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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Pati and Sara are both immigrant, Latina women who came to the United States in their 20’s. At the time of this study, each lived in low-income, urban neighborhoods in southern California in communities where the majority of their neighbors were also of Latino heritage. Both Pati and Sara were married and living with their spouses; each had three children. Pati reported an annual household income of between $20,001 and $30,000 per year, while Sara reported an annual income of between $10,001 and $20,000. Based on multiple descriptors commonly used in research studies about family processes and child development (e.g., family composition, income, immigrant generation), Pati and Sara are similar. However, these descriptors are social address labels that artificially homogenize groups of people (Rogoff, 2003). As illustrated in this study, the cases of Sara and Pati converged in some ways, but also differed in several important aspects.

Both Sara and Pati structured their daily routines to ensure that their children were supported in attaining a quality education, yet how they could support their children’s education varied. Sara provided a structured homework help routine and was very involved at her son’s school, while Pati opted to send her son to a charter school that was higher quality than the local public school in her eyes. Because Pati worked evenings and nights, she could not support her son’s education in the same direct ways that Sara was able to support her son. In terms of ethnic and racial socialization, both reported talking to their children frequently about the importance of education and hard work to become what they wanted to be as adults (i.e., endorsing an egalitarian perspective). Sara engaged in high levels of cultural socialization while Pati was able to with less frequency given her strenuous work schedule. Finally, neither Sara nor Pati said that they spoke to their children about prejudice or bias with any frequency. There parenting patterns varied in many ways, mostly due to contextual factors.
Pati is originally from El Salvador and Sara is from Mexico. When Sara immigrated to the United States she did so with one of her sisters, following in their mother’s footsteps, who had worked intermittently in the United States for decades. In contrast, Pati is the first in her family to come to the United States. As a result, Sara and Pati’s social support networks differ. While Sara said that she did not spend lots of time with her family on a weekly basis, she did see extended family including siblings, cousins, nieces and nephews at large gatherings for holidays and celebrations. Pati, in contrast, did not have family in the United States. She mentioned that she spoke on the phone frequently with family members in El Salvador, but that she did not have anyone near-by besides a few of her husband’s cousins who they rarely saw. These contrasting social support networks impact family life and children’s development. For example, social networks can be sources of information, particularly for immigrants, when navigating new social institutions such as child care and education systems (Yoshikawa, 2011). Extended family can provide childcare for children who are not in school. In addition, extended family can reinforce heritage culture values and practices such as speaking Spanish. As a result parents’ social support networks impact children’s development, including their racial and ethnic identity development.

Sara and Pati also differed based on their employment situations. Pati and her husband each worked low-wage, full-time jobs. In addition, Pati worked non-standard hours cleaning a health clinic at night. The strain of working nights on Pati’s family’s daily routine was evident, particularly with household chores falling by the wayside. Pati needed additional support in doing housework and providing child care. However, her husband did not chip in. The results were a chaotic family life and difficult marital relationship, according to Pati. Her daily routine was at a breaking point and in her view could not be sustained without changes (e.g., changing her job). In Sara’s household, her husband worked full-time packaging crackers, while she was in charge of housework and child care. There was a clear division of labor in their household and their routine seemed stable. Sara
maintained a structured routine at home with specific times for food preparation, homework help, and bedtime. Despite reporting a slightly lower household income than Pati, Sara’s lifestyle seemed more consistent and harmonious. Pati’s family life was chaotic and seemed unsustainable long-term if things continued as they were.

These snapshots of Pati and Sara’s lives begin to reveal how variable families and their daily routines who belong to similar social address categories are. In addition, the cases of Pati and Sara highlight how features of families’ contexts influence their daily lives and contribute to variability in families’ experiences. A nuanced and detailed understanding of variability in Latino families’ experiences and how context impacts family life is largely missing from developmental psychology research literature on Latino families due to a reliance on large-scale, quantitative studies that explore patterns in parenting and child development in the aggregate. As such, the goal of this dissertation study was to draw on the diverse landscape of Latino heritage families’ lived experiences, and describe how being of Mexican or Salvadoran heritage mattered in the lives of families and children.

**Introduction**

Ethnic and racial socialization (ERS)\(^1\) is what parents teach their children about their heritage culture (i.e., cultural socialization) and about relating to and relations among other racial and ethnic groups (e.g., preparation for bias, promotion of an egalitarian perspective; Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Children’s ethnic and racial identity is the meaning of race and ethnicity in children’s lives as evidenced by their attitudes and behaviors (Neblett, Rivas-Drake, & Umaña-Taylor, 2012). These two phenomena within the Latino population\(^2\) are important to understand because of the links that ERS and ethnic and racial identity have to psychosocial and academic outcomes for children and youth and also due to the sheer number of children and youth of Latino heritage implicated in this

---

\(^1\)Terminology for parenting practices related to racial or ethnic heritage and intergroup relations among different racial and ethnic groups in research studies is inconsistent. For this study, ethnic and racial socialization and ethnic and racial

\(^2\)Latino is used in this study to denote individuals with heritage ties to Spanish speaking countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Hispanic is used when works cited used that term, which also includes those with heritage ties to Spain.
Research conducted on Latino heritage families with adolescents underscores a positive relation between cultural socialization and ethnic and racial identity development (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). This is significant because for Latino adolescents, positive ethnic and racial identity is related to improved academic achievement, higher levels of self-esteem, and better mental health (Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Arellano & Padilla, 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff 2007). Beyond parent’s ERS practices, contextual factors including the racial and ethnic compositions of schools and the sociolinguistic features of neighborhoods also influence Latino adolescents’ ethnic identity formation (Feinauer & Whiting, 2012; Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff 2007). A complex pattern of relations among individual, home, and community factors and the formation of Latino adolescents’ ethnic and racial identity development has been documented with important implications regarding the protective function that positive ethnic and racial identity development can serve in particular contexts. Therefore, the precursors to adolescents’ ethnic and racial identity development, such as ethnic and racial identity development in middle childhood, as well as the associated parenting practices are important to understand.

Latinos are a diverse and growing sector of the population in the United States, yet this diversity has not been well reflected in research on ERS, which has drawn largely on African American populations (Hughes, et al., 2006). Current projections predict that the Hispanic population will increase from 55 million in 2014 to 119 million in 2060, increasing by 115% in that time from 17% of the total population in the United States to 29% (Census Bureau, 2015). For Latino children specifically, projected trends are similar. In 2014, 24% of children in the United States were Hispanic, which is projected to increase to 32% by 2050 (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2015). Latinos in the United States have ties of varying strength to 19 different countries in the Americas and the Caribbean (including Puerto Rico). Based on 2011
census data, individuals of Mexican heritage continue to be the largest Latino subgroup in the United States, followed by Puerto Rican and Salvadoran heritage individuals (Lopez, Gonzalez-Barrera, & Cuddington, 2013). In California, the Mexican heritage population is the largest national heritage group of Latinos residing in the state at 78%, yet Salvadorans are the second largest group with 8% of the state’s population of Latinos (Brown & Lopez, 2013). While growth of the Latino population is projected to continue, diversity within this population is also shifting, which stems from myriad factors including socioeconomic status (SES), nativity status and immigrant generation, region of residence, family composition, cultural practices including language use, and for immigrant Latinos, immigration trajectories. In particular, the histories of Mexican versus Salvadoran (and other Central American) heritage families in the United States also vary dramatically.

A commonly held belief is that immigrants leave their home countries for economic reasons, seeking job opportunities and livable wages to better provide basic needs for their families, who are often left behind (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008). This is true in many situations, particularly with the first pioneering immigrants to leave their families and communities, but it does not tell the whole story (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Immigration is also a social endeavor whereby family members and neighbors follow those first immigrant pioneers to be reunited in the receiving country (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Families’ motivations for immigrating to the United States are also shaped by the conditions in which they live in their home countries and the historical political relations that their home countries’ governments have with the United States (Coutin, 2007; Telles & Ortiz, 2008). As such, Latino communities in the United States differ because of their histories in the United States. For example, Mexican heritage families have lived in the United States since before it was the United States and there is a long history of migration between Mexico and the United States with surges and lulls in numbers, but with steady growth across the decades spanning 1950 to the 2000 (Telles & Ortiz, 2008). El Salvador has been
characterized as a “nation of emigrants” because estimates suggest that up to 1 in 4 Salvadorans lives in the United States (Coutin, 2007). However, this migration is much more recent when compared with Mexican immigration. Salvadorans had a barely visible presence in the United States prior to the 1980’s, which suddenly changed with the large influx of Salvadorans fleeing violence and political persecution during the Salvadoran civil war (Rumbaut, 2008). These differing immigration trajectories relate to other sociodemographic differences when comparing Salvadoran and Mexican heritage individuals living in the United States.

Not surprisingly, a much larger percentage of Salvadorans in the United States are foreign born (59%) as compared with Mexican heritage individuals (33%; Lopez & Patten, 2015). Related to this, Salvadorans have a lower rate of U.S. citizenship and are less likely to be proficient in English than their Mexican peers in the United States (Lopez & Patten, 2015). Education levels as measured by percentage of Salvadorans and Mexicans with high school and college degrees are similar for these populations (Lopez & Patten, 2015). Salvadorans in the United States have slightly higher income levels ($44,060) and a lower poverty rate (20%) than Mexican heritage people in the United States ($40,000 and 26%, respectively; Lopez & Patten, 2015). While there are also common threads that link Mexican and Salvadoran individuals such as the Spanish language or the Catholic religion, many of the differences that distinguish these populations may potentially impact family life and daily routines resulting in varied ERS activities and patterns.

A better understanding of ERS practices and ethnic and racial identity for Latino children is also important due to the mean level vulnerabilities in school-related outcomes that are documented for this group. On average, Latino children start school with lower reading and math scores compared to Asian American and European American peers and lag behind their African American peers in reading scores (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Unfortunately, public schooling has not been able to equalize initial disparities, which persist over time (Princiotta &
Flanagan, 2006). Latino children drop out of high school at higher rates than youth from any other racial or ethnic group (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). While parents’ ERS practices are not expected to correct for all barriers that impede Latino students’ success, because ERS is promotive of positive academic and psychosocial outcomes for Latino youth, it merits additional exploration.

Dissertation Aims

This dissertation study explored variability in the ERS practices of Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families and the ethnic and racial identity development of their school-aged (i.e., ages 5 to 10) children. Mexican and Salvadoran families were of interest because they are the largest Latino national heritage groups in California and they have varied immigrant histories in the United States, which was hypothesized to be linked to families’ daily routines and ERS practices. In addition, drawing on these two national heritage groups responded to important gaps in the research literature.

Latino families’ ERS practices have been studied mostly by drawing on Mexican heritage samples of parents of adolescents (Hughes, Rodriguez, Smith, Johnson, Stevenson, & Spicer, 2006). Furthermore, quantitative methodologies have dominated this field resulting in descriptions of patterns in parental ERS and how they influence adolescents’ ethnic and racial identity in the aggregate (Hughes et al., 2006). Variability within parental ERS in the Latino population with attention to why parents engage in particular ERS practices has been examined in a limited way. Therefore, this dissertation utilized qualitative methods to explore variability in ERS as it permeates the daily lives of Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families from differing socioeconomic backgrounds, immigrant generations, neighborhoods, and family structures. In addition, this study focused on elementary school-aged children and their mothers to examine parenting practices and ethnic identity during middle childhood, a precursor to adolescent ethnic and racial identity. Finally,
this study went beyond most examinations of ERS to include what conversations between mothers and children about their daily lives and cultural heritage looked like.

