level (grand-mean centered) at Level 2.

**Balancing Time With Family, Friends and Studying**

**Gender and ethnic variation.** To address our first research question regarding whether time with friends and studying competed with adolescents’ leisure time with family, we assessed how adolescents’ time with friends and studying were associated with adolescents’ time with family on the same day and whether gender or ethnicity may differentially shape these daily associations. As shown in Model 1a of Table 1-2, whereas adolescents were less likely to spend time with family on days that they spent time with their friends, adolescents were more likely to spend time with family on days when they also spent time studying. The negative daily association between family and friends suggests that spending time with friends competed with adolescents’ time with family. The positive association between family and studying suggests that adolescents were able to balance time with family and studying on the same day. Moreover, results indicated that these daily associations varied according to gender. Analyses of simple slopes were conducted in order to observe the gender differences in adolescents’ differential time use patterns. Figure 1-1a shows that on days when adolescents spent time with friends, females were even less likely than males to have spent time with their family on that same day. And on days when females spent time studying, they were even more likely to spend time with their
families on that same day (see Figure 1-1b). For males, time spent with family and studying was independent of each other.

In regards to how the actual amount of time adolescents spent with friends and on schoolwork was associated with their amount of leisure time with family on the same day, Model 2a of Table 1-2 shows significant ethnic variation in these daily associations. As shown in Figure 1-2a, on days when European and Asian American adolescents spent more time with friends, they were significantly less likely than their Latino peers to spend time with family on that same day. Additionally Figure 1-2b illustrates that only Latino American adolescents spent more time with family on days when they also spent more time studying. The daily association between time with family and studying was not significant for European and Asian American adolescents.

Results also showed that adolescents were more likely to spend time and spent more time with family on days when parents did not work and on non-school days. There were no differences in overall family leisure time nor in the daily associations between time with family, friends and schoolwork that was due to parents’ education level in any of our analyses.

Follow-up analyses also examined whether overall family time and the daily associations between family, friend and study time differed according to adolescents’ generation status and whether they came from single- vs dual-parent homes. Results did not show any significant differences in overall family time or in the daily associations due to these factors.

**Adolescent family values and achievement expectations.** We also sought to understand whether there would be variation in adolescents’ negotiation of their activities due to their family values and achievement expectations. As shown in Model 1b of Table 1-2, we found that the adolescents’ achievement expectations modified the extent to which their time with friends impinged upon their time with family. In order to interpret this moderating effect, we conducted
additional analyses to test the simple slopes for adolescents with high (+1 SD), average, and low (-1 SD) achievement expectations. Results showed that only adolescents with low \( (b = .11, SE = .03, p = .001) \) and average \( (b = .06, SE = .03, p = .025) \) levels of achievement expectations were more likely to spend time with family and on schoolwork on the same day (see Figure 1-3a). For adolescents with high achievement expectations, the daily association between time spent with family and studying on the same day was not significant, \( b = .02, SE = .03, p > .05 \).

Model 2b of Table 1-2 shows that the daily association between actual amount of time spent with family and studying varied according to adolescents’ achievement expectations as well. Similar analyses to test the simple slopes were conducted to examine the moderating effects of adolescents’ achievement expectations. Although the individual slopes for each of these groups was not significant on its’ own, the slopes varied in their direction of association (see Figure 1-3b) – on days when adolescents spent more time studying, adolescents with high achievement expectations spent less time with their family \( (b = -.03, SE = .02, p > .05) \), adolescents with low achievement expectations spent more time with their family \( (b = .03, SE = .02, p > .05) \), and there was no association between time spent with family and studying for adolescents with average levels of achievement expectations \( (b = -.00, SE = .02, p > .05) \).

Family obligation values were associated with greater proportion of days and amount of time spent with the family, on average, but did not modify the daily associations between adolescents’ time with family, friends and schoolwork.

**Rewarding or Stressful Nature in the Daily Maintenance of Family Leisure Time**

In the next set of analyses, we examined how adolescents’ time with family was associated with their feelings of family role fulfillment and psychological distress. There were two approaches to which we addressed this question. First, we examined how adolescents’
leisure time with family predicted their feelings of family role fulfillment and distress on the same day, above and beyond time that they spent with friends and studying on that day. We included adolescents’ time with family, friends and schoolwork predicting their feelings of family role fulfillment and psychological distress in two separate models. Gender, ethnicity and parental education were included at Level 2 to assess whether adolescents’ average feelings of family role fulfillment and distress and the daily associations between adolescents’ time spent in each of the three activities and their well-being would vary by those characteristics. All daily level variables were person-centered and parental education was grand-mean centered.

As shown in Model 3a of Table 1-3 and Figure 1-4a, results indicated that on days when adolescents spent time with their family, they experienced stronger feelings of family role fulfillment. Additionally, Model 4a of Table 1-3 and Figure 1-4b illustrate that for adolescents from Latino and Asian backgrounds only, on days when adolescents spent more time than usual with their family, they derived stronger feelings of family role fulfillment on that same day. Findings also indicated that higher levels of parental education enhanced adolescents’ feelings of family role fulfillment on days when they studied more.

There was no daily variation due to gender and there were no gender or ethnic differences in adolescents’ overall feelings of family role fulfillment when averaging across the study days.

As indicated in Models 3b and 4b of Table 1-3, adolescents’ time spent with family was not related feelings of distress on that same day. Averaging across the 14 days, females reported higher levels of distress than males.

Our second approach to understanding how family leisure is associated with feelings of family role fulfillment and distress was to examine whether additional time spent with friends and studying on the same days that adolescents also spent more time with family was associated
with these indicators of well-being. Do adolescents continue to derive a sense of family role fulfillment on days when they spend more time with friends and schoolwork in addition to more time in family leisure as well? Or are the additional time commitments stressful for adolescents? We included 2-way interactions of family X friends and family X studying into the model at Level 1 predicting adolescents’ feelings of family role fulfillment and distress. We also examined whether these additional daily associations varied by adolescent gender, ethnicity and parent education level.

We found that on days when adolescents spent more time with both friends and family than they usually do (i.e., days that are high in both family and study time), they felt more distressed, $b = 0.03, SE = 0.01, p = .010$. Moreover, these feelings of distress were greater for females than for males, $b = 0.02, SE = 0.01, p = .036$ (see Figure 1-5a), and less so for adolescents from Asian backgrounds, $b = -0.05, SE = .02, p = .026$.

As shown in Figure 1-5b, on days when females spent more time on both schoolwork and family leisure than usual, they were more likely than males to derive stronger feelings of family role fulfillment, $b = 0.04, SE = 0.02, p = .026$. Females also experienced less distress on days when they were more likely than usual to spend both time studying and with family, $b = -0.10, SE = 0.04, p = .006$ (see Figure 1-5c).

Lastly, we included 3-way interactions (i.e., family X friend X study) in the models but they were not related to same-day feelings of family role fulfillment or psychological distress.

**Discussion**

The adolescent years present challenges to youths’ leisure time with family as adolescents develop an increased need for autonomy. In the current daily diary study, we found that for most adolescents, socializing with friends constrained adolescents’ leisure time with
family, whereas time spent studying went hand in hand with greater family leisure. There was
great variability in adolescents’ experiences maintaining time with family each day. Females
faced greater limitations to their time with family than males. Adolescents from Latino
backgrounds were better able to balance family leisure among their commitments with friends
and schoolwork each day, compared to Asian and European American peers. And adolescents
with strong academic orientations prioritized their studies over family leisure. Despite the
rewarding nature of family leisure in strengthening adolescents’ feelings of family membership,
competing demands between family and friends were particularly stressful for some adolescents,
reflecting the inherent challenges in negotiating one’s autonomy and family connectedness. The
current study demonstrates that the maintenance of family time is an active process embedded in
adolescents’ day-to-day lives that requires youth to make decisions about how to sustain their
sense of family connectedness in the face of growing social demands and expectations.

The current daily diary study contributes to the literature on adolescent time use by
exploring the daily variability and contingency in adolescents’ family leisure that is shaped by
commitments with friends and school on the same day. Findings revealed that social experiences
and expectations from domains outside the family have both constraining and facilitative
influences on adolescents’ time with family. For instance, on days when adolescents spent more
time with friends, they were less likely to spend and spent less amount of time with family. This
pattern is consistent with cross-sectional and longitudinal studies that have also found an inverse
relation between time spent with friends and studying across the teenage years (Larson &
Richards, 1991; Montemayor, 1982). In contrast, adolescents were able to better balance
schoolwork and family on the same day. Among females and adolescents from Latino
backgrounds, in particular, spending time on schoolwork even coincided with greater leisure
time with family on the same day. Overall, family leisure and studying may go hand in hand with one another as both activities may take place at home, whereas adolescents may be more likely to spend time with friends outside of the home, thereby limiting their opportunities to spend leisure time with family.