After discussing the theoretical framework that guided this study, the literature review presents prior research on Latino children’s ethnic identity and then Latino parents’ ERS practices. Finally, the contextual factors that relate to parents’ ERS practices are discussed.

**Theoretical Framework**

Ecocultural theory, which posits that the single most important source of influence on children’s development is the cultural community into which they are born, guided my dissertation research (Weisner, 2002). Ecocultural theory aligns with Bronfenbrenner’s (1986) ecological (now called bioecological theory; Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 2006) perspective to a great extent. Both seek to explicitly incorporate the child’s sociocultural context into research on the processes that influence children’s development. An ecological framework situates child development at the center of a series of nested systems that each exert influence on children’s development with diminishing degrees of intensity as the systems become farther removed from the child’s daily life (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Ecological theory privileges the family as the primary, but not exclusive context in which development takes place (i.e., the microsystem; Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Development occurs through regular and enduring interactions between the child and her immediate settings, including people and objects. Furthermore, interactions among the settings in the microsystem, primarily between home and school, also influence children’s development in what is called the mesosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The next layer of context that has implications for children’s development comprises other social structures that do not contain the developing child directly. For example, parental work has direct impact on parents, with indirect impacts on children’s development, but the child is not typically present in the parents’ workplace. Moving still further from the child, the macrosystem is a general cultural orientation or ideology that provides the
structured scripts and protocols that shape concrete interactions at the preceding levels (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Finally, time, the chronosystem, also exerts a subtler influence on child development given that all individuals are embedded in and impacted by the historical times and events of their life course (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). While bioecological theory describes how context matters for child development, a few key features of the ecocultural model expand upon the ecological perspective and are useful in framing the current study.

Ecocultural theory places families’ values, goals, and subjective needs at the center of the family environment (Berheimer, Gallimore, & Weisner, 1990). Among the most important influences on development from an ERS perspective, is an understanding of what kind of child, kind of person, the community or family wants to produce. A primary question to answer is then: What is the moral direction for development that is a goal? This is paramount in research on immigrant families and ethnic or racial minority groups, since the values and goals they hold for their children often differ from White, middle-class values, which are assumed – either implicitly or explicitly – in a majority of developmental science research as guiding parents’ wishes for their children. When the starting point is parents’ values and goals, then why parents structure their daily lives as they do is foregrounded along with how there daily lives unfold. Family routines and activities are a useful unit of analysis in the study of child development since these routines are constructed and sustained in alignment with the values and norms of families’ cultural contexts and in response to constraints on family resources (Berheimer et al., 1990; Weisner, 1996). Everyday, routine parenting practices, including getting children ready for school, preparing and sharing meals, disciplinary practices, and weekend outings, nurture and drive children’s development and reflect cultural values, ideals, and norms.

Variability in family processes such as ERS processes is also highlighted from an ecocultural perspective since families find unique ways to adapt to their contexts, resources, and constraints
(Weisner, 1996). How cultural heritage is manifested in routine, daily activities and what it means for children are at the core of this dissertation study. In addition, the varied ways in which specific features of families’ sociocultural contexts shape ERS practices are central to the current study.

**Literature Review**

**Parental Ethnic and Racial Socialization Practices: Types and Functions**

While children receive messages about race and ethnicity from multiple sources including teachers, peers, and the media, parents are a primary source through which information and values regarding race and ethnicity are transmitted to young children (Knight et al., 2011). Racial and ethnic minority parents are often faced with the challenge of instilling a sense of pride in the family's heritage culture in their children, while also preparing them for situations in which they may experience bias or prejudice (i.e., others’ negative attitudes or differential treatment of them due to ethnic or racial group membership). Additionally, parents may espouse egalitarian beliefs such as the promotion of equality among racial and ethnic groups in the United States (e.g., that race and ethnicity no longer matter in the United States) or in some cases silence about race (i.e., a color-blind perspective), choosing to ignore the topic of race relations with their children (Pahlke, Bigler & Suizzo, 2012; Katz, 2003; Spencer, 1983; Hughes et al., 2006). This dissertation study explored each of the following types of parental ERS:

**Cultural socialization.** Across multiple racial and ethnic minority groups including African American, Chinese, Mexican and Japanese families, cultural socialization, or teaching children about and instilling a sense of pride in their heritage culture, is evident (e.g., Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Within the Latino population, parents engage in cultural socialization linked to their heritage culture in a variety of ways. This includes promoting ethnic pride and behaviors (e.g., speaking Spanish and celebrating particular holidays such as Day of the Dead), knowledge of the history of their ethnic group, and cultural values including the importance of education, respect for elders, familial
interdependence and religious orientations with their children (Calzada, Fernandez, & Cortes, 2010; Knight, Bernal, Garza, Cota, & Ocampo, 1993). Until recently, the extent to which Latino families, specifically Mexican heritage families, valued their children’s education was consistently called into question (Valencia & Black, 2002). However, that Latino families overwhelmingly believe in the importance of their children’s formal education is now widely supported by empirical evidence (e.g., Goldenberg, Gallimore, Reese, & Garnier, 2001; Valencia, 2002).

Cultural socialization has been documented across multiple Latino heritage groups including Mexicans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans, residing in different regions of the United States including New York City, Colorado and Arizona, and in communities with varying racial and ethnic compositions (Calzada et al., 2010; Hughes, 2003; Quintana & Vera, 1999; Knight et al., 1993; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Spanish language use is a key component of ethnic socialization and marks differences in children’s knowledge of their heritage cultural (Bernal, Knight, Garza, Ocampo, & Cota, 1990). In addition, family composition, (e.g., the presence of grandparents living at home with children) is related to children’s Spanish language proficiency (Pérez, 1994).

Some researchers distinguish implicit from explicit (or overt and covert) cultural socialization messages. Implicit cultural socialization encompasses experiences that lack a planned or intentional component of teaching the child about the heritage culture and are everyday occurrences such as such as the décor of the home, eating ethnic foods, or speaking Spanish at home (Umaña-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006). In contrast, explicit cultural socialization practices are planned and intentional in teaching children about their cultural heritage such as travel to the heritage country or buying books about the heritage culture and reading them to children (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006). Interestingly, many cultural socialization practices, such as eating ethnic foods or speaking Spanish at home, could be considered explicit or implicit based on the family’s perspective, yet this has not been addressed in the research literature. The current study sought to understand variability in
cultural socialization practices in Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families not only by assessing the prevalence of different practices, but also parents’ reasoning behind engaging in these practices and the meaning that these practices had for children and their parents in the context of their daily routines.

**Preparation for bias.** To date, research studies on preparation for bias draws mostly on African American samples of families with adolescents. In general, parents’ socialization messages about preparation for bias are more prevalent with adolescents as compared with younger children (Hughes et al., 2006). Research findings show that in some cases, African American parents’ messages related to preparation for bias and cultural socialization serve as a buffer that mitigates the negative impact of adolescents’ experiences with discrimination on psychosocial outcomes (Neblett, White, Ford, Philip, Nguyên, & Sellers, 2008). Furthermore, studies have shown that a strong and positive ethnic or racial identity in African American youth reduces the magnitude of the relation between experiencing discrimination and adverse academic outcomes (Wong, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2003). However, preparation for bias messages have also been linked to adverse outcomes in African American samples. For example, for young adolescents of African American heritage, parents’ preparation for bias messages have been positively associated with antisocial behavior with subjects’ self esteem and ethnic affirmation linking parental ERS and children’s behavior (Hughes, Witherspoon, Rivas-Drake, & West-Bey, 2009).

For Latino families, less is known. Latino parents’ ERS practices related specifically to preparing their children for situations of bias or discrimination are more varied and less frequent than cultural socialization practices across Latino heritage groups (Hughes, 2003). Mexican heritage families’ ERS practices can incorporate a focus on preparation for bias or discrimination with children as young as second grade (Quintana & Vera, 1999). Yet, limited research regarding variability in preparation for bias messages has been conducted. Hughes (2003) found that among
parents who reported preparing their adolescent children for bias, Dominican parents in New York City did so with greater frequency than Puerto Rican parents, while rates of engagement in cultural socialization practices did not differ across the two groups (Hughes, 2003). Given the lack of evidence related to preparation for bias messages with school-aged children of Latino heritage, the current study sought to explore the frequency of and the reasoning behind Mexican and Salvadoran parents’ ERS messages related to preparation for bias with their elementary school-aged children.

**Egalitarian and color-blind perspectives and silence about race.** The conceptualizations of egalitarian and color-blind perspectives and silence about race within parents’ ERS practices are related and overlapping in the research on ERS. Egalitarianism is defined as promoting individual traits rather than racial or ethnic group membership as what matters for achievement or success (Hughes et al., 2006; Sanders Thompson, 1994). It has also been further defined as promoting equal treatment of all people while deemphasizing the importance of race (Hughes et al., 2006; Sanders Thompson, 1994). The definition of an egalitarian perspective is directly related to the definition of a color-blind or color-mute perspective. Color-blind parenting is when parents ask their children not to notice race and promote the notion equality among races (Hughes et al., 2006; Pahlke, Bigler, & Suizzo, 2012). In addition, teaching children that race does not matter in the United States today is considered promotive of a color-blind perspective (Pahlke et al., 2012). Finally, another aspect of ERS that is related to egalitarian and color-blind perspectives is referred to as silence about race, wherein parents avoid engaging in discussions about race with their children (Hughes et al., 2006).

Limited studies regarding the promotion of an egalitarian or a color-blind perspective and silence about race have been conducted, particularly with Latino heritage families with school-aged children. African American families have been documented emphasizing the egalitarian ideals of education, hard work and equality among races with their elementary school-aged children (Marshall,
Research findings suggest that European American parents of preschool-aged children sometimes espouse a color-blind perspective and minimize attention to issues of race and ethnicity in interactions with their children (Hamm, 2001; Katz, 2003; Pahlke et al., 2012). One reason European American parents do this is to avoid biasing their young children toward race, ethnicity, or skin color as salient markers of differences among people (Hamm, 2001; Katz, 2003). Another study documented that parents of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds, including of Mexican heritage, valued egalitarian ideals as an important component of school readiness for their young children who were under age four (Anderson et al., 2015). In this study, Spanish-speaking Mexican heritage parents in particular, supported egalitarian ideals as enhancing children’s school readiness (Anderson et al., 2015). The current study incorporated an exploration of the prevalence of socialization messages related to the promotion of egalitarian and color-blind perspectives and silence about race as well as an examination of parents’ reasoning behind these messages with their elementary school-aged children.

**Factors that Influence Parental Ethnic and Racial Socialization**

Parents’ ERS practices occur in context and are proactively and reactively constructed within their environments and based on their experiences. Three aspects of parents’ contexts that are discussed here as potential sources of variability in their ERS practices were parental work (wages and schedule), social support networks, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition.

**Parental work.** Parental work impacts family processes and child development in multiple ways (Han, 2005; Presser, 2007). Non-standard work hours (evening and night shifts) are mostly negatively associated with marital quality and stability and parent-child interactions, including the amount of time parents spend with children (Presser, 2007). However, qualitative inquiry into low-wage, non-standard work schedules of single mothers has revealed some positive aspects of non-standard work hours such as flexibility in hours that allow mothers to adapt child care arrangements...
to their schedules along with negative aspects such as time away from children (Hsueh, 2006). For immigrants working in low-wage jobs, undocumented immigrants in particular, work situations can be extreme with longer shifts and more hours worked per week, lower pay, less job stability, limited wage growth, and lower quality jobs (repetitive and monotonous tasks) than citizen low-wage workers (Yoshikawa, 2011). Finally the low wages associated with jobs that entail evening and night shifts (e.g., service industry jobs) also have adverse impacts on family functioning and children’s development (e.g., Conger, Conger & Martin, 2010). While parental work has not been studied in relation to ERS practices specifically, given prior research findings it is likely that parental work, would influence ERS practices particularly due to the time parents have to spend with their children and the quality of parent-child interactions.

Social supports. An extensive body of research drawing on diverse samples including Latino heritage families documents a positive relation between mothers’ social supports (both emotional and practical supports such as caring for children in an emergency) and parenting practices such as warmth and nurturance (Ceballo & McLoyd, 2002; Izzo, Weiss, Shanahan, & Rodriguez-Brown, 2000; McLoyd, 1990). Within the Latino population, immigrant generation, documentation status, and heritage country (which are often intertwined) are associated with mothers’ social support networks and access to social capital (e.g., information, resources, and cultural norms that are shared through social ties; Yoshikawa, 2011). For example, Mexican mothers in New York had more limited social support networks (e.g., fewer grandparents in homes) and less access to information as compared with Dominican mothers, who tended to be of later immigrant generations and were less likely to be unauthorized (Yoshikawa, 2011). While less often studied, extended social support networks can also be sources of ERS in terms of exposure to heritage languages, cultural values, and norms (Arriagada, 2005; Rumbaut, 1997). One aspect of the current study was to explore how variability in social support networks influenced ERS practices.
**Neighborhood racial and ethnic composition.** Limited research studies address the links between the racial and ethnic composition of neighborhoods and parents’ ERS practices with elementary school-aged children. One study conducted on ERS and neighborhood composition drew on an African American sample of families with first graders and suggested that there was a relation between neighborhood racial and ethnic composition and parent’s ERS practices such that African American parents living in predominantly European American neighborhoods were less likely to share messages about the promotion of mistrust that families in predominantly African American neighborhoods (Caughy, O’Campo, Nettles, & Lohrfink, 2006). For African American youth, increased neighborhood diversity is positively linked to parental ERS messages regarding preparation for bias and cultural pride, yet gender and personal experiences with racism moderate these relations (Stevenson, McNeil, Herrero-Taylor, & Davis, 2005). This line of inquiry has yet to be replicated with Latino heritage samples.

**Children’s Racial and Ethnic Identity**

Around age six children are able to accurately label their own race or ethnicity, but still have limited definitions of what those labels mean (Ruble, et. al., 2004). Early work by Bernal et al. (1990) documented ethnic identification in a sample of Mexican heritage preschoolers (ranging in age from 3.5 to 6 years old) living in Denver, Colorado. In general, older children accurately used ethnic labels more frequently than younger children in the sample, while children across this young sample displayed limited knowledge of their ethnic labels meant (Bernal et al., 1990). A second study conducted by Bernal et al., (1990) sampled Mexican heritage children ages 6 to 10, and found older children (8- to 10-year-olds) had more complex and abstract reasons, moving beyond the tangible, when describing their ethnicity as compared to younger children (Bernal et al., 1990). Other studies support this developmental progression suggesting that during middle childhood, what children’s
ethnic or racial labels mean to them become increasingly complex moving from knowledge of tangible behaviors to affective ties (Quintana & Vera, 1999; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014).

Information on the racial and ethnic identity development of elementary school-aged children of differing Latino heritage groups (i.e., Mexican and Salvadoran heritage children) is warranted. Just as the varied histories of Mexicans and Salvadorans in the United States impacts family processes, they may also have implications for children’s developing identities. The current study included measures of children’s ethnic and racial identities as well as mothers’ choices for children’s racial and ethnic identities and their reasoning around those choices.

The Current Study

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the ERS practices of Mexican and Salvadoran heritage women with elementary school-aged children and situate those practices in the contexts of their daily lives. Prevalence of ERS practices was explored along with mothers’ reasoning as to why they did or did not engage in certain practices with their children. Contextual factors that influence ERS practices were also explored. In addition, this study explored children’s ethnic identification and meaning making in comparison to how mothers racially and ethnically identified their children and why. Finally, how children and mothers spoke about their daily lives and cultural heritage was explored through a photo elicitation task. This dissertation addressed the following research questions:

1. Within the context of daily lives, what do cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of an egalitarian perspective, and promotion of a color-blind perspective look like in Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families with elementary school-aged children? Do these practices vary as a function of heritage country?
2. What contextual factors influence Mexican and Salvadoran heritage mothers’ ERS practices? How do these contextual factors vary in terms of their influence on family lives in this population?

3. What additional information is obtained by utilizing multiple research methods (survey based self report and a qualitative photo elicitation task) that allow families to talk about ERS?

4. How do Salvadoran and Mexican heritage elementary school-aged children identify and describe their ethnicity or race?
CHAPTER 2: STUDY METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants of Mexican and Salvadoran heritage with elementary school-aged children were recruited from southern California through public and charter schools, early childhood education centers, and participant referrals. Mexican and Salvadoran heritage were targeted given their large numbers in southern California and differing immigrant trajectories and sociodemographic characteristics (Brown & Hugo Lopez, 2013). Participants were intentionally recruited from a wide geographic area with the aim of obtaining families from varying socioeconomic backgrounds and neighborhoods of differing racial and ethnic compositions. Written consent was obtained from parents and children provided verbal assent before study participation began. A $20 gift card to Target was given to all mothers who participated in this study and children received a picture book and university branded pencil and eraser as thanks for their participation. A total of 27 Latina mothers and their elementary school-aged children (one per family) participated in this study (see Table 1 for participant dyad descriptions). Almost all participating women (n=26; 96%) were the biological mothers of the children; in one case a child’s biological grandmother participated in the study. All sample children were U.S.-born, while only 7 mothers (26%) were U.S.-born (Table 2 presents full sample descriptive statistics and Table 3 presents descriptive statistics by heritage country). Of the remaining 20 mothers (74%), 10 were born in Mexico and 10 in El Salvador. There were not substantial differences in sociodemographic characteristics when comparing Salvadoran and Mexican heritage participants so demographics are discussed in the aggregate here.

Participants’ socioeconomic backgrounds were varied although the sample was largely a low-income sample. Average annual household income per capita was $7,569.94 (SD=8,512.45) and 20 participants (74%) reported annual household incomes of less than $40,000 for the prior year. Almost half of the women worked outside of the home for pay (n=13; 48%), while 11 (41%) were
unemployed and 3 (11%) were full-time students. Women who worked full- or part-time worked as waitresses, seamstresses, housekeepers, teachers, or in non-profit organizations. All but one spouse or partner were employed outside of the home in jobs that included construction work, restaurant staff, being a car wash dryer and a banker. One partner was a full-time student. There was substantial variability in the educational attainment of the mothers sampled ranging from no formal schooling at all to completing graduate studies ($M= 6.19$ equivalent to receiving a high school degree; $SD = 2.88$). Fathers too displayed variability in educational attainment with a slightly lower average than mothers of 5.72 ($SD=2.61$), which is equivalent to completing some high school education.

Household compositions were quite varied. On average, 5 ($SD=1.97$) people lived in each home, but ranged from 2 to 10 people. Most mothers were living with a partner or were married ($n=24; 89$%); 3 were separated or divorced. Mexican women were most often married to or living with Mexican heritage men although one Mexican heritage woman was married to a Chinese-American man. Salvadoran heritage women were most often married to Salvadoran men although one Salvadoran woman was with a Mexican man and another was with a Guatemalan man. Children’s ages ranged from 4.73 years to 10.23 years old ($M=7.44; SD=1.49$) and approximately half of the children were girls ($n=13, 48$%).

**Procedures**

Parents and children were interviewed on two different occasions for approximately one hour each session. For the first data collection session, in all but five cases, two bilingual Spanish-and English-speaking researchers simultaneously collected data with both parent and child, separately. In five cases just one researcher was present so parent and child interviews were conducted consecutively, and in the interest of time, mothers filled out their interview responses independently. These five cases differed from the full sample because each of these mothers was
working or studying full time out of the home so interviews had to be scheduled on the weekends. However, these five cases were a mix of socioeconomic backgrounds, geographic residence and heritage country. Data collection differed because only one researcher was present so mothers were given the close-ended survey items to complete on their own, while the researcher interviewed the child.

The first interview began with basic introductions and time to get to know one another. Once a comfortable climate was established, mothers and children were interviewed separately. Each mother first described her child’s ethnic or racial identity and shared about her daily routines for weekdays and weekends. Next, mothers were handed a copy of a survey and the researcher and participant read the items together. Mothers responded openly about their reasoning behind their survey responses and marked the actual frequency with which they engaged in the practice on their copy of the instrument to foster a greater sense of privacy. All open-ended responses were audio-recorded and transcribed. Children completed an assessment of their own racial and ethnic identification and the meaning behind their identities. At the conclusion of the first session, the lead researcher described the photo elicitation task to mothers and children.

In preparation for the second research session, mothers and their children were asked to take several photographs according to the following guidelines. Mothers and children were given digital cameras, laminated instructions, and received the following prompt:

“Before our next meeting, I would like you to take pictures of objects, activities, places and people here at home or in your neighborhood or community. I really just want pictures of your daily routines, what you do each day. Also, I want you to take pictures of things, activities, places and people that are important to you in terms of your culture and [insert heritage country]. Some other people who have done this for me have taken pictures of family members or family celebrations (even pictures of pictures), their school or church, books about where they are from, Facebook pages that help them keep in touch with family and friends who live far away, etc. There are no right or wrong things to take pictures of, just make sure there is no nudity and nothing illegal photographed. Take the pictures in whatever way works for you. For example you and your child can work together and take pictures together or you could each choose what to take pictures of separately. I’d like you to take at least 10 pictures, but you can do more than 10 if you would like to. At our next meeting in a week, you’ll tell me all about the pictures you took. Do you have any questions?”
Mothers and children were shown how to use the camera with a flash and they got to take a few practice shots. A time was scheduled for the second research session, approximately 1 week later.

During the second research session mothers and children talked about the photographs they had taken during the prior week while responding to the principal researcher’s prompts regarding details of the pictures and their meaning. The second session was video recorded.

**Measures**

Mothers responded to a series of survey and open-ended questions regarding their children’s ethnic and racial identities, their daily lives, parenting practices related to ethnic and racial socialization and basic demographics, while children completed assessments related to ethnic identity and intergroup attitudes. Conversations between researchers and participants were audio recorded and open-ended responses were transcribed. All measures were piloted with three mother-child dyads allowing for adjustments to be made to language used and ordering of questions in places that were lacking clarity.

**Mothers’ perceptions of child’s racial and ethnic identity.** Mothers completed a labeling task in which they were presented with descriptors written on index cards and were asked to say ‘yes’ if the word described their child, ‘no’ if it did not or ‘don’t know’ if they were not sure (Bernal et al., 1990). They were presented with a series of 11 cards with racial, ethnic or national labels such as Mexican, White, Latino, American, and Salvadoran. Ethnic and racial labels were chosen based on relevant panethnic and national labels given that Salvadoran and Mexican heritage families were intentionally recruited for this study. After responding to each label on the predetermined list, mothers were asked to provide any additional racial, ethnic or national labels that described their children, but may have been omitted. Then, based on all of the ‘yes’ responses and any new labels that mothers added, mothers were asked to choose one label that most described her child. Finally, using the one label that mothers determined was the best descriptor for her child (no one chose
more than one label), they were asked why they chose that particular label. These open-ended responses were recorded and transcribed. Responses were transcribed and analyzed thematically based on the following themes identified in prior research (Gillen-O’Neel, Mistry, Spears Brown, Rodriguez, White, & Chow, 2014): tangible aspects of heritage including geography (e.g., birthplace), family heritage (e.g., country where parents were from), cultural practices and beliefs (e.g., language, foods, and religious practices), physical characteristics, social referencing, affect and belonging. The following 5 categories capture how mothers chose their labels: language(s) spoken, heritage country, child and parents’ birthplace, foods eaten at home, an overall evaluation of what being that label was like and other. Responses that incorporated more than one category were counted in each category that the mother invoked in her justification of the response.