Considered to be one of the key developmental tasks confronting adolescents, negotiating family connectedness and establishing behavioral and psychological independence will inevitably be more challenging for some youth than others. Indeed, there was great variability in the means by which adolescents balanced their time with family, friends and schoolwork and how these processes contributed to their daily well-being. Females were especially likely to experience conflict in balancing their time with family and friends on the same day – on days when females spent more time with friends, they were less likely than males to also spend time with their family. Interestingly, there were no gender differences in the average amount of time socializing with peers across the week, despite males spending greater proportion of days with their friends across the week. This suggests that on the fewer days that females spent time with friends, they were likely to spend a large proportion of time with their friends that day, thus making up for lost time on other days in which they spent time with family instead. It appears then that perhaps females compartmentalize their week by devoting separate days for family versus friends, whereas males have greater flexibility in balancing time with family and friends on the same days. These differential trends may reflect gender differences in the nature of friendships and structure of activities that adolescents engage in (Rose & Rudolph, 2006). For example, females develop intimacy with their friends through conversations and are more likely than males to spend time with their friends in public (e.g., going to the mall), which can take up a greater proportion of their day (Larson & Richards, 1991; McNelles & Connolly, 1999).
When females did combine their time with family and friends on the same day, they felt greater feelings of distress, compared to males, demonstrating the internal conflict and challenge for females to balance these two activities on the same day. Interestingly, on days when females spent more time on schoolwork and with family, they felt less distressed, and even derived stronger feelings of family role fulfillment. Indeed, females were more likely than males to balance schoolwork and family on the same days. Although we did not investigate specific gender socialization messages that adolescents may receive from their parents, it appears that gendered norms at home encourage females to stay close to the family and promote their engagement in activities (e.g., studying, housework) that are more likely to take place at home (Crouter et al., 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Qin, 2006). Males, on the other hand, have greater leeway in how they structure their time each day, and experience less conflict balancing time with family, friends and schoolwork.

Despite the normative pattern for adolescents to experience oppositional pulls from family and friends, there was significant ethnic variation in the extent to which adolescents’ leisure time with family was contingent upon their activities with friends and schoolwork. Compared to youth from Asian and European backgrounds, Latino youth were more likely to maintain their time with family on top commitments with friends and schoolwork on the same day. For adolescents from Latino families, socializing with friends impinged upon their family leisure time to a lesser degree than it did for their other peers. And on days when Latino adolescents studied more, they spent even more time with their family. Together, these findings suggest that Latino adolescents balance their time between family, friends and schoolwork all on the same day. Their daily maintenance of family leisure reflects the interdependent values placed
on family relatedness that is characteristic of Latino families (Kagitcibasi, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

We similarly found that adolescents from Asian families also balanced family leisure and schoolwork on a daily basis, however they displayed a slightly different approach compared to their Latino peers. For youth from Asian backgrounds, studying neither promoted nor impinged upon their family leisure time. Regardless of how much time adolescents from Asian families spend studying, they maintained their leisure time with family. This may be somewhat surprising based on extant research (Feldman & Rosenthal, 1991; Fuligni & Stevenson, 1995) and findings from our study that Asian youth spend the most time studying, on average; thus it may have been expected that schoolwork would constrain their time with family. These efforts to balance time with family and studying reflect the similar cultural values that Asian and Latino families place on family solidarity, and also on academic achievement (Fuligni et al., 2002; Kao, 2002).

Interestingly, however, time socializing with friends impinged upon greater leisure time with family for Asian adolescents, than it did for their Latino peers. Taking into account that Asian youth spend the most time on schoolwork each day, it leaves little room for additional activities in their day. As such, it is possible for any extra time than usual that Asian youth devote to their friends on a given day would impinge upon their family leisure time on that same day.

Regardless of the differential subtleties on how time with friends and studying shape adolescents’ time with family, both adolescents from Asian and Latino families derived elevated feelings of family role fulfillment on days when they spent more time than usual with their family. For these adolescents, being with their family is an important aspect of the cultural script they follow to maintain family cohesion and connectedness and reflects the interdependent values that Latino and Asian families endorse (Fuligni et al., 1999; Kagitcibasi, 2005; Markus &
Kitayama, 1991). Relatedly, family obligation values underscoring the importance to spend time with family was associated with greater proportion of days and average amount of time adolescents spent with family. However, family obligation values did not influence adolescents’ day-to-day maintenance of family leisure time. Given that Latino and Asian youth have been found to endorse stronger family obligation values compared to European American youth (Tsai, Telzer, & Fuligni, 2012; Fuligni et al., 1999), findings suggest that family obligation do not explain for additional variation in the daily variability and contingent nature of family leisure time, over and above the ethnic differences we found.

However, we did find that adolescents’ perceived parental academic expectations encouraged those who had stronger motivation to do well in school to prioritize time on schoolwork over family leisure. It is possible that adolescents who display stronger academic orientations have parents who are closely monitoring their progress in school and their daily activities, in general (Crouter, MacDermind, McHale, & Perry-Jenkins, 1990; Rodgers & Rose, 2001). For instance, parents may oversee that the type of leisure activities their child is engaged in is not interfering with their schoolwork, thereby helping their child to establish a routine that will promote high academic performance. Furthermore, these findings are consistent with prior studies illustrating that adolescents with lower academic performance were less likely to adjust their studying habits and instead, maintained stronger peer orientations, compared to their peers who did better in school (Fuligni, 1997; Witkow, 2009). As college enrollment is becoming increasingly competitive, many high school students begin to prepare for college by taking advanced courses that necessitate more time commitment towards schoolwork. As such, students with high academic achievement expectations are allocating more time towards studying, and less time towards leisure activities, including time with family.
Altogether, adolescents’ time use reflects the types of socialization opportunities and goals that structure their day-to-day lives and provide adolescents’ a sense of meaning to their routines. Even during a time when adolescents may derive greater enjoyment from their interactions with their friends than with family (Csikszentmihalyi & Hunter, 2003), our findings indicated that adolescents nevertheless found family leisure time to be meaningful, reinforcing their sense of family membership. On days that adolescents spent time with their family, regardless of the sheer amount of time spent, and over and above time spent with friends and studying on that same day, they derived stronger feelings of family role fulfillment. And as previously mentioned, for Latino and Asian youth, spending more leisure time with family on a given day was linked to elevated feelings of family membership. Given that adolescence is a critical period for youths’ identity formation (Erikson, 1968), these findings provide important confirmation that the family continues to be a significant social group, among other increasingly salient social domains (e.g., friends, school), from whom adolescents derive feelings of identification, membership and connection with (Fuligni & Flook, 2005). Nevertheless, inherent in the developmental task to negotiate one’s individuality and connectedness with the family, are understandably moments of conflict and frustration for adolescents. Adolescents were particularly likely to experience feelings of distress on days when they balanced more time than usual with both family and friends on the same day. These findings reflect the challenging nature of this task that adolescents are confronted with in figuring out how do maintain both a sense of connectedness with their family, yet also satisfy their needs for autonomy.

Despite key methodological strengths in the study design, such as the utilization of daily diary checklists among an ethnically diverse sample, there are limitations that are important to address. Although adolescents’ self-reported on their activities and feelings each day, it is
unclear the extent to which adolescents are choosing to engage in these activities or whether parental monitoring or household rules are structuring adolescents’ daily time use. For example, we do not know if adolescents chose to spend time with family or whether family leisure was imposed upon them. Another limitation of our study is that although we were able to examine how socialization goals and values related to the family and school shape adolescents’ time use, we did not have equivalent measures in our study to assess adolescents’ friendships, such as their quality of friendships, and how that also plays a role, particularly in the competing nature between time with friends and family. Given the marked gender differences in our study, it would be valuable for future studies to identify the types of gender socialization messages that adolescents receive in order to understand how gendered norms structure youths’ daily activities.

**Conclusion**

The adolescent years present challenges to youths’ leisure time with family as adolescents begin to confront increasingly more social demands and expectations. The current study highlights various methods by which adolescents maintained their connectedness with family through family leisure in conjunction with everyday commitments from friends and school. In general, adolescents’ time with family and friends competed against one another, and this was especially true for females and youth from Asian and European backgrounds. Males and adolescents from Latino backgrounds were able to better balance time with family, friends and schoolwork on a day-to-day basis. Additionally, adolescents’ strong academic orientations encouraged youth to prioritize studying over leisure with family. Despite this critical developmental period when youth experience pulls from outside the home, adolescents continued to find family leisure meaningful in reinforcing their sense of family membership. Overall, the current study demonstrates the daily processes that adolescents are actively engaged in to figure
out how to best meet their developing needs for autonomy, yet also maintain connectedness to their family.
Table 1-1  
*Gender and Ethnic Differences in Adolescents’ Average Time With Family, Friends and Studying*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Group differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.70 (.29)</td>
<td>.70 (.29)</td>
<td>.71 (.28)</td>
<td>.77 (.24)</td>
<td>.69 (.29)</td>
<td>.65 (.32)</td>
<td>E&gt;L+, E&gt;A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>.43 (.27)</td>
<td>.45 (.29)</td>
<td>.42 (.26)</td>
<td>.49 (.25)</td>
<td>.41 (.28)</td>
<td>.40 (.27)</td>
<td>M&gt;F*; E&gt;L+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork</td>
<td>.43 (.30)</td>
<td>.41 (.32)</td>
<td>.45 (.29)</td>
<td>.40 (.31)</td>
<td>.42 (.28)</td>
<td>.49 (.34)</td>
<td>F&gt;M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of Time (Hours)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1.34 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.24 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.41 (1.21)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.34)</td>
<td>1.26 (1.03)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.94)</td>
<td>E&gt;L***; E&gt;A**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1.30 (1.25)</td>
<td>1.26 (1.21)</td>
<td>1.33 (1.28)</td>
<td>1.70 (1.30)</td>
<td>1.04 (1.08)</td>
<td>1.24 (1.35)</td>
<td>E&gt;L***; E&gt;A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork</td>
<td>0.81 (0.95)</td>
<td>0.73 (0.95)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.95)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.71)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.20 (1.36)</td>
<td>A&gt;E**, A&gt;L***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M=males, F=females, E=European, L=Latino, A=Asian. Ethnic group differences are based on Bonferonni contrasts. +p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001*
### Table 1-2.

*Adolescent Time With Friends and Studying Predicting Leisure Time With Family on the Same Day*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Days of Family Time</th>
<th>Amount of Family Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b ) ( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>( .78 ) ( (.03)*** )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>( .01 ) ( (.02) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>( -.09 ) ( (.04)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>( -.13 ) ( (.05)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>( -.01 ) ( (.01) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation</td>
<td>( .09 ) ( (.03)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>( .00 ) ( (.02) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Time</td>
<td>( -.12 ) ( (.03)*** )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>( -.04 ) ( (.02)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>( .07 ) ( (.04) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>( .02 ) ( (.04) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>( .01 ) ( (.01) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation</td>
<td>( .02 ) ( (.02) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>( -.02 ) ( (.02) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Time</td>
<td>( .07 ) ( (.03)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>( .04 ) ( (.02)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>( .04 ) ( (.04) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>( .00 ) ( (.06) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>( -.00 ) ( (.01) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation</td>
<td>( .01 ) ( (.02) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>( -.05 ) ( (.02)* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent work</td>
<td>( -.04 ) ( (.02)+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School day</td>
<td>( -.03 ) ( (.01)*** )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Gender is effects coded (-1=male, 1=female). Ethnicity is dummy coded with European American youth as the comparison group. Friend and study time are person-centered. Parental education, family obligation, achievement expectations and academic aspirations are grand-mean centered. Parent work is dummy coded (0=no work, 1=work). School day is effects coded (-1=non-school day, 1=school day). \( *p<.05, \) \( **p<.10, \) \( ***p<.001 \)
Table 1-3.  
*Time With Family, Friends and Schoolwork Predicting Family Role Fulfillment and Psychological Distress*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proportion of Days</th>
<th>Amount of Time (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Role</td>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulfillment</td>
<td>Distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3a</td>
<td>Model 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Time</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Time</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Time</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Work</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School day</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Gender is effects coded (-1=male, 1=female). Ethnicity is dummy coded with European American youth as the comparison group. Family, friend and study time are person-centered. Parental education is grand-mean centered. Parent Work is dummy coded (0=no work, 1=work). School day is effects coded (-1=non-school day, 1=school day).

*p<.05, **p<.10, ***p<.001
**Figure 1-1a.** On days when females spent time with friends, they were less likely than males to spend time with their family on that same day. **\( p < .01, ***p < .001 \)

**Figure 1-1b.** On days when females spent time studying, they were more likely to spend time with their family on the same day. **\( p < .01 \)**
Figure 1-2a. Time spent with friends on a given day impinged upon time with family to a lesser degree for adolescents from Latino backgrounds compared to their peers from Asian and European American families. Time with friends is person centered such that 0 represents the mean of each adolescent’s time with friends. ***p < .001

Figure 1-2b. On days when adolescents from Latino families spent more time studying, they also spent more time with their family. Time spent studying is person centered such that 0 represents the mean of each adolescent’s time spent studying. **p < .01
Adolescents with high achievement expectations were less likely to spend time with family on the same days in which they also studied. *p < .05, **p < .01

Adolescents with high achievement expectations spent less leisure time with family on days when they studied more. Time spent studying is person centered such that 0 represents the mean of each adolescent’s time spent studying.

Figure 1-3a. Adolescents with high achievement expectations were less likely to spend time with family on the same days in which they also studied. *p < .05, **p < .01

Figure 1-3b. Adolescents with high achievement expectations spent less leisure time with family on days when they studied more. Time spent studying is person centered such that 0 represents the mean of each adolescent’s time spent studying.
Figure 1-4a. On days when adolescents spent time with family (regardless of how much time), they felt like a better son/daughter. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Figure 1-4b. Spending more time with family was associated with elevated feelings of family role fulfillment for Latino and Asian American youth. ***p < .001
Figure 1-5a. On days when females spent more time than usual with both family and friends, they experienced greater feelings of distress compared to males.

Figure 1-5b. On days when females spent more time than usual with both family and studying, they derived stronger feelings of family role fulfillment, compared to their male peers.

Figure 1-5c. On days when females were more likely to spend time with both family and on schoolwork, they felt less distressed. For males, spending time with both family and on schoolwork was not related to feelings of distress.
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Study 2:

A Daily Diary Study on Adolescents’ Provision of Emotional Support to Their Families
Abstract

Although adolescents’ participation in instrumental support is a common activity in their family routines, less is understood about the prevalence and conditions under which adolescents provide emotional support to their families. In this two-year longitudinal study with 421 Mexican-American parent-adolescent dyads (adolescents: $M_{age} = 15$ years, 50% males; parents: $M_{age} = 42$ years, 83% mothers), we take a daily diary approach to investigate how parental daily and chronic stressors at home encourage adolescents to provide emotional support to their parents and to other family members. Findings revealed that adolescents provided comfort and care to their parents and to other family members at similar rates. Interestingly, however, parents’ daily familial stressors encouraged adolescents to provide emotional support to other family members, rather than to their parents. This daily contingency between parental familial stressors and adolescents’ emotional support to other family members was especially pronounced among parents with poor physical health. Moreover, adolescents who endorsed strong family obligation values had even stronger inclinations to provide support to their families on days marked by greater parental need. And on days when adolescents provided emotional support to their families, they derived elevated feelings of family role fulfillment. Provision of emotional support was not concurrently or longitudinally linked to negative indicators of psychological well-being. Findings demonstrate that adolescents’ provision of emotional support is a culturally relevant and meaningful activity for Mexican-American youth.
A Daily Diary Study on Adolescents’ Emotional Support to Their Families

Family routines play a central role in youth adjustment and great attention has been focused on adolescents’ engagement in various forms of caregiving at home (e.g., Crouter, Head, Bumpus, & McHale, 2001; Gager, Sanchez, & Demaris, 2009; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009). Much of the research on adolescents’ family responsibilities has centered on youths’ participation in instrumental caregiving, which typically encompasses the completion of general household tasks (e.g., doing chores at home, caring for siblings). Recent efforts have been made to distinguish between instrumental and emotional caregiving. Whereas instrumental caregiving involves meeting the practical and physical needs of the family, emotional caregiving requires adolescents to tend to the emotional well-being of the family, such as providing advice to family members and serving as their parent’s confidante during difficult times (Hooper, Marotta, & Lanthier, 2007; Kuperminc, Jurkovic, & Casey, 2009; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Peris, Goeke-Morey, Cummings, & Emery, 2008; Shin & Hecht, 2013; Titzmann, 2012; Williams & Francis, 2010). Despite this conceptual distinction, emotional caregiving is not well-defined nor uniformly operationalized across studies, and in some cases, emotional caregiving continues to be grouped with instrumental support (e.g., Kuperminc et al., 2009; Williams & Francis, 2010). As such, knowledge about the nature of adolescents’ provision of emotional caregiving to their families is limited and greater research is needed to better understand this specific form of support.