**Daily routines.** Mothers provided open-ended responses to questions regarding a typical weekday routine, typical weekend routine, and how they celebrated special occasions such as birthdays and holidays (Weisner, 2002). For example, the initial prompt asking about weekday routines was, “Tell me a little about a typical weekday starting with when you get up in the morning and get the kids off to school until bedtime in the evening.” Standard follow-up questions were asked of all participants regarding the stability of their routines and additional sources of support in child care responsibilities and household chores. Responses were transcribed and used for in depth descriptions of exemplar cases.

**Parenting practices.** Mothers responded to a series of survey items regarding parenting practices related to ERS. The components of ERS explored through the survey items are described in detail below and included explicit and implicit cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of a color-blind perspective, promotion of an egalitarian perspective and silence about race. While mothers responded to these items, they spoke about what these interactions looked like with their children or why they did or did not engage in the specific activity or practice. These
spontaneous, qualitative justifications to the survey items were transcribed and also analyzed. In five cases, mothers responded to survey items independently and therefore did not have the opportunity to explain their responses verbally.

**Parental ethnic and racial socialization.** Fifteen items measured the frequency with which parents engaged in activities related to ethnic and racial socialization. All answers were provided on a scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (every day).

**Implicit and explicit cultural socialization.** To measure cultural socialization, that is, parents’ teaching of traditions, values, beliefs, and history related to the child’s ethnic group, 8 items were adapted from multiple sources including the Family Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bámaca-Gómez, 2004), Hughes and Chen’s (1997) measure of racial socialization, and the Ethnic Socialization Scale (ESS; Knight et al., 1993). Given the current study’s small sample size, conducting a psychometric analysis of common underlying dimensions of these items was not feasible. Instead, items were grouped conceptually into subscales for implicit and explicit cultural socialization drawing on Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2006) definition that explicit cultural socialization practices have a planned and intentional teaching aspect behind them, while implicit cultural socialization activities do not. Sample items for explicit cultural socialization included: How often do you or a family member: take {insert child’s name} to cultural events (concerts, festivals, etc.) related to {insert heritage country}? read books to {insert child’s name} or encourage {insert child’s name} to read books about the history or culture of {insert heritage country}? For implicit cultural socialization items included: How often do you or a family member: eat typical foods from {insert heritage country} with your child? Talk on the phone with {insert child’s name} and family members still in {insert heritage country}? Responses for the 4 items on the explicit cultural socialization subscale and for the 4 items on the implicit cultural socialization subscale were averaged to create composite scores.
Preparation for bias. To assess preparation for bias, 3 items from Hughes and Chen’s (1997) measure of racial socialization were used. Sample items included: How often have you or someone in your family: talked with [focal child] about racism (which is when people think or treat other people unfairly because of their race, ethnicity or skin color)? or told [focal child] that someone may treat him or her unfairly because of his/her family’s heritage? Items were averaged to create a composite score with higher scores indicating more frequent engagement in conversations related to preparation for bias between parents and children.

Silence about race. The following item assessed parents’ tendency to not engage in conversations about race and ignore the topic all together (Pahlke et al., 2012): How often have you or a family member avoided talking about race or ethnicity with {insert child’s name} even when she or he has asked questions or made observations about race or ethnicity?

Egalitarian perspective. Parents responded to 2 items adapted from the Racial Socialization Questionnaire – Parent version (White-Johnson, Ford, & Sellers, 2010) related to promoting an egalitarian perspective with their children, which were: How often have you or a family member: told {focal child} that he/she can be anything he/she wants to be regardless of his/her heritage; told {focal child} that through hard work and education anyone, regardless of race or ethnicity, can succeed in the United States. Responses were averaged to create a composite score.

Color-blind perspective. Parents responded to 1 item that assessed their promotion of a color-blind perspective (Pahlke et al., 2012): How often have you or a family member: told {focal child} that race or ethnicity does not matter in the United States; everyone is treated the same?

Children’s ethnic and racial identification. All children completed assessments to measure their ethnic and racial label identification and what their racial or ethnic background labels meant to them. These measures were based on standard measures of child and adolescent ethnic identity development (Bernal et al., 1990).
**Ethnic and racial identification and meaning.** Each child completed the same labeling task as their mothers did (described above). After practicing with a few items, children were presented with a series of 11 cards with racial, ethnic or national labels such as Mexican, White, Latino, and American. Children were then given the chance to provide additional racial, ethnic or national labels that described them, but may have been omitted. Then, based on all of the ‘yes’ responses and any new labels that children added, each child was asked to choose one label that most described him or her. After identifying one label as most like them, children were asked open-ended questions to ascertain why they chose the label they did as most like them. Prompts included, “Why are you [insert child’s ethnic or racial label]? What makes you [insert child’s ethnic or racial label]? What is it like to be [insert child’s ethnic or racial label]?” Responses were transcribed and analyzed using the same criteria described above.

**Family background characteristics.** Caregivers were also asked to provide information on background characteristics as part of the structured interview. Parents reported on their socioeconomic status (i.e., parental education level, annual household income, and occupation), family immigration history, family composition, language use at home, and their community contexts. *Maternal and paternal education* levels were reported using an 11-point scale ranging from never having attended formal education (0) to graduate or professional degree obtained (11). An 11-point scale was completed to assess *annual household income* ranging from less than $10,000 per year (1) to more than $150,001 per year (11). *Maternal and paternal occupation* were captured by asking if the mother/father was employed (part or full time) and what kind of work she/he did (open-ended). *Immigrant generation* was captured by asking the mother where the target child, her/his parents and grandparents were born. *Family composition* was denoted via 2 variables including marital status and total number of people living in the household at the time of the interview (continuous variable). Additionally, *home language context*, was described by asking what language each inhabitant of the
household spoke to the target child and what language the target child spoke in response to that person. Parent perception of the focal child’s English and Spanish language proficiency both receptively and expressively was assessed on a 4-point scale ranging from Not at all (1) to Very well/completely (4). Finally, to learn more about families’ community contexts, mothers were asked to share what language (Spanish, English or both) they used most when out of the house in their community and what the racial and ethnic compositions of their neighborhood and friendship networks were.

**Photo elicitation task.** Mothers and children were asked to take at least 10 pictures of their daily lives and also of anything that was important to them in terms of their ethnic or racial heritage (Croghan, Griffin, Hunter, & Phoenix, 2008). Photographs were sorted according to photo content based on what emerged from the data and how the photograph was discussed (e.g., children’s schooling, family outing, travel, food preparation, meal times, family celebration). Conversations were transcribed and then broadly categorized as either incorporating extensive explicit cultural socialization messages or not. Descriptions of what these two types of conversations were like and why particular dyads engaged in the more explicit socialization are provided.

**Analysis Plan**

For close ended data (i.e., children’s and mothers’ ethnic and racial label choices, the frequency of mothers’ self-reported parenting practices, and family demographics) responses were entered into an excel spreadsheet, doubled checked by a second research assistant, and then imported into Stata v. 13 for analysis. Means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages were calculated and distributions were assessed.

All open-ended children’s data (i.e., responses to questions and probes around their chosen ethnic and racial identity labels) were fully transcribed in the language spoken during the interview and in a denaturalized way (i.e., removing non-standard pronunciation, stutters, nonverbal and
involuntary vocalizations, and pauses; Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005). Transcriptions were manually coded based on relevant themes identified by prior research using an iterative process. More discrete categories were identified initially, which were then aggregated into broader categories (Merriam, 2009). Results are presented in analytic narratives and direct quotes (Ericson, 1986).

Open-ended parent interview data from the first interview session were also transcribed in full in the language spoken during the interview and following denaturalized transcription methods (Oliver et al., 2005). Given the structured protocol used in parent interviews, transcriptions were amenable to manual coding to describe patterns observed in the data, analyze essential features, and interpret what it meant (i.e., ethnographic analysis; Wolcott, 1994 cited in Merriam, 2009). Results are presented in analytic narratives and direct quotes (Ericson, 1986).

Photo elicitation task data was treated in two steps. Each photograph was cataloged and given a brief descriptor based on the photo content and how it was discussed. Any explicit mentions of heritage culture were tagged and then those interview segments were fully transcribed in the language spoken during the interview using denaturalized transcription (Oliver et al., 2005). These transcription segments were then used to describe patterns, analyze essential features, and interpret meaning as described previously (Wolcott, 1994 cited in Merriam, 2009). Results are presented in analytic narratives and direct quotes (Ericson, 1986).
CHAPTER 3: PARENTAL ETHNIC AND RACIAL SOCIALIZATION

Results presented in this chapter underscore three primary findings: 1. Parents may espouse similar goals and values for their children, yet how they achieve those goals and instill values, varies, 2. ERS messages were multi-faceted and overlapping, and 3. Cultural socialization mostly occurred implicitly, although activities or behaviors that were implicit for many families were explicit for some.

Across the full sample families showed that the moral direction of development that they fostered in their children was focused on education and fair treatment of others. Families worked toward raising children who would someday be educated and respectful of others. However, parents faced differing resource and time constraints and had varied opportunities to spend time with their children, so how they supported their children’s education, for example, differed from family to family. Similarly, how parents explained and justified messages about treating others equally to their children varied and was not always based on race or ethnicity, but also drew on other markers or examples of injustice such as treating others equally regardless of weight or language issues. Interestingly, variability in families’ lives, daily routines and ERS practices were not attributable to heritage country and therefore are discussed via exemplar cases and across the full sample. Results presented in this chapter also demonstrate that socialization messages touched on more than one component of ERS. For example, in some cases egalitarian messages were linked with notions of a color-blind perspective. Finally, cultural socialization was more common through implicit rather than explicit mechanisms. Yet, based on the mother’s perspective what might be considered implicit versus explicit differed.

I first present three cases in depth and compare and contrast those cases to the experiences of the other families’ in my sample. For exemplar cases, I present their individual composite scores for the frequency with which they engaged in the various components of ERS (e.g., endorsement of
an egalitarian perspective, preparation for bias) with their children. I then situate their individual composite score in the full sample by comparing individual scores to the sample mean or distribution across quartiles. The exemplar cases were chosen because the mothers’ parenting goals and values often converged (e.g., regarding the importance of education, treating others with respect), yet how their goals and values permeated their daily routines varied. In addition, the mothers represent a mix of immigrant and U.S.-born mothers with heritage ties to Mexico and El Salvador.

**The Lives, Parenting, and ERS of Three Women**

**Sara**

Sara (briefly introduced on page 1) is a 50-year-old Mexican heritage woman who immigrated to the United States at age 23. She was enthusiastic about participating in the study from our first conversation and welcomed us into her home with warmth and kindness. She is the oldest of 7 siblings who she largely raised in Mexico after their father died at a young age forcing her mother to find work in the United States intermittently. “Como yo soy la mayor yo me hacía cargo de la casa y de los hijos y ella [su mamá] trabajaba acá. Yo dejé mi carrera al tercer semestre ya de mi carrera y fue algo muy difícil.” (Since I am the oldest I took charge of the house and the children and she [her mother] worked here. I left my studies in the third semester of my studies and it was a very difficult thing.) Sara described her family life in Mexico as difficult, yet she also took pride in raising her siblings. She was honored by the respect they had for her, which they demonstrated by sharing their hardships with her, even before telling their problems to their mother.