In the current longitudinal, daily diary study with Mexican-American parent-adolescent dyads, we drew upon the family systems framework and prior research on children’s family caregiving (e.g., parentification literature) to guide us in uncovering the daily prevalence and nature of adolescents’ emotional support to their families and its’ impact on adolescents’ concurrent and long-term well-being. Our sample of Mexican-American families provides an
ideal context to study adolescents’ emotional caregiving because families from Latino backgrounds endorse very strong cultural values placed on family cohesion, interdependence and support for one another (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). In fact, Mexican-American adolescents display the highest rates of instrumental support compared to their peers from Asian and European backgrounds and provide assistance to their family almost every day (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009; Tsai, Telzer, Gonzales, & Fuligni, 2013). In the current study, we sought to examine how often Mexican-American adolescents provide emotional support to their parents and to other family members, the daily conditions under which these behaviors occurred, the family and individual characteristics that may further promote this form of support, and finally, the concurrent and longitudinal implications for their well-being.

The Daily and Family Context of Adolescents’ Emotional Caregiving

Grounded in the family systems framework (Minuchin, 1985; Whitchurch & Constatine, 1993) which purports that children’s behaviors are embedded within family dynamics involving other members, prior research on adolescents’ caregiving to their families demonstrate that children undertake household tasks in response to their family’s needs (Crooter et al., 2001; Gager et al., 2009; Tsai et al., 2013). Parents’ everyday strains can limit the time and energy they have to expend on their own caregiving responsibilities at home, and thereby increase their reliance on their children to help around the home. For example, in one study with Mexican-American parent-child dyads, Tsai and colleagues (2013) found that on days when parents went to work or felt more fatigued than usual, adolescents were more likely to provide instrumental support to their families. Such findings provide evidence that children’s caregiving behaviors at home are influenced by the daily needs and demands of other family members, particularly those of their parents.
Following this framework, we examined whether parents’ daily family stressors (e.g., conflicts, family demands) at home would enlist adolescents to provide emotional support to their parent and other family members. On days when parents encounter a family stressor, adolescents may offer comfort directly to their parents. It is also possible that adolescents will extend their support to other family members in efforts to ease any tension and restore family well-being. Adolescents may perceive the episodic stressor as one that not only affects their parent, but also the well-being of entire family, and thereby, lend support to other family members as well. Therefore, we examined whether parents’ family stressors elicited adolescents to provide emotional support to their parent, other family members, or both, on that same day. This distinction regarding to whom adolescents provide support to can contribute to the literature on emotional caregiving which has typically centered on adolescents’ support specifically to their parents (e.g., Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Peris et al., 2008; Titzmann, 2012).

In addition to examining the daily contingency between parents’ episodic family stressors and adolescents’ emotional caregiving, we explored whether more chronic, pre-existing hardships (i.e., economic strain, poor physical health) would further promote adolescents’ emotional caregiving. Research on parentification – the situation when children assume “adult-like” responsibilities to maintain family functioning and well-being – have shown that adolescents living under severe economic hardships or with a parent who has a serious medical illness often assume responsibilities at home to care for their parent and family members (Burton, 2007; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Stein, Rotheram-Borus, & Lester, 2007; Tompkins, 2006). These types of financial and health adversities often incapacitate parents’ ability to fulfill their own caregiving responsibilities to their families, and therefore, increase the need for children to meet both the practical and emotional needs of their families.
In the current study, we examined whether parents’ financial hardships and poor physical health would further increase the likelihood that adolescents would provide emotional support to their family on days when their parents are also confronted with a family stressor. Having to deal with conflicts or meeting unforeseen demands, in and of itself, is stressful and can interfere with parents' ability to fulfill their caregiving responsibilities. For parents who also face chronic economic hardships or poor physical health, the combination of both episodic and chronic stressors, may place parents and the family at an even greater need of emotional support. We expected that particularly stressful days (i.e., days when parents experience a family stressor) within the context of concurrent family hardships (i.e., economic strain, poor physical health) will heighten adolescents’ response to their family’s needs and further encourage them to provide emotional support to their families. Adolescents may provide comfort directly to their parents and also extend their support to other family members, who may also be impacted by the family stressor at home.

**Variation in Emotional Caregiving Due to Adolescents’ Individual Characteristics**

Based on prior research indicating important individual differences in youths’ instrumental support, we sought to examine whether there would be individual differences in adolescents’ overall levels and the contingent nature of their provision of emotional support.

**Gender and birth order.** In general, females and older siblings are more likely than males and younger siblings to complete household tasks at home (Cogle & Tasker, 1982; Crouter et al., 2001; Gager et al., 2009; Lee, Schneider, & Waite, 2003; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Tsai et al., 2013). We similarly expected that overall rates of emotional support would be highest among females and older siblings and explored whether these gender and birth order patterns would persist in the same manner on days marked by parental stressors. That is, do females and older
siblings continue to be more likely than males and younger siblings to provide emotional support on days of greater need or is it possible for all children, regardless of gender and birth order, to contribute equally when there is an immediate family need to attend to?

**Cultural factors: Family obligation values and generational status.** The current study with Mexican-American families provides a unique opportunity to explore whether the provision of emotional support may be a culturally relevant and meaningful practice for youth. Latino families are often characterized by strong family obligation values emphasizing the importance to support, respect and spend time with the family (Fuligni et al., 1999). Indeed, family obligation values are manifested in adolescents’ daily provision of instrumental support at home (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009; Tsai et al., 2013). Although research with Latino youth has not focused specifically on their emotional caregiving to the family, we believe that this form of support is similarly embedded in youths’ internalization of family obligation values. We expected that adolescents with strong family obligation values would be more likely to provide emotional support to their families on days when their parents are confronted with a family stressor, compared to their peers with weaker family obligation values.

Furthermore, the challenges associated with adapting to and raising a family in a new country can be difficult for immigrant parents and necessitate greater support and assistance from their children. For instance, children from immigrant families often serve as language brokers for their parents by translating materials or facilitating conversations from English to their parents’ native language (Dorner, Orellana, & Jiménez, 2008). And in general, adolescents from immigrant backgrounds provide greater instrumental support to their families, compared to their non-immigrant peers (Fuligni et al., 1999; Titzmann, 2012). In the current study, we
examined whether adolescents from immigrant backgrounds would demonstrate higher levels of emotional caregiving in response to parental need, compared to their non-immigrant peers.

**Stressful or Rewarding Nature of Emotional Caregiving**

Research findings on the impact of adolescent’s provision of caregiving on their well-being and adjustment demonstrate both negative and positive outcomes. Some studies report that adolescents’ assumption of family responsibilities place youth at risk for adverse psychological well-being. For instance, adolescents’ provision of emotional support has been positively linked to depressive feelings, internalizing and externalizing behaviors, exhaustion and unhappiness (Gore, Aseltine, & Colten, 1993; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Titzmann, 2012; Williams & Francis, 2010). Other scholars have found instrumental support to be related to adaptive behaviors, including social competence, self-efficacy, and effective coping skills (Kuperminc et al., 2009; Stein et al., 2007; Tompkins, 2006). Additionally, Telzer & Fuligni (2009) found that instrumental support was related to youths’ feelings of family role fulfillment. Overall, findings are mixed with some evidence suggesting that emotional support may be more detrimental towards adolescents’ psychological well-being, compared to instrumental support.

In the current study, we examined whether adolescents experienced feelings of distress or family role fulfillment on days when they provided emotional support to their family. On the one hand, the inherently stressful circumstances that encourage adolescents to lend support may contribute to feelings of distress. On the other hand, providing emotional support to their families may align with Mexican-American cultural values emphasizing family interdependence; as such, adolescents may feel that they are fulfilling their role as a family member on days when they provide emotional support to their families. Lastly, we also assessed for any long-term implications on adolescents’ well-being by examining whether adolescents’ provision of
emotional support if predictive of psychological distress (i.e., internalizing and externalizing symptoms) the following year.

**Current Study: Daily Diary Approach and Research Aims**

To our knowledge, no studies have yet to examine adolescents’ *daily* provision of emotional care to their families. The daily diary approach is a useful method that allowed us to assess the prevalence and contingent nature of adolescents’ provision of emotional support in the context of the families’ naturally occurring everyday lives. Participants reported about events, behaviors and feelings on the same day as they occurred, thereby providing more reliable and valid estimates, compared to retrospective accounts from one-time questionnaires (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Moreover, the daily diary method allowed us to examine individual differences in the daily associations between parental family stressors and adolescents’ provision of support. For example, are females or males more likely to provide support on days marked by greater need? Lastly, our cross-informant approach enabled us to assess same-day associations between *parents’* report of family stressors and *adolescents’* report of their provision of emotional support on that same day, thereby reducing method variance.

The overall goal of the study was to examine the prevalence and nature of Mexican-American adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their parents and family members and its’ implications for adolescents’ well-being. Five key research goals motivated the study: (1) What is the prevalence of adolescents’ emotional support to their parents and to other family members? (2) Do adolescents provide emotional support to their families in response to parental reports of family stressors? (3) Do chronic family hardships (i.e., parents’ economic strain, poor physical health) encourage even higher levels of emotional support? (4) Does the daily association between parental need and adolescents’ emotional caregiving vary by adolescent
characteristics (i.e., gender, birth order, family obligation values, generation status)? (5) How does emotional caregiving relate to adolescents’ concurrent and future well-being?

Methods

Sample

At the first wave of this two-year longitudinal study, 421 ninth and tenth grade students ($M_{age} = 15.03$ years, $SD = 0.83$; 50% males) and their parent ($M_{age} = 41.93$ years, $SD = 6.77$) from Mexican backgrounds participated in the study. The parent was the primary caregiver who self-identified as the adult who spent the most time with the adolescent and knew the most about the adolescents’ daily activities. The majority of primary caregivers were mothers (83%), 13% were fathers and the remaining 4% were grandparents, aunts or uncles. Given that 96% of primary caregivers were mothers or fathers, we use the term “parents” throughout the paper for the sake of simplicity. At Wave 2, 341 families (81%) participated again one year later ($M = 1.04$ years, $SD = 0.11$).

Most of the adolescents came from immigrant families: 12.6% were first generation (i.e., adolescent and at least one parent was born in Mexico), 68.6% were second generation (i.e., adolescents was born in the U.S., but at least one parent was born in Mexico) and 18.8% were third generation (i.e., adolescent and parent were born in the U.S.). The majority of parents (72.8%) had less than a high school education, 13.3% completed high school and 13.7% had more than a high school education. Families included about five members, including the participating adolescent and parent ($W1: M = 5.17, SD = 1.57$; $W2: M = 5.02, SD = 1.86$).

Procedure

Procedures were approved by the UCLA Institutional Review Board and by the school district. Participants were recruited from two high schools in the Los Angeles area. Each school
possessed significant proportions of students from Latin American backgrounds (62% and 94%) who were from lower- to lower-middle class families. In both schools, over 70% of students (72% and 71%) qualified for free and reduced meals, slightly above the average of 65% for Los Angeles County Schools (California Department of Education, 2011; 2012).

Classroom rosters were obtained from the participating schools. Across the first year, a few classrooms were randomly selected each week for recruitment. Classroom presentations about the study were given to students, letters were mailed to students’ homes around the same time the presentations were given, and phone calls were made to parents to determine eligibility and interest. Both the adolescent and their parent had to be willing to participate in the study. The final sample represents 63% of families who were reached by phone and determined to be eligible by self-reporting a Mexican ethnic background. This rate is comparable to other survey and diary studies that followed similar recruitment procedures with Mexican families (Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005). Approximately one year after Wave 1, all families were contacted by phone or mail to participate in Wave 2 of the study.

At both waves of the study, interviewers visited the participants’ homes where adolescents completed a self-report questionnaire on their own and parents participated in a personal interview during which the interviewer guided parents through a similar questionnaire and recorded the parents’ responses. Questionnaires included items that assessed family background (e.g., household size, education level) and well-being (e.g., internalizing and externalizing symptoms) and took approximately 45-60 minutes to complete. Next, adolescents and parents were each provided with a 14-day supply of diary checklists to complete every night before going to bed for the subsequent two-week period. Each diary checklist was three pages long and took approximately five to ten minutes to complete each night. To ensure timely
completion of the diary checklists, participants were instructed to fold and seal each completed
diary checklist and to stamp the seal with an electronic time stamper. The time stamper imprinted
the current date and time and was programmed with a security code so that participants could not
alter the correct date and time. Both English and Spanish versions of the questionnaires and
diaries were available and interviews with parents were conducted in their preferred language. At
Wave 1, three adolescents and 299 (71%) parents completed the study materials (i.e.,
questionnaires/interviews and diaries) in Spanish. At Wave 2, five adolescents and 249 (73%)
parents completed the study in Spanish.

At the end of the two-week period, interviewers returned to the home to collect the diary
checklists. Adolescents received $30 and parents received $50 for participating at both waves of
the study. Participants were also told that a pair of movie passes would be awarded if inspection
of the data indicated that they had completed the diaries correctly and on time. The time-stamper
monitoring and incentives resulted in high rates of compliance, with 96% (adolescents) and 95%
(parents) of the potential diaries being and with 86% (adolescents) and 90% (parents) of the
diaries being completed on time (i.e., before noon on the following day) at Wave 1. At Wave 2,
88% (adolescents) and 89% (parents) of the potential diaries were completed and 85%
(adolescents) and 89% (parents) of the diaries were completed on time.

Measures

Information on the descriptive statistics (i.e., range, mean, standard deviation) of key
variables is provided in Table 2-1.

**Adolescent daily diary measures.**

**Provision of emotional support.** Adolescents were asked whether they “provided
emotional support (e.g., listening, advice, comfort)” to their parents and to other family members
(Bolger, Zuckerman, & Kessler, 2000). Indices of support (0 = no; 1 = yes) to parents and other family members were analyzed separately.

**Psychological distress.** Adolescents’ daily distress was assessed with items from the Profile of Mood States (POMS: Lorr & McNair, 1971). Adolescents used a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) to indicate the extent to which they felt distressed which tapped anxious and depressive feelings (items: sad, hopeless, discouraged, on edge, unable to concentrate, uneasy, nervous). We averaged across the seven items to create a daily index of psychological distress. This measure had good internal consistency across both waves (W1: $\alpha = .84$; W2: $\alpha = .86$).

**Family role fulfillment.** On a 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely), adolescents responded to the statement “How much did you feel like a good family member today?”

**Parent daily diary measures.**

**Family stressor.** Parents indicated whether any of the following six family stressors occurred that day: had a lot of work at home, a lot of family demands, argued with your spouse or partner, argued with another family member, someone in your family did something bad or created a problem, something bad happened to someone else in your family. An index of family stressor was created to assess whether any one of the six stressors occurred (0 = no, 1 = yes). Parents experienced some type of stressor at home on about half of the study days (W1: $M = 7.10, SD = 4.40$; W2: $M = 6.76, SD = 4.43$)

**Adolescent questionnaire measures.**

**Family obligation values.** Family obligation values include adolescents’ attitudes toward (1) current assistance to the family (2) respect for the family and (3) future support to the family (Fuligni et al., 1999). **Current assistance.** Twelve items measured how often adolescents felt they
should assist with household duties, such as “run errands that the family needs done” and “help take care of your brothers and sisters” (1 = almost never; 5 = almost always). **Respect.** Seven items measured adolescents’ belief about respecting and following the wishes and expectations of family members, such as “do well for the sake of your family” and “show great respect for your parents” (1 = not at all important; 5 = very important). **Future support.** Six items measured adolescents’ beliefs about providing support and being near their families in the future, such as “help parents financially” and “have your parents live with you when they get older” (1 = not at all important; 5 = very important). All three subscales were correlated with one another (rs = .45-60, p < .001), therefore we created a general measure of family obligation values by averaging across all three subscales. Overall, this scale had high internal consistencies across both years of the study (W1: \( \alpha = .90 \); W2: \( \alpha = .88 \)).

**Internalizing and externalizing symptoms.** Adolescents completed the Youth Self-report form of the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach, 1991). Adolescents rated items on a 3-point scale (0 = not true of me, 1 = somewhat or sometimes true of me, 2 = true or often true of me). Internalizing symptoms (\( N = 31 \) items) included anxious, somatic and withdrawn symptoms (e.g., “I cry a lot,” “I worry a lot,” “I don’t have much energy”). This scale had good internal consistency (W1: \( \alpha = .88 \); W2: \( \alpha = .86 \)). Externalizing symptoms (\( N = 32 \) items) included rule breaking and aggriess behaviors (e.g., “argues a lot,” “gets in fights,” “break rules”) and had high internal consistency (W1: \( \alpha = .89 \); W2: \( \alpha = .88 \)).

**Parent questionnaire measures.**

**Economic strain.** Parents completed a nine-item scale that assessed the extent to which they experienced any difficulties meeting their financial needs over the last three months (Conger et al., 2002). Parents responded to questions such as, “How much difficulty did you have paying
your bills” (0 = no difficulty at all; 4 = a great deal of difficulty). Using a 4-point scale from 0 (not true at all) to 4 (very true), parents also responded to items such as “You had enough money to afford the kind of food you needed.” These later items were reversed scored. The scale had strong internal consistency (W1: $\alpha = .90$; W2: $\alpha = .92$).