At the time of the study, Sara lived with her husband and two of her three children in an apartment on the second floor of a home with a few other units in a low-income neighborhood comprised mostly of Mexican heritage families. She reported that their annual income during the year prior to data collection was between $10,001 and $20,000. Sara graduated high school and studied a few semesters in a vocational program while her husband had studied through a portion of
middle school. Their apartment was small and in a run-down building with a broken front door and a hazardous, dark stairwell. Her living area was crowded with two brown couches, a vanity, a clothes dresser, water and soda bottles stacked up, a cage for their pet turtle, Chiva, and a small book shelf filled with books for children. The walls and the refrigerator were filled with pictures of family in Mexico and the United States.

Sara’s husband worked outside of the home full time packaging crackers, while she was in charge of the home and taking care of the children. When asked if anyone helped at home with child care or housework she responded, “No. Soy nada más yo.” (No. It is only me.) Sara’s daughter was 20 years old at the time of the study and lived in northern California where she was in her third year of college. Her middle child, a 17-year-old boy, was a senior in high school busy with college applications. Her younger son, Ernesto, who participated in this study, was 9 years old and in 4th grade at a local public school.

Sara described her daily routine explaining how she got Ernesto up and ready for school each morning and then returned home after dropping him off to clean and cook. In the afternoons she picked him up from school, they ate together, Ernesto watched a little TV and it was straight to homework before bathing, a light dinner, and bedtime. The most salient feature of Sara’s description of her family routine and parenting practices was how she structured her family life to support her son’s education. When we arrived for our first interview session, Sara was hosting a kind of homework club for Ernesto and two of her neighbors’ children who had recently immigrated from Mexico and started school in the United States with limited English language proficiency. Periodically throughout our first interview a child would approach and ask her for feedback on her/his work. In describing a typical weekday Sara said, “A las 4:30 es hora de tarea. Hasta que termina. Si termina y hay un chance de que puede jugar con los demás niños, juega, y si no, no hay día de juego.” (At 4:30 it is time for homework. Until he finishes. If he finishes and there is a chance that he can play with the
other kids, he plays, and if not, it is not a day for play.) During our second interview when I asked Ernesto to tell me more about himself she interjected reminding him that he was intelligent (Ernesto quickly agreed). Sara valued intelligence and school success, often discussing her daughter’s university experiences with pride.

Sara experienced some challenges with Ernesto and was very involved in his schooling. He had been diagnosed as on the autism spectrum, due mostly to language delays, when he was a preschooler. He had received special education services as a young child. At the time of our interview Sara explained that Ernesto no longer received special education services and that he was one of the most advanced children academically in his class. While she in part attributed her son’s progress to the inclusive education model at his school, she also expressed her dissatisfaction with the English Language Development program at Ernesto’s school and had taken to teaching him to read and write in Spanish herself since that was not offered at their local school.

Sara’s emphasis on her children’s education was directly linked to her self-reported endorsement of an egalitarian perspective in her interactions with Ernesto. When asked how often she told Ernesto that he could be anything that he wanted to be, regardless of his race or ethnicity she responded, “Yo pienso que el número 5 [todos los días] porque en realidad yo todo el tiempo estoy impulsando mis hijos a que ellos… no haya barreras para ellos. Que el hecho de ser Latino no quiere decir que porque vivimos en un barrio tan feo, ellos no pueden aspirar a ser algo mucho mejor de lo que son todos los que viven aquí.” (I think that number 5 [everyday because in reality all of the time I am pushing my kids so that they… there are not barriers for them. That the fact of being Latino does not mean that because we live in such an ugly neighborhood, they cannot aspire to be something much better than what everyone who lives here is.) Additionally, when asked if she espoused a color-blind perspective (i.e., if she talked with her son about race or ethnicity not mattering in the United States because everyone is treated equally) she said, “Bueno, regulmente él tiene esa noción porque en la escuela no hay diferencias. Y en mi familia tampoco. Unos
son nacidos aquí, otros somos nacidos en México, y aquí ya hemos mezclado nuestra cultura con otras. So entonces él piensa - él sabe que todos somos iguales.” (Well, he regularly has that notion because in school there are not differences. And not in my family either. Some are born here, others we are born in Mexico, and here we have already mixed our culture with others. So then he thin- he knows that we are all equal.) Sara’s numeric response for the frequency in which she talked about an egalitarian perspective with Ernesto was 5.00, which was the median response for the full sample and slightly higher than the mean ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.08$; Table 4 presents composite ERS values for full sample and by heritage country and Table 5 presents item-level responses for full sample and by heritage country$^3$). Her engagement in conversations related to a color-blind perspective was similar to that of the sample average of once a week at 3.0, while the sample mean was 3.33 ($SD = 1.57$).

Conversations regarding preparation for experiences of prejudice or bias were limited with Ernesto. Sara reported talking about preparation for bias almost never (1.67), which placed her below the mean for the full sample (2.43, $SD = 1.09$). Sara elaborated about talking with Ernesto about the possibility of his being treated unjustly because of his Mexican heritage saying, “La verdad es que no le ponemos a… no le decimos que puede pasar así. Porque yo no quiero que él crezca con este concepto de que por ser Latino, hay gente que lo puede tratar diferente. Él es un niño normal como los demás. Sea Mexicano, Latino, Americano, como sea. Él tiene que ser tratado igual. So no más es la explicación esa.” (The truth is that we do not get him to… we do not tell him that it can happen like that. Because I do not want him to grow up with this concept that for being Latino, there are people that can treat him differently. He is a normal child like the rest. Whether Mexican, Latino, American, whatever. He has to be treated the same. So just that is the explanation.) In this explanation of preparation for bias Sara mixes in ideas related to a color-blind perspective by saying that she doesn’t want her son to have the notion that prejudicial treatment is possible so she does not address the possibility with him. When asked if she

---

$^3$ The response scale for the frequency with which parents engaged in particular activities or conversations with their children was 1=never, 2=1/2 times per month, 3=weekly, 4=3/4 times per week, 5=daily.
told her son not to pay attention to other people’s skin color or race, she explained that she thought that her son was observant regarding how people are treated with links to skin color. “Él pregunta porque tratan mal a esta persona. O porque esta persona tiene ese color y no lo toman en cuenta. Entonces yo trato de explicarle que um todos somos iguales. El color de la piel no tiene nada que ver con una persona. Regularmente son buenas o malas no importa la raza.” (He asks why they treat this person badly. Or why this person is this color and they do not take him/her into consideration. So I try to explain to him that um we are all equal. Skin color does not have anything to do with a person. Normally, they are good or bad regardless of race.) Similar to the prior quote, in this example Sara displays support for a color-blind perspective since she does not actually recount engaging with her son in a conversation about race relations. Her egalitarian ideals seem to overshadow actually addressing prejudice and bias due to race or ethnicity. Interestingly, Sara also said that she never avoided the topic of race or ethnicity with Ernesto and claimed to not silence the topic of race in her parenting; she reported that if he had questions she discussed them with him in the moment. However, there may have been some missed opportunities to talk about prejudice and discrimination with Ernesto. Sara’s egalitarian beliefs permeated what she taught her son about race and unjust treatment such that she stressed equal treatment as a two way street. She taught her son that he deserves equal treatment and that he should treat others equally regardless of their race or ethnicity.

Sara appeared to have a nostalgic reverence for Mexico that influenced her parenting practices with Ernesto through implicit and explicit mechanisms of cultural socialization. Sara and her family taught Ernesto about their Mexican heritage implicitly through food, language and family stories (3.5 was Sara’s implicit cultural socialization composite, which put her in the top quartile across the full sample). For example, Sara said that her husband told Ernesto stories about Mexico or family members in Mexico on a daily basis. She prepared traditional foods almost everyday and only on the weekends they ate other kinds of food when they were out. The family spoke mostly
Spanish at home and to Ernesto, yet he often spoke only English back. This was not an issue for Sara because her son displayed language delays as a young child and school staff had recommended that they focus on one language with him rather than promoting bilingualism.

Explicit forms of cultural socialization were more frequent for Sara and her family (3.25) than for the sample average ($M = 2.27, SD = 0.80$). Sara was in the top quartile of the sample in terms of engaging in explicit cultural socialization. These explicit activities included attending cultural events related to Mexico on occasion, such as the annual Mariachi festival, which happened to take place between our two interviews. Sara and Ernesto went to the festival, which seemed like a time for Sara to teach him about Mexican culture while enjoying her favorite music. While listening to mariachi music during our second interview she said, “Mi corazón tiembla, quiero llorar, quiero cantar, osea me emociono bastante.” (My heart trembles, I want to cry, I want to sing, I mean I get very emotional.) Sara’s Mexican roots were an integral part of her own identity that she shared with her son through implicit and explicit cultural socialization mechanisms.

*Maite*

Maite is a 38-year-old Salvadoran woman who immigrated to the United States when she was 25. Maite was initially a cautious participant in the study, yet she seemed to warm up to the experience and enjoy the interviews once we got started. In El Salvador she had studied dentistry and almost graduated, but she left before finishing her studies to make more money to support her young daughters. When she came to the United States she left two daughters, then ages 7 and 4, in El Salvador. Her daughters still lived in El Salvador and were ages 20 and 17 at the time of the study.

Maite lived in southern California with her parents, brother, and 8-year-old son, Eduardo, who participated in this study. Her son’s biological father returned to Mexico, yet he remained involved in Eduardo’s life seeing him with some frequency when Eduardo travels to Mexico and by supporting him financially. At the time of the study Maite was in a committed relationship with a
man of Peruvian heritage who spent half the week living with Maite and her family at her apartment. She had recently changed jobs and was working full time cleaning offices during standard business hours. This was a significant change since previously she had worked nights in a restaurant with very little time to spend with Eduardo. She reported an annual household income between $20,001 and $30,000 for the year prior to data collection. Because of her full time work, family members contribute to caring for Eduardo on a daily basis. Her brother picked Eduardo up at school each day and her parents cared for him in the afternoon until Maite got home.

Maite’s apartment was located in a low-income housing complex where residents benefited from reduced rent, but had to participate in workshops twice a year. The workshops were aimed at supporting residents’ self-esteem, economic stability, and social mobility. Most of her neighbors were of Salvadoran and Latino heritage, but there are also African American and Korean heritage residents in her complex. To gain entry to the building, visitors had to be escorted and signed in by residents. Maite’s apartment was clean, organized, and appeared to be spacious. The furnishings were coordinated including a dining set in the kitchen area, two sofas, a media console and TV in the living area. The apartment was decorated for Christmas with a tree with lights and ornaments.

Maite had a similar goal of raising an educated child as Sara did, but how Maite supported her son’s education took on a different form as compared with Sara. Maite had enrolled her son at a near-by charter school because it had a reputation of heightened academic rigor as compared with the local public school. She was immediately impressed with the school when Eduardo was in kindergarten saying, “Pero en kinder, él entró de 4 años. Casi casi que salía hasta dividiendo. Que les enseñaron a sumar, a restar. Y era una cosa osea… Yo quedé maravillada con el estudio y la disciplina también.” (But in pre-K, he started at 4 years old. He almost almost left up to doing division. That they taught them to add, to subtract. And it was something I mean… I was left astounded with the studies and the discipline too.) Her son told me that his school was unique and when I asked why Maite suggested,
“Porque te hacen estudiar un poquito más?” (Because they make you study a little more?) Additionally, when Eduardo told me that his classroom was named after a prominent university in the United States his mom asked him where he hoped to study. Eduardo said, “Johns Hopkins,” and then went on to tell me he wanted to study dentistry as his mom had done in El Salvador. It was evident that Maite and Eduardo had discussed Eduardo attending college previously as they laughed about the logistics of him moving far away to study, but still wanting to live with his mom. Maite cared about education and encouraged her son to have high educational and career aspirations.