**Physical symptoms.** Parents indicated whether they experienced a variety of 12 different physical symptoms in the past two weeks (1 = not at all; 5 = almost everyday), including “headaches,” “very tired for no reason,” and “stomachaches or pain” (Resnick et al., 1997; Udry & Bearman, 1998). The index of parents’ physical symptoms was calculated by averaging across the 12 items. Ther scale’s internal consistency was good (W1 & W2 $\alpha$s = .83).

**Adolescent birth order.** Parents reported on the ages of the adolescents’ siblings. Adolescents were categorized as being an only (13%), youngest (21.4%), middle (27.5%) or oldest (38.1%) child in the family. Based on prior work suggesting that older siblings are more likely to provide caregiving to their families, it was sensible to group adolescents as being an only or youngest child versus being a middle or oldest child in the family.

**Control variables.**

**Family composition.** Parents reported on their current relationship status. The majority of parents (74.6%) were married, remarried or in a domestic relationship with a partner, and these families were considered dual-parent households.

**Parents’ education level.** Parents reported their own and their partner’s highest educational attainment by selecting one of the following ten categories: some elementary school, completed elementary school, some junior high school, completed junior high school, some high school, graduated from high school, trade or vocational school, some college, graduated from
college, some medical, law or graduate school. Educational status was calculated by averaging both parents’ level of education.

Results

Analytic Strategy

In order to maximize the power to examine daily associations between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support, as well as the individual variations in these associations, we combined both waves of the study and conducted a series of three-level hierarchical linear models such that days at Level 1 were nested within waves at Level 2, which subsequently was nested within persons at Level 3. Preliminary analyses suggested that the provision of emotional support to parents and to other family members did not change over time, therefore we did not estimate how daily- or individual-level associations would vary as a function of time. Collapsing the two waves of data provided up to 28 daily reports and allowed us to make estimates across the two years, thereby increasing our ability to detect daily associations between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of support.

The three-level hierarchical models were estimated using the SAS PROC GLIMMIX (v9.2) procedure given that our main outcome of interest – whether adolescents provided emotional support or not on any given day – was a binary variable. Separate models were conducted to predict adolescents’ provision of emotional support to parents and to other family members. To determine the appropriate variance structure for our models, we conducted a series of likelihood ratio tests to compare the fit of nested models which differed in their variance components. The best fitting model included random intercepts at the wave and person levels and weekday as a random effect at the wave level.
We person-centered daily parental family stressor and also included an index of parental family stressor that was averaged across the 14 days at each wave in the models. This ensured that daily-level associations were independent of person-level differences. Family (i.e., economic strain, physical health) and adolescent (i.e., family obligation values) characteristics were grand-mean centered at each wave and included in Level 3. Covariates in the models included weekday, family composition and parental education level.

**Daily Prevalence of Emotional Support to Parents and Other Family Members**

To address our first research question, two separate models were estimated to assess the prevalence of adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their parents and to other family members. Results indicated that adolescents provided emotional support on 12% \((b = .12, SE = .01, p < .001)\) and 13% \((b = .13, SE = .01, p < .001)\) of the days to their parents and other family members, respectively. This translates to an average of 3.36 and 3.64 days of the 28 study days that adolescents provided emotional support to their parents and other family members, respectively. Adolescents were more likely to provide emotional support to other family members on weekends than weekdays, \(b = -.01, SE = .00, p = .029\). Provision of emotional support to parents did not vary by day of the week.

**Daily and Chronic Conditions Underlying Emotional Support**

**Daily stressors.** To examine the daily conditions under which adolescents provided emotional support, we examined the daily associations between parental family stressor and adolescents' provision of emotional support to their parents and to other family members, in separate models. As shown in Model 1a and 1b of Table 2-1, although findings did not indicate significant daily associations between parental family stressor and adolescents’ emotional caregiving, results suggested that on average, adolescents with parents who experienced high
levels of family stressors are more likely to provide emotional support to their parents and to other family members.

Additionally, on average, adolescents from dual-parent households were less likely than those from single-parent homes to provide emotional support to both their parents and other family members. Adolescents’ emotional caregiving to parents and to other family members did not vary as a function of by parents’ education level, therefore we excluded parents’ education level from the rest of the analyses in the paper.

**Chronic stressors.** Next, we assessed for individual differences according to parents’ chronic hardships (i.e., economic strain, physical health) in the daily associations between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support, as well as in adolescents’ average levels of emotional caregiving. As shown in Models 2a and 2b of Table 2-1, results indicated that parents’ physical health modified the daily association between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support to other family members, but not to their parents. In order to interpret the moderating effect of parents’ physical health in the daily association between parental family stressor and adolescent emotional support to other family members, we conducted additional analyses to test the simple slopes for parents with low (-1 SD), average, and high (+1 SD) levels of physical symptoms. Standard deviations of parents’ level of physical symptoms were assessed at each wave. Results indicated that the individual slope for parents with high levels of physical symptoms (i.e., very poor physical health) was significant, $b = .02, SE = .01, p = .015$. As shown in Figure 2-1, on days when parents reported a family stressor, adolescents with parents who faced greater than average levels of physical symptoms were more likely than their peers with parents with fewer physical symptoms, to provide emotional support to other family members.
As indicated in Models 2a & 2b of Table 2-1, economic strain did not significantly modify the daily level associations between parental family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support. However, results indicated that on average, economic strain was positively associated with emotional caregiving to parents and other family members.

**Adolescent Variation in the Provision of Emotional Support**

Next, we assessed for individual differences due to adolescent gender, birth order, family obligation values and generation status. On average, family obligation values were positively associated with adolescents’ emotional caregiving to their families. Moreover, as shown in Model 3b of Table 2-1, results indicated that adolescents’ family obligation values modified the daily association between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support to other family members. In order to interpret this moderating effect of adolescents’ family obligation values, we conducted additional analyses to test the simple slopes for adolescents with low (-1 SD), average, and high (+1 SD) levels of family obligation values. Results indicated that the individual slope for adolescents with high endorsement of family obligation values was significant, $b = .04, SE = .02, p = .024$. As shown in Figure 2-2, on days when parents reported a family stressor, adolescents who had very strong family obligation values were more likely than their peers with weaker family obligation values to provide support to other family members.

No other adolescent characteristics modified the daily level association between parental stressors and adolescents’ emotional caregiving, and there was little variation in adolescents’ average levels of emotional support, with the exception of gender. On average, females were more likely to provide emotional support to other family members.

**Stressful or Rewarding Nature of Daily Provision of Emotional Support**
Next, we examined whether adolescents experienced emotional caregiving as stressful or rewarding. Four separate models were conducted to assess whether adolescents’ daily provision of emotional support to parents and to other family members was associated with same-day feelings of psychological distress and family role fulfillment. Given that the outcome variables (i.e., feelings of distress and family role fulfillment) were continuous indices, these models were estimated in SAS PROC MIXED and included the same variance structure as in previous analyses. We person-centered adolescents’ provision of emotional support to parents and other family members and included an index of their average levels of support across the 14 days at each wave. Lastly, we included parental daily family stressor and weekday in the model.

As shown in Table 2, results indicated that on days when adolescents provided emotional support to either their parent or other family members, they did not feel distressed, but rather, a heightened sense of feeling like a good family member particularly on days when adolescents provided emotional support to other family members. Similarly, results also indicated that averaging across days, provision of emotional support was not associated with overall feelings of distress, but with stronger feelings of family role fulfillment.

**Long-term effects of emotional support on well-being.** Lastly, we examined the long-term implications of adolescents’ emotional caregiving to their family for their well-being. We were interested to understand whether the daily contingency between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ emotional caregiving would be associated internalizing and externalizing symptoms the following year. Therefore, we calculated the daily level associations between parental family stressors and adolescents’ emotional caregiving to parents and other family members, separately, at Wave 1 and extracted the empirical bayes estimates for each individual. These estimates represent the daily-level association (i.e., slopes) between parental family
stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support to parents and to other family members. Theses estimates were used in separate regression models to predict adolescents’ internalizing and externalizing symptoms at Wave 2, controlling for Wave 1 symptoms. Results indicated that the daily contingency between parental family stressor and adolescents’ provision of emotional support to either parents or other family members did not predict adolescents’ average levels of internalizing (bs = -0.67-0.07, SEs = 1.16-3.53, ps > .05) or externalizing symptoms (bs = -4.32-0.77, SEs = 1.11-3.06, ps > .05) at Wave 2.