To help reach her education goals, Maite relied on the mission and ethos of her son’s charter school academy since she had less time and limited language ability to directly support his education herself. Homework was a set feature in their daily routine, but Maite was not able to support Eduardo in the same ways that Sara supported Ernesto since Maite worked full time outside of the home. Maite reviewed Eduardo’s homework each day to make sure he had completed it and sought support from her boyfriend via text messages or in person for homework questions that required additional input.

Maite’s emphasis on education was also directly linked to her self-reported high level of endorsement of egalitarian ideals (5.0, which was higher than the sample mean as stated previously). Maite reported talking with her son daily about the importance of education and hard work to achieve one’s goals in the United States. For example, she had talked to her son about becoming president of the United States someday if he wanted to or even the president of El Salvador or Mexico once he obtained citizenship. Equality was central to her teaching her son how to treat others, which blended into her promotion of a color-blind perspective. She reported talking with her son on a monthly basis (2.0, which was less frequent than the sample mean) that all people are equal saying, “Osea, sí, que todos somos hijos de Dios.” (I mean, yes, that we are all children of God.)
Similar to Sara, Maite did not report talking with Eduardo to prepare him for possible experiences of bias or prejudice based on his ethnicity or nationality (1.67, which was less frequent engagement in conversations about preparation for bias than the sample mean). When she elaborated on the topic she said that she had spoken with her son about racism saying, “Sí lo hemos platicado por la gente morena específicamente.” (Yes, we have talked about it for Black people specifically.) Maite also mentioned talking with her son about discrimination being wrong using discrimination against a person due to her/his weight as an example (she considered her son to be obese). Maite had big dreams for her son’s future and did not outwardly acknowledge that he might face barriers in achieving his educational and career goals, but she was concerned with instilling in him a sense of treating others fairly. This perspective contrasted Sara’s who recognized that being Latino and living in their neighborhood could be a barrier to achievement, yet she did not let this knowledge impact her dreams and aspirations for Ernesto.

Eduardo was exposed to the Salvadoran culture implicitly through daily activities (3.75, top quartile of full sample) and explicitly, for example, via a trip he had taken to El Salvador to meet his sisters. He also experienced Mexican culture, mostly through his travels to Mexico to visit his biological father, and somewhat to Peruvian culture through cuisine thanks to Maite’s boyfriend. For Ernesto’s Salvadoran heritage food, language, and family interactions were sources of implicit cultural socialization that shaped Maite and Eduardo’s daily routines. Maite laughed as she described how Eduardo loved beans with Salvadoran cream and pupusas (a traditional food of tortillas stuffed with bean, cheese, and/or pork). She also promoted her son’s appreciation of and identification with Salvadoran culture through speaking Spanish with him (although as described below he expressed this being stressful), through his closeness with his grandfather who lived with them, and in maintaining close ties with his older sisters in El Salvador via phone.
Opportunities for explicit cultural socialization outside of the home were limited due to Maite’s previous job where she worked evenings and nights in a restaurant (1.5, which placed her in the bottom quartile of the sample). Maite explained, for example, that she did not celebrate national or religious holidays with her son because of her prior work, “No… pues es apenas es primer año que voy a poder.” (No… well it is barely it is the first year that I will be able to.) In addition, their weekend schedule was quiet. They still tended to stay at home mostly, a routine that persisted from when she had worked nights given her quite recent change in work at the time of data collection. While Ernesto had been to El Salvador on one occasion, Maite wished that she could share her heritage country with her son as Eduardo’s father was able to do with him in Mexico. “No he tenido la oportunidad que los dos estemos juntos en mi país y que yo le diga, ‘o mira aquí nos caímos con mi mamá o allá íbamos con mi papá.’” (I have not had the opportunity for the two of us to be together in my country and that I tell him, ‘oh look here I came with my mom or there we used to go with my dad.) Because she had not been able to travel to El Salvador with Eduardo she felt that he likely identified more with his Mexican heritage than his Salvadoran heritage.

Margarita

Margarita is a 39-year-old Mexican heritage woman who was born in the United States to Mexican immigrant parents. At the time of the study, she was married to an American man who was from a mixed Hawaiian and Chinese heritage background. Margarita and her husband both had college degrees and she reported a household income of between $80,001 and $100,000 in the year prior to data collection. They lived in a condominium in a middle class, urban neighborhood in southern California with their two children, a 9-year-old boy and a 6-year-old girl, Molly, who participated in this study. Margarita was very interested in participating in the study in part because she seemed to look forward to reflecting on the contrasts and similarities between the child rearing practices she engaged in with her children and those that she experienced as a child. Throughout our
conversations she often spoke of the customs and practices that she experienced as a child and contrasted them with mainstream ‘American’ practices and what her children experienced.

Margarita and her family lived in a busy, densely populated neighborhood where most of their neighbors were White, but their social network was racially and ethnically diverse. For our first interview, Margarita met us at her building’s entrance and was enthusiastic about getting started. The front door to their condominium was off of an open, central courtyard. Once inside she invited us to sit in the living area on the entry level. There were large sliding doors across the living area allowing bright sunlight to flood the room and a fireplace in the corner. Her living room was furnished with two sofas, a TV, a fish tank, and was filled with many toys, books, and games for the children.

Margarita’s children’s education was a prominent feature of her family life, yet she did not discuss her children’s education with the same detail and emphasis as Maite and Sara did. In contrast to Sara and Maite, Margarita did not have a language barrier to overcome when helping her children with her homework and she had experienced the American education system first hand. Margarita spoke about helping her children with their homework in a matter-of-fact way with little emphasis on the mechanics of how she was able to support her children. She valued the education her children were receiving and highlighted the school’s code of conduct, which was to be respectful, be responsible, be safe and be kind, when she spoke about their school.

Margarita reported supporting ideals related to an egalitarian perspective in conversations with Molly, but to a lesser degree than Sara and Maite (3.5, which was the bottom quartile of the sample). Additionally, Margarita did not link her children’s achievement of their goals through hard work and education to her children’s heritage at all. “Now for this one we talk about they can be whatever they want, but we don’t specify because of their heritage.” She said that she talked with her children in broader terms about achieving what they wanted in life, without mentioning heritage,
which she attributed in part to her children’s mixed racial and ethnic heritage and not wanting to privilege one aspect of their heritage over another.

For Margarita, conversations about racism or possible experiences of prejudice due to race or ethnicity had not occurred with Molly (1.33, which was in the bottom quartile of the sample). Margarita stated, “It hasn’t [come up]. What comes up is the bullying. That we talk about a lot.” As in Maite’s case, Margarita talked about unfair treatment with her daughter, but due to something other than race or ethnicity. Margarita reported that she did not avoid the topic of race (1.0=never), but conversations about race focused on treating others equally regardless of skin color rather than discussing racism directly. As with Sara, egalitarian and color-blind perspectives were somewhat blended for Margarita. In general, conversations about race and prejudice were imbued with egalitarian ideals and honored equal treatment regardless of skin color. Margarita stated, “We talk about skin color. ‘Cause we say you know we’re all the same. It doesn’t matter what color your skin is.” Disentangling egalitarian and color-blind messages was difficult in both Margarita and Sara’s cases.

The most salient feature of Margarita’s parenting was her careful consideration of what and how she taught her children about their multiple heritage cultures. From an outside perspective it seemed as if all of her cultural socialization practices were explicit in that they were planned and intentional. However, from her viewpoint, her socialization toward her Mexican heritage was more implicit (2.0, which placed Margarita in the bottom quartile of the sample) as compared with socialization messages related to their Hawaiian or Chinese heritage cultures. For example, beyond having more extensive contact with her family, her children spent each Friday afternoon and night at their Mexican grandmother’s house, her children also experienced the Mexican culture through their friendship network. “And our friends, a lot of our friends are Mexican. So they get to go I mean they go to the birthday parties and it’s full on Mexican… with arroz con leche (rice with milk).”
With respect to explicit socialization (1.0, the bottom quartile of the sample), Margarita felt that she did more to orient her children to their Hawaiian and Chinese heritage cultures. For example, when asked if she read books about Mexican culture or history with her daughter she explained that they had lots of books related to Chinese and Hawaiian culture, but none for her Mexican culture. She explained this saying, “I guess ’cause I figure we’re… well they’re living it [their Mexican heritage].” When asked if she ever told Molly to be proud of being of Mexican heritage Margarita said, “I don’t use the word proud. I just - to us it’s like a given. Like more who you are and there’s nothing, everybody’s different. To us yeah we more like… My kids are so mixed, and my husband is mixed and a lot of people we know are so mixed. We don’t like distinguish. Yeah… so we just it’s everything is more of general terms. Be proud of who you are.” Margarita’s family was the only case in my sample of a family with a mixed background across panethnic groups. Although the reasons behind her explicit cultural socialization practices were unique, that she engaged in extensive, explicit cultural socialization was not unique.

Conclusion

Sara, Maite, and Margarita’s cases present different constellations of parenting practices that align with similar goals for their children: obtaining a good education and learning to treat others fairly. Education was a primary focus of children’s daily lives in each of the cases, yet each mom ensured that her child completed homework and got the best education that they could in different ways. Sara had a highly structured homework routine that involved neighborhood children in some instances, while Maite shared big dreams with her son about his education and career and chose a charter school for him that was academically rigorous, but was more limited in how she could directly support his education due to her work schedule and limited English proficiency. Finally, Margarita did not talk as extensively about homework and help, just that it happened every night. This is not surprising possibly due to her familiarity with the American education system, fluency in
English, and the quality of her children’s school. To some extent Margarita’s education-related practices were implicit in the way that some cultural practices were implicit for Sara and Maite. For Sara and Maite in particular, high valuations of education seemed to fit well with their endorsement of egalitarian ideals.

Conversations with children about racism were infrequent in general. Out of the three, only Sara reported occasionally discussing the possibility of her son experiencing racism, while neither Maite nor Margarita had spoken to their children about possibly experiencing racial or ethnic prejudice. Prejudice or bias due to race or ethnicity seemed to be discussed in somewhat broad terms and was intertwined with messages that stressed equality in general. For example, Maite and Sara stressed equal treatment of others regardless of birthplace, weight, and disability. In a similar way, conversations about equality seemed to take on a color-blind perspective in some instances, yet in general mothers did not report that they avoided the topic of race with their children.

Finally, how heritage culture permeated the daily lives of these exemplar cases varied in some instances and was consistent in others. For example, for Sara and Maite speaking Spanish at home and eating ethnic foods were constant sources of implicit cultural socialization for their children. These practices were not evident in Margarita’s case. Margarita juggled teaching her children about three different heritage cultures. Because their Mexican heritage family was geographically closer and because their friendship network was largely comprised of Mexican heritage families, she regarded cultural socialization to her Mexican heritage as implicit and was explicit and intentional about teaching her children about their Chinese and Hawaiian heritage cultures. In all cases, familial support networks were important sources of cultural socialization. For Margarita, time spent with family on a weekly basis and for holidays and celebrations was essential in helping her children identify with their Mexican heritage. She provided less of the implicit cultural socialization at home than did Sara and Maite and therefore relied more on her family to support her children’s Mexican
identity development. For Maite too, her son’s connection with his grandparents and uncle, who lived with them, and his close relationships with his sisters in El Salvador were important in promoting a connection to El Salvador.

While the cases of Sara, Maite and Margarita illustrate varied patterns of parenting practices despite similar goals for their children, to what extent were these patterns replicated in the remainder of the sample? In the next section I present data to answer this question.

**Racial and Ethnic Socialization Practices in the Full Sample**

*Educated Children as a Parenting Goal*

The finding that Sara, Maite, and Margarita utilized varied strategies in support of their children’s education, was broadly observed throughout the full sample. Precisely how parents supported their children’s education took on multiple forms. Some families exercised their support for their children’s education through school choice by opting for charter schools in seven cases and private schools in six cases. Parents commonly expressed choosing charter or private schools over public schools because they felt the quality of education offered was better than in the public school system. Of the six private schools that families in my sample chose to enroll their children in, five were affiliated with the Catholic Church. These schools also reinforced families’ heritage culture in terms of religion and spirituality. Six children in the sample attended schools with bilingual Spanish-English immersion instruction models. For five of these families, the language barrier between the home language and school language was eliminated allowing parents to be more engaged in their children’s education. For the sixth family, the mother spoke English as her primary language, but enrolled in her son in a bilingual program specifically to provide a greater connection to their heritage culture.

Homework help was a standard feature of weekday routines for all families in my sample. However, the degree to which mothers and fathers could support their children’s homework
completion, particularly in the English language, varied. Parent literacy levels were also varied. In one case neither the mother nor the father had ever attended any formal schooling in their home country of El Salvador. This made homework help, even in Spanish, next to impossible, yet they found a solution part way through the school year and started sending their son to the after school program to get homework support there. Other solutions to homework help included text messaging family members, as in the case of Maite, relying on older siblings to help younger siblings, and hiring a tutor.

There was also variability in how mothers spoke with their children about the importance of education and hard work in achieving their dreams in the United States. Most commonly, mother’s simply stated that they talked frequently with their children about achieving what they wanted in life as a possibility in the United States. In many cases it was not clear if mothers were explicitly de-emphasizing, race or ethnicity while also promoting personal traits of education and hard work despite it being mentioned in the prompt. For example, Lilibeth, a Mexican immigrant mother of two stated that she often told her 7-year-old son Tomás that he could be anything he wanted to be saying, “Con frecuencia se lo digo. Como, ‘ay tu estás chiquita ahora pero en un futuro cuando ya estés más grande, tu quieres ser un abogado, vas a ser abogado, tu quieres ser un maestro, vas a ser un maestro. Tu puedes ser un Octavio Paz, un gran pintor.” (With frequency I tell him. Like, ‘hey you are little now, but in the future when you are bigger, you want to be a lawyer, you will be a lawyer, you want to be a teacher, you will be a teacher. You can be an Octavio Paz, a great painter.) In these cases mothers stated that opportunities were available to their children in the United States through hard work and education, yet it was not clear if they were thinking about race or ethnicity as potential barriers to their children’s success when they did so. In another example, Regina, a Salvadoran heritage, immigrant mother of two, said, “Cuando voy dejándolos a la escuela voy diciéndoles eso. Que tienen que estudiar mucho para ser profesionales, y que tienen que poner atención a la maestra, que ayudan a los niños que los necesitan. Y le pregunta
que quiere ser cuando está grande y me dice, ‘maestro.’” (When I go dropping them off at school I tell them that. That they have to study a lot to be professionals, and that they have to pay attention to the teacher, that they help the kids that need it. And I ask her what she wants to be when she is big and she tells me, ‘teacher.’) A few mothers like Sara, who referenced her “ugly neighborhood,” chose to turn features of their context, that could be considered potential barriers, into sources of motivation. For example, Luisana, a Mexican heritage, immigrant mother of three (discussed in detail in the next chapter), used her husband’s challenging work situation to underscore the importance of her children’s education. She stressed the importance of education with her children so that they would not be limited in their work opportunities and have to work multiple low-wage jobs as their father did.

Promotion of Egalitarian and Color-blind Perspectives and Silence about Race

In general, mothers in this sample reported frequently endorsing ideals related to an egalitarian perspective with their school-aged children ($M=4.19; SD=1.08$). Parents across the full sample endorsed equal treatment of others and that through hard work and education, their children could accomplish their goals. This did not vary substantially based on national heritage; Mexican and Salvadoran parents both reported talking with their children about education and hard work several times a week ($M = 4.37, SD = 0.88; M = 3.96, SD = 1.30$, respectively). As seen in the cases of Sara, Maite and Margarita, mothers wanted their children to treat others with respect mostly in broad, general terms, though sometimes with links to race. For example, Inez, a Mexican heritage immigrant mother explained, “Sí se lo platicamos aquí. Que hay que tratar a todos iguales aunque todos somos diferentes. Porque también ella me dice, ‘No oye es que yo hablo Español, hablo Inglés, ella no.’ Le digo, ‘Bueno todos somos diferentes.’ Y si les digo ‘Bueno claro tu tienes- sí vienes de una raza’ y si le digo osea, ‘Sí eres pero todos somos iguales.’” (Yes we talk about it here. That one has to treat all people the same even though we are all different. Because she also says to me, ‘No listen it’s that I speak Spanish, I speak English, and she
does not.’ I tell her, ‘Well we are all different.’ And yes I tell them, ‘Well of course you have- yes you come from a race’ and yes I tell her I mean, ‘Yes you are but we are all equal.’) In this example Inez does not report that they actually speak about unjust treatment due to race, rather she superficially acknowledges that there are different races, but emphasizes equal treatment of all people.

In some cases, mothers reported that color didn’t matter in their households or that discrimination was wrong, but these seemed to be issued as blanket statements without much attention to actual race relations. These cases seem to be linked to a color-blind perspective where equality was stressed and race and ethnicity were deemphasized. For example, a few mothers mentioned God and said that all people were children of God. In several instances, parents’ reasoning about equal treatment of others meant that they asked children not to notice skin color, which is also a direct promotion of a color-blind perspective. This blending of egalitarian ideals and a color-blind perspective as in Sara’s (presented previously) and Inez’s cases, resulted in missed opportunities to talk explicitly about prejudice and race relations. However, due to a strong focus on equality, parents, like Sara and Inez, likely felt they were addressing the issue of racism completely.

Heritage country was not a significant marker of difference in terms of mothers’ self-reported endorsement of a color-blind perspective where Mexican and Salvadoran mothers reported average levels of 3.60 ($SD = 1.50$) and 3.00 ($SD = 1.65$), respectively.

The majority of mothers in this sample reported that they did not ignore the topic of race; rather they discussed it when it arose and as needed (silence about race $M = 1.12$, $SD = 0.33$) with no significant variability in these types of ERS messages that was attributable to national heritage (Table 4). For example Mariela, a Salvadoran heritage immigrant mom said, “No nunca,” (No never) when asked if she avoided talking about race with her son. Sara stated about her Ernesto, “Si él tiene algo que preguntar él- es mejor explicar… explicar en el momento que lo pregunta y no estoy como con una tarea de estarle repitiendo a cada rato.” (If he has something to ask he- it’s better to explain… explain in the
moment what he asks and then I’m not like with a task to be repeating it each time.) Inez reported, “Pero no si ellas lo preguntan lo hablamos muy abiertamente.” (But if they ask about it we talk about it very openly.) To some extent egalitarian ideals and the promotion of a color-blind perspective were enmeshed for several participants in this study, yet, simultaneously mothers reported that they did not ignore the topic of race when their children brought it up.

Preparation for Bias

Conversations about racism and the possibility of experiencing prejudice and how to react or cope in that situation were not frequent among family members and their school-aged children in this sample \((M=2.43;\ SD=1.09)\), just as they were not prevalent in the cases of Sara, Maite, and Margarita. The prevalence of these types of conversations and ERS messages did not vary substantially by heritage country (Table 4). In part, this was due to the young age of many participant children. Several mothers expressed concern that their children were too young to understand the concepts of racism and prejudice. Regina, a Salvadoran mother of a 5-year-old girl, one of the youngest children in the sample, said the following about talking to her daughter about racism or unjust treatment due to race or skin color, “Pienso que ella todavía no lo capta bien. Tal vez puede entender que todos son iguales, pero creo que ella todavía no capta bien esa idea.” (I think that she still does not understand it well. Maybe she could understand that all are equal, but I think that she still does not understand that idea well.) Luisana, a Mexican immigrant, mother of three said that she would take her cues in discussing racism or bias from her daughter, “Yo pienso que si ellos le preguntan a uno es cuando uno debe de empezar a — porque ellos ya se están fijando en el problema que hay — porque está el problema y se fijan. Mientras no lo notan tanto, osea no lo hablan, quiere decir que todavía no están en eso. No están fijando en que colores.” (I think that if they ask you it is when you should start to- because they are already noticing the problem that there is – because there is a problem and they notice. While they do not notice it so much, I mean they do not talk about it that means that they still are not in that. They are not
focusing on what colors.) Other mothers in my sample simply stated that they did not engage in conversations about bias, but did not offer reasons as to why they did not. Finally, several mothers stated that they talked to their children about possibly being treated unfairly, but not due to their race or ethnicity. Rather they linked possible unfair treatment to more salient personal characteristics such as weight or disability status. For example Gaby mentioned that her son was teased due to his language issues, but that his Mexican heritage had not been a source of teasing so she had not discussed how to prepare for situations of bias due to race or ethnicity with him.

In one case, Laura, a Mexican heritage mother of a 6-year-old boy said that she spoke with her son frequently about situations of potential bias since her boyfriend was African American and her son had experienced negative comments when Laura first started dating him. In general, mothers seemed to be responsive to their children’s cues and most children did not frequently bring the topic of racism home due to young age or perhaps experiencing bias, but because of other features or characteristics, not race or ethnicity.

**Implicit and Explicit Cultural Socialization**

Finally, cultural socialization took on many different forms in this sample due to numerous factors, yet here too heritage country did not dramatically relate to the frequency with which families engaged in cultural socialization (Table 4). Most notably, what were implicit practices for some families were explicit for others. Implicit cultural socialization practices such as speaking Spanish at home, eating ethnic foods, celebrating holidays and birthdays, spending time with extended family networks, and attending religious services were common across several families ($M = 3.14, SD = 0.60$). In most cases each of these practices seemed to be implicit in families’ routines from the mothers’ perspective. However, for a few cases religion, language, social supports, or ethnic foods were sources of explicit cultural socialization such that these practices served as lessons through which children connected with their heritage culture.
Language was a prominent theme in the present study from both mothers’ and children’s perspective (discussed more in chapter 5). In some families language could be considered an explicit practice, but because of its prevalence in daily life in the majority of this sample, a key feature of implicit cultural socialization practices, it is discussed along with other implicit cultural socialization practices. The majority of mothers in this sample spoke Spanish to their children (74%; n=20), yet only 13 (48%) children spoke Spanish back to their mothers. Most of these Spanish-speaking women were immigrant mothers. Speaking Spanish and insisting on their children speaking Spanish presented conflict in some cases. For example, Ángela, a Salvadoran heritage, immigrant mother of two said, “Estoy en el conflicto con él porque él no quiere hablar casi Español. Él quiere hablar más Inglés. Yo aquí en la casa sí le prohíbo hablar Inglés.” (I am in conflict with him because he does not want to speak Spanish almost. He wants to speak English more. Here at home I forbid him from speaking English.) For two mothers in particular, language was an important socialization mechanism for connecting their children to the heritage cultures. Of the seven cases where mothers spoke English or a balanced mix of Spanish and English to their children, six were U.S.-born and one was Mexican-born but moved to the United States at a young age.