We also conducted the same regression analyses, but instead of using the empirical bayes estimates, we examined adolescents’ average levels of emotional support to parents and to other family members, separately, at Wave 1 to predict well-being at Wave 2. Similarly, results did not show that overall levels of adolescents’ provision of emotional support was predictive of internalizing (bs = 0.34-1.40, SEs = 1.46-1.48, ps > .05) or externalizing (bs = -0.17-0.35, SEs = 1.40-1.42, ps > .05) symptoms at Wave 2.

**Discussion**

The overarching goal of the current study was to uncover the nature of Mexican-American adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their families in their naturally occurring everyday lives. Findings revealed that adolescents’ emotional caregiving was shaped by their family’s daily and chronic needs at home. Although adolescents provided emotional support to their parents and to other family members at similar rates, parents’ confrontation with a family stressor on a given day prompted adolescents to provide comfort and care, not to their parents, but instead, to other family members. This daily contingency between parents’ familial stressors and adolescents’ caregiving to other family members was especially pronounced among parents who had poor physical health. Additionally, results suggested that the provision of
emotional support is a culturally meaningful and personally satisfying form of caregiving among Mexican-American youth. Mexican-American adolescents who endorse strong family obligation values displayed the highest levels of emotional support to their families and this was especially true on days marked by greater parental need. Moreover, adolescents derived a sense of family role fulfillment on days that they engaged in emotional caregiving. There was no evidence that emotional caregiving had any concurrent or long-term negative ramifications on adolescents’ psychological well-being.

Research on adolescents’ caregiving at home has largely centered on youth’s instrumental assistance and has typically included studies that relied on one-time questionnaires to assess their behaviors. Less is understood about how frequently adolescents engage in emotional caregiving in their day-to-day lives. Through a daily diary approach, we were able to obtain precise measurements on how often and under what daily and contextual conditions adolescents provided emotional support to their families. We learned that on average, adolescents provided emotional support to their parents and to other family members roughly three to four times a month. Although emotional support may occur less regularly than instrumental support, this is understandable due to the circumstantial nature of emotional caregiving. Whereas adolescents provide instrumental support to meet the practical and everyday needs at home (e.g., cleaning, cooking), emotional support is offered in response to stressful and emotionally salient situations (Hooper et al., 2007; Titzmann, 2012).

Supported by the family systems framework (Minuchin, 1985; Whitchurch & Constatine, 1993), the findings from our study provide further evidence that adolescents engage in caregiving behaviors in response to familial need (Crouter et al., 2001; Gager et al., 2009; Tsai et al., 2013). Specifically, we found that for parents who have poor physical health, the occurrence
of a family stressor on a given day prompted adolescents to provide emotional caregiving to a family member, but interestingly, not to their parent. It is possible that for parents who concurrently face health problems, confrontation with an episodic family stressor can be even more overwhelming and debilitating for parents and interfere with their ability to fulfill their own parenting responsibilities that day (Burton, 2007; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Stein et al., 2007). Consequently, their children must step in and assume the responsibility to provide comfort and care to their family members, such as their siblings. Adolescents’ emotional care towards another family member can help to ease the tension and strain at home, which in and of itself, can lessen the burden of the parent who may now be more preoccupied by the stressor at hand, such as resolving the conflict that arose. Given that some of the stressors (e.g., conflict with someone at home) may have involved another family member, it is possible that adolescents lent their support to that other family member, such as a sibling. Unfortunately, one of the limitations we face in our study is that we did not collect information on which family member the teen provided comfort to. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that adolescents are responsive to changing family dynamics at home and contribute to the maintenance of family well-being and functioning by lending their support to their family on stressful days (Burton, 2007; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Peris et al., 2008; Titzmann, 2012).

It is important to note that although we did not find a daily contingency between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support to parents, adolescents provided emotional support to both parents and other family members at similar rates across the study. The absence of this daily contingency may suggest that adolescents do not provide emotional support to parents and other family members on the same days. Family stressors can be taxing on parents’ psychological well-being and time, making them less accessible to their children, and as
a result, children may not provide immediate comfort to their parents on that same day. Research on parents’ spillover of work stressors to family life indicate that when parents have a stressful day at work, they become emotionally and socially withdrawn from their families (Repetti, Wang, & Saxbe, 2009). It is possible that adolescents provided emotional support to their parents on a later day, perhaps when the emotional situation has subsided.

Interestingly, economic strain was one of the few factors that contributed to variation in adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their parents. Economic strain was positively linked to adolescents’ overall levels of emotional caregiving to both parents and other family members. Parents facing economic hardships may disclose about family problems to their children, who in turn, become more cognizant of the financial constraints at home (Lehman & Koerner, 2002). Through conversations that parents have with their children about issues related to finances (e.g., budgeting), children can offer their support, by listening or showing they understand. As such, adolescents’ emotional support to their parents may not be necessarily linked to a particular stressor that occurred on any given day, but rather to their parents’ general stress levels. Altogether, findings may suggest that adolescents’ emotional support to parents may be shaped largely by chronic familial stressors, whereas adolescents’ emotional support to other family members is contingent upon daily and chronic needs of the family.

Most significantly, our findings demonstrate that emotional caregiving is a culturally relevant and rewarding activity for Mexican-American youth. Adolescents’ endorsement of family obligation values was associated with higher overall levels of emotional support to their parents and to other family members. And on days marked by greater parental need, strong family obligation values boosted adolescents’ emotional support to other family members, providing evidence that emotional caregiving is similarly embedded in family obligation values,
as is instrumental support (Telzer & Fuligni, 2009; Tsai et al., 2013). The response to provide support to other family members also reflects the importance that family obligation values place on the maintenance of cohesive relationships beyond that of the parent-child dyadic bond. Furthermore, on days when adolescents provided emotional support to their family members, they experienced elevated feelings of family role fulfillment, suggesting that Mexican-American youth may feel it is their responsibility as a family member to provide comfort and care to their family during times of need. For Mexican-American youth, the provision of emotional support appears to be personally meaningful and rewarding.

Indeed, we did not find evidence that emotional caregiving was concurrently or longitudinally related to youth maladjustment. Adolescents did not experience feelings of distress on days when they offered emotional support and their provision of emotional care was not indicative of later development of internalizing or externalizing symptomology. These results do not coincide with some of the literature on parentification positing that adolescents’ engagement in caregiving is detrimental to their well-being (Gore et al., 1993; Pakenham & Cox, 2012; Williams & Francis, 2010). A large proportion of studies in the parentification literature are based on clinical samples or families undergoing tremendous hardships and dysfunction (e.g., poverty, parent with HIV/AIDS, alcohol abuse); as such, caregiving warranted under these exceptional living conditions is be understandably taxing on children’s psychological well-being (Burton, 2007; Stein et al., 2007). Moreover, the parentification framework is largely based on Western perspectives asserting that children’s adoption of adult responsibilities and knowledge about family problems are developmentally inappropriate (Earley & Cushway, 2002; Jurkovic, 1997). In non-Western cultures, children’s participation in housework, including family caregiving, is viewed as important aspect of children’s routines that play a central role in the
maintenance of family functioning and adolescents’ social development (Goodnow, 1988; Weisner, 2001). Within a cultural milieu, such as our sample of Mexican-American families, that encourages family interdependence and support for one another, the provision of support is a more normative expectation of and activity for children. These findings highlight the importance to situate the examination of children’s behaviors within the larger cultural context in order to understand the relevance and meaning underlying adolescents’ behaviors and its’ implications for child development and adjustment.

Lastly, there was some variation in adolescents’ emotional caregiving due to adolescent gender. Although females were more likely to provide emotional support to other family members, there were no gender differences in their emotional support to parents. A similar family dynamic was also evident in another study indicating that although females provided greater overall levels instrumental support (i.e., the combination of general housework, sibling care, parental assistance), there were no gender differences in adolescents’ instrumental assistance specifically towards parents (Tsai et al., 2013). Perhaps, when there is a specific need or request from parents, parents rely equally on both their sons and daughters, but when there are more general demands to be met, daughters are more readily than sons to assume responsibility.

Despite key methodological strengths in our study, such as our longitudinal design, utilization of daily diary checklists, and cross-informant reports, there are limitations in our study to acknowledge. One limitation is that we did not ask adolescents to report who they provided emotional support to, if not to their parent. Thus, we cannot make definite conclusions about which family member adolescents provided support to. It is also not clear whether the contingent nature between parents’ family stressors and adolescents’ provision of emotional support was drive by adolescents’ own initiative to provide support or if a family member sought emotional
support from the adolescent. Lastly, compared to other studies that assessed emotional caregiving via multi-item scales that tapped into various forms of caregiving, our measure of emotional support was based on a single item, which could have underestimated the prevalence of emotional caregiving. Nevertheless, our item explicitly asked if adolescents “provided emotional support (e.g., listening, advice, comfort)” to their family, thus allowing adolescents to make their own inferences about what constitutes as emotional support to them.