Ethnic or traditional foods were commonly served across the full sample (M=4.26; SD=0.71). Only four mothers reported eating ethnic food less than several times a week, eating typical heritage foods once a week. All others ate ethnic foods many times a week or daily. A few mothers went into great detail about the foods they ate including how they prepared them and what markets they could go to and get the best ingredients that most approximated ingredients in El Salvador or Mexico. Additionally, a few mothers gave the research team explicit directions regarding where to find the best Salvadoran and Mexican foods close to their homes.

Families mostly celebrated birthdays and national and religious holidays with traditional foods and extended family networks, yet there was also a noticeable blending of heritage traditions
with mainstream ‘American’ traditions at these events. For example, Margarita recognized how her family had incorporated Thanksgiving into their celebrations when she was a young girl saying, “So Thanksgiving we always get together also. We have tradition- [stopped herself] Now that, that evolved like in our culture we don’t do Thanksgiving it’s not a typical holiday. So it only started as I was older ’cause I was the one that told my family, my parents that like hey, ‘How come we don’t do this?’ And so we started doing it, but it wasn’t part of our culture.” Several families mentioned celebrating the traditional Mexican holidays of Day of the Dead and *Las Posadas.*

As in the cases of Sara, Maite and Margarita, for most of my sample, extended family networks were important sources of cultural socialization. In a few cases, participants chose not to spend too much time with their extended family, but getting together with family for holidays was common across most participants. In about a third of the sample, three generations of family lived in the same house or apartment so contact with extended family networks was constant.

For just under half of the families in my sample, weekly attendance at religious services was also a source of cultural socialization for their children. Mariela, a Salvadoran heritage, immigrant mother of two, commented that she wanted to start taking her children to church again because she that their beliefs were straying too far from her own saying, "*Fijate que lo he llevado, pocas veces,* … *Pensaba este domingo empezar otra vez porque sí los quiero llevar porque siento de que sí necesitan porque tienen una ideología diferente de la mía*” (You know I have taken him, a few times, … I was thinking this Sunday of starting again because yes I want to take them because I feel like they do need it because they have a different ideology from mine.) Ludin, a Mexican heritage, U.S.-born woman who was raised in Mexico explained in great detail how her children’s Catholic school provided the religious orientation that she felt represented her cultural heritage. She said, “*A veces este estamos tan ocupadísimos de lunes a viernes o de lunes a domingo que a veces las cosas religiosas pasan a tercer plano, pero quiero que ellos crezcan con esos valores y esas enseñanzas, es muy importante que conozcan también de su fe.*” (Sometimes we
are so super busy from Monday to Friday or from Monday to Sunday that sometimes the religious things are passed to third place, but I want them to grow up with those values and these teachings, it is very important that they know their faith too.) For others in my sample, religious services were a less frequent source of cultural socialization mostly related to holidays, yet it was still an esteemed component of families’ heritage cultures.

Explicit forms of cultural socialization were not common among participants in my sample ($M= 2.27; SD=0.80$) who most often cited limited opportunities as to why they did not, for example, take their children to cultural events or read books about their cultural heritage with their children. Travel to heritage countries was not an option for most mothers and their children in this sample due to financial constraints and in a few cases immigration status. Six children had been to their heritage country in my sample, while several expressed interest in going.

**Conclusion**

To a large extent, mothers in my sample organized their daily routines to support the educational goals that they held for their children and sought to teach their children about treating others respectfully and fairly regardless of a host of characteristics including race and ethnicity. In several cases, mothers’ socialization messages served multiple, sometimes conflicting purposes, particularly in terms of messages related to egalitarian and color-blind perspectives. Conversations related to preparation for bias were limited, which is not surprising given the ages of children included in the current study. Cultural socialization was present to some extent in all households, yet specific practices varied across participant dyads. Interestingly, what might be considered implicit cultural socialization in some families was viewed as explicit cultural socialization in others. Across the full sample, variability in the prevalence of some practices was evident as was variability in parents’ reasoning behind why they chose to engage or not in particular practices. In the following
section, I explore what features of families’ contexts account for some of this variability in ERS practices.
CHAPTER 4. CONTEXTUAL FACTORS RELATED TO PARENTAL ETHNIC AND RACIAL SOCIALIZATION

In the prior section I presented data documenting variability in Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families’ parenting practices even in the presence of complimentary goals and values for their school-aged children. In this chapter, I explore the contextual factors that influenced parenting practices and ERS. Salient factors in this study that impacted parent-child interactions included parental work (both wages and work schedules), informal social supports, and neighborhood composition. Not only did constraints due to parental work, social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition influence the time and resources parents could invest in their children, but each of these also provided specific examples of interactions and events for parents or children that sparked conversations related to heritage and race relations. Furthermore, variability in parenting could not be attributed to one single contextual factor. Rather, it was a series of contextual factors that intersected and worked in concert to influence parenting practices and family routines.

After briefly discussing how the identified themes are intertwined, I then present three cases in depth to illustrate how work, social supports, immigrant trajectories, and neighborhood composition influence parenting practices and then assess the extent to which the three selected cases represent the overall sample.

Interrelatedness of Themes

The themes explored in this section -- income, parental work schedules, informal social support networks, immigration pathways, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition -- are intertwined, simultaneously exerting influence on each other and on families in dynamic ways. They cannot be isolated one from the other in actuality. For example, employment and income are related to each other such that changes in one correspond with changes in the other. Similarly income, immigrant generation, and neighborhood characteristics are intertwined in families’ lives.
While contextual factors that are explored in this section are interrelated, there were instances when particular facets of family life were at the forefront, outweighing the influence of other aspects of a family’s life. For example, income and work exerted somewhat distinct influences on Maite’s life when she changed jobs. Maite had recently changed jobs and transitioned from working nights to working traditional daytime hours. For the first time since her son was born she had the time to help her son in the evenings with homework, get him ready for bed, etc., which she had not been able to do with her prior job. While income and work were still related in Maite’s life, the change in work schedule meant more for her family and her son than any change in income associated with the switch.

Parenting practices and children’s lives are not decontextualized. Context is a complex array of factors that influence families’ lives in dynamic ways. However, for analytic purposes, it is useful to treat each of these themes individually, as I discuss them below, for simplicity. In several instances, examples that are used to illustrate one theme are also used to illustrate another to highlight the reality that life is not as clean as a series of analytic variables.

Three Exemplar Cases that Illustrate How Context Influences Parenting

Mariela

Mariela is a 40-year-old Salvadoran heritage woman who immigrated to the United States fleeing El Salvador due to threats to her safety, in her early twenties. In the United States, she was reunited with her parents and not long after arriving here, met her long-term partner, also a Salvadoran heritage immigrant. The couple had two children. She and her family, including her 8-year-old son, Martin who was included in this study, lived in a low-income, mostly Latino neighborhood in southern California. They lived in a one-bedroom apartment. During the summer prior to data collection, Mariela and her family were forced out of their apartment unexpectedly. Their housing situation had been somewhat unstable since then. They had been living temporarily in
a “borrowed” apartment and were unsure of when and where they would find a more permanent housing solution.

Around the time of the housing upheaval Mariela’s husband lost his job for a period of several weeks, but was working as a driver at the time of data collection. Mariela had worked as a housekeeper for one family consistently for several years, yet with two low-wage jobs the family struggled to make ends meet. She reported an annual income during the year prior to data collection of between $20,001 and $30,000. Mariela had sent remittance dollars to El Salvador for years, but had recently stopped due to a family argument. She received many gifts from her boss, which helped her to add extra comforts into her family life such as a skateboard and a guitar for her son and a natural Christmas tree for the family for the first time ever. Still, the financial strain of having to move combined with lost wages due to her husband’s unemployment was evident.

Similar to most families in my sample, Mariela and her partner gave importance to her children’s education and sent them to a highly regarded private school that offered financial aid to make it possible. Martin was learning in both Spanish and English at school and Mariela joked that his Spanish was better, more formal and proper, than her own. Regarding cultural socialization, Mariela stated that she did not do anything specifically related to El Salvador that would make her children aware of their heritage culture and reported lower than average levels of implicit cultural socialization (2.5) and about average levels of explicit cultural socialization (2.25). When I spoke with her about participating in the study she thought Martin would not have much knowledge of his heritage culture and that he would not identify with ‘Salvadoran’ as a personal descriptor. However, once she enrolled in the study, she mentioned that her son was very curious to know more about El Salvador. “… [Martin] quiere saber mucho de El Salvador a pesar que no nació allá quiere saber de El Salvador. De playas, de lugares turísticos, de como son los niños, como como andan en la calle, como son los perros, todo lo que no tiene que ver nada con acá.” (… he [Martin] wants to know a lot of El Salvador even though he
wasn’t born there he wants to know of El Salvador. Of beaches, the touristy places, how the kids are, how how people walk in the street, how the dogs are, everything that doesn’t have anything to do with here.) For Mariela, her son’s curiosity about El Salvador was somewhat of a mystery. She felt that she did not engage in any explicit cultural socialization practices that would draw his attention to being Salvadoran. However, the implicit cultural socialization practices that she did engage in with Martin such as speaking Spanish and eating Salvadoran foods, combined with their social support networks and neighborhood context, were enough to teach Martin about his Salvadoran roots.

Most of Mariela’s family, her parents and 9 of her 10 brothers and sisters and their children, lived somewhat close to her in southern California. When they gathered for important holidays, like Thanksgiving, it was always a large group, about 30 people, at one of Mariela’s older sister’s homes:

“So ella [hermana mayor] es la que prepare el pavo, y ella prepara bueno prepara pavo por la tradición de acá y el esposo de ella pues es blanco es gabacho entonces el señor come pavo, pero la mayoría de nosotros estamos con que hagamos una gallina también. So estamos con la gallina con panes con gallina y esa es la comida de nosotros. Si con la salsa sí. Hacemos los panes, le bebamos la ensalada, el berro, el la lechuga, el tomate, el rabano al pan grandote le metemos el pollo con la salsa y ese es la comida de nosotros. Pero pues la gente de acá celebra diferente es el pavo, es el pedacito de pavo, el gravy, y todo eso. So sí está y allí varios de mis hermanos que están con que ‘ay mira da me de los dos, dame dos platos.’”

(So she [older sister] is the one who prepares the turkey and she prepares well she prepares turkey because of the tradition from here and her husband well he’s White he’s gabacho so the mister eats turkey, but the majority of us are with the idea that we should make a chicken too. So we are with the chicken with chicken sandwiches and that’s our food. Yes, with the sauce, yes. We make the sandwiches, we put on the salad, and the watercress, the lettuce, the tomato, the radish, on the big bread and we put in the chicken with the sauce and that is our food but well the people here celebrate differently it is the turkey, the little piece of turkey, the gravy, and all that. So yes it is there and several of my brothers are with that ‘hey look give me both, give me two plates.’)

In this case, foods, holiday celebrations and social support networks were sources of cultural socialization for Mariela’s children. While family gatherings were not frequent, they were likely significant for Martin since many people were present and Salvadoran and American traditions were
juxtaposed with each other. This contrast likely made his heritage culture more salient to him.

Beyond important holidays, Mariela limited her interactions with her extended family to some extent. She mentioned that she was wary of leaving her children with family members whose friends she did not know or trust, but in emergencies, Mariela did count on her mother to help out with caring for her children. In addition