Conclusion

Traditional Western perspectives on adolescents’ engagement in caregiving have typically posited that children’s assumption of responsibilities towards the maintenance of family functioning and well-being is not developmentally appropriate. The current study with Mexican-American families offers a different perspective illustrating that within a cultural milieu that promotes family solidarity and interdependence, engagement in emotional caregiving is part of the family’s cultural script to respond to the needs of the family, and is consequently experienced as a rewarding behavior. Adolescents’ emotional caregiving was most prevalent among individuals who internalized strong family obligation values and was associated with elevated feelings of family role fulfillment, suggesting that emotional caregiving is embedded in cultural values and family routines that reinforce adolescents’ feelings of family membership. Future studies should continue to examine adolescents’ caregiving to their families across diverse ethnic groups to better understand how cultural contexts shape the nature of adolescents’ caregiving and how these behaviors contribute to adolescents’ social and psychological development.
Table 2-1

*Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescent Daily Measures</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of support to parents</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of support to other family members</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological distress</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family role fulfillment</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescent Questionnaire Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing symptoms</td>
<td>0-62</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing symptoms</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Daily Measures</strong></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family stressor</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Questionnaire Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic strain</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical symptoms</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Values for adolescents’ provision of support and parents’ family stressor indicate the proportion of days in which these events occurred. Only parental report on economic strain differed across wave, *t*(336) = 3.83, *p* < .001.
## Table 2-2

*Daily Associations Between Parental Family Stressors and Adolescents’ Emotional Caregiving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other Family Members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>Model 2a</td>
<td>Model 3a</td>
<td>Model 1b</td>
<td>Model 2b</td>
<td>Model 3b</td>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>Model 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. Family Stressor</strong></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual-parent household</strong></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic strain</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical symptoms</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birth Order</strong></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family obligation values</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Generation</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Generation</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Family Stressor</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic strain</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical symptoms</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birth Order</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family obligation values</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st generation</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd generation</strong></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekday</strong></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Daily family stressor was dummy coded (0=no family stressor and 1=family stressor occurred) and was person-centered. Weekday, dual-parent household, gender, and birth order were effects coded (-1=weekend, single-parent household, male, youngest or only child; 1=weekday, dual-parent household, female, middle or oldest child). Generation status was dummy coded with 3rd generation being the control group. Economic strain, physical symptoms and family obligation values were all grand mean centered at each wave. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 2-3
Daily Associations Between Emotional Caregiving and Feelings of Distress and Family Role Fulfillment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distress</th>
<th></th>
<th>Family Role Fulfillment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Other Family Members</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Other Family Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercept</td>
<td>B       SE</td>
<td>B       SE</td>
<td>B       SE</td>
<td>B       SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Emotional Support</td>
<td>-0.01   0.02</td>
<td>0.05   0.09</td>
<td>0.43   0.18*</td>
<td>0.54   0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Emotional Support</td>
<td>0.01 0.02</td>
<td>0.04   0.02</td>
<td>0.07   0.04</td>
<td>0.08   0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Family Stressor</td>
<td>0.03   0.01*</td>
<td>0.03   0.01*</td>
<td>-0.04  0.02</td>
<td>-0.04  0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>0.04   0.01***</td>
<td>0.04   0.01***</td>
<td>-0.04  0.01***</td>
<td>-0.04  0.01***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Daily emotional support and family stressor was dummy coded (0=provided support, no family stressor; 1=did not provide support, no family stressor occurred) and were person-centered. Weekday was effects coded (-1=weekend; 1=weekday). *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .00
Figure 2-1. On days when parents experienced a family stressor, adolescents with parents who experienced high levels of chronic physical symptoms were provided emotional support to other family members.
Figure 2-2. On days when parents experienced a family stressor, adolescents who endorsed high levels of family obligation values provided emotional support to other family member.
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CONCLUSION

This dissertation provides a close examination on how adolescents maintain connectedness with their families in their naturally occurring everyday lives. Findings from the studies reveal great variability in adolescents’ time with family and the contingent nature of their family interactions that is due to both external and internal factors at home. Whereas commitments outside the home may constrain adolescents’ time with family, challenging family circumstances and cultural values can provide unique opportunities for youth to fulfill their roles as valued members of the family. And although adolescence is a critical period to exercise one’s autonomy and achieve greater independence, adolescents nonetheless derive important feelings of family membership through their engagements with their family. In this conclusion, I summarize the highlights and contributions of the dissertation.

Findings from both studies reflect the types of opportunities and expectations within and outside the family domain that shape adolescents’ engagement with their family. At this developmental stage when adolescents become more oriented towards social groups and activities outside the home, it is important to recognize how outside pulls can influence family dynamics. In Study 1, findings revealed that commitments (e.g., friends, school) external to the home could either constrain or facilitate adolescents’ family leisure time. Whereas adolescents’ time with friends competed with their time with family, studying was more likely to go hand in hand with greater family leisure. In Study 2, findings showed how internal conditions at home promote family connectedness. On days when parents faced familial stressors at home, Mexican-American adolescents responded to their parents’ needs by providing emotional support to their family members. Moreover, challenging circumstances at home due parents’ poor physical health encouraged even higher levels of emotional caregiving from adolescents. Family
adversities at home encouraged adolescents to be responsive to the needs of their family. Together, findings underscore how the intersection of multiple domains (e.g., friends, school, parents) in adolescents’ daily lives influences their opportunities to be engaged with the family.

Furthermore, adolescents’ time with family, whether it is spent in leisure or emotional caregiving, offers insight on the socialization goals that structure adolescents’ lives and interactions with their family. Particularly, it is evident from both studies that cultural processes are in play and embedded in adolescents’ daily routines at home. In Study 1, marked ethnic differences in adolescents’ balancing of time with family, friends and schoolwork demonstrated that Latino youth were especially likely to preserve and maintain their time spent in family leisure in spite of time commitments with friends and schoolwork on the same day. Moreover, for adolescents from Asian and Latino backgrounds, the more time they spent in leisure with their family, the stronger they felt like a family member that day, compared to their European American peers. These ethnic patterns in balancing time with family and the feelings of family membership that was derived from family leisure reflect cultural orientations towards family interdependence that are characteristic of families from Latin and Asian collectivistic societies.

In Study 2, the inclusion of only Mexican-American families allowed a unique investigation of how cultural values regarding family obligation are manifested in adolescents’ provision of emotional support to their families. Findings indicated that adolescents whom internalized strong family obligation values were most responsive to parental needs resulting from their experiences with chronic and daily stressors. Furthermore, on days when adolescents engaged in emotional caregiving, they felt like a better family member, suggesting that assuming familial responsibilities to contribute to their family well-being and functioning is a culturally relevant and meaningful way for Mexican-American adolescents to fulfill their roles at home. In
sum, findings from both studies demonstrate how cultural values and socialization goals shape adolescents’ family routines at home.

Lastly, findings from this dissertation provide evidence that the family continues to be a significant social group from whom adolescents derive feelings of identification and membership. Above and beyond time spent socializing with friends and completing schoolwork, adolescents experienced elevated feelings of family role fulfillment on days when they spent leisure time with the family. And despite the stressful familial conditions under which Mexican-American adolescents provided comfort to their families, responding to the needs of their family was nonetheless a rewarding activity for them. Therefore, family leisure and the provision of support are valuable activities that reinforce adolescents’ feelings of family membership and connectedness, and thereby, sustain the centrality of the family.

This is not to say, however, that adolescents’ efforts to maintain connectedness with their family is a simple chore. Inherent in the developmental task to negotiate one’s autonomy and connectedness with the family are understandably moments of conflict and frustration, particularly when adolescents are met with opportunities or demands that compete with one another. For instance, Study 1 indicated that on days when adolescents balanced more time than usual with both family and friends, they experienced greater feelings of distress. The combination of both feelings of reward and conflict in adolescents’ negotiation of autonomy and connectedness reflect the challenging nature of meeting their needs for autonomy, yet also maintaining connectedness with their family.

In sum, this dissertation demonstrates that adolescents actively negotiate their family relationships in their every day lives. Adolescents develop means to maintain their family relationships by establishing a balance in their social commitments and assuming familial
responsibilities at home. Cultural and familial socialization goals play a critical role in shaping these daily family processes. As such, there is great variability in adolescents’ daily family interactions and some adolescents will confront these tasks with greater ease than others. Despite the inherent challenges of being a teenager and negotiating their independence from family, the family continues to serve as an important socialization context and social group to which adolescents feel a sense of membership with and play an important role in. It is my hope that this dissertation provided new perspectives on how adolescents sustain their family relationships in their day-to-day lives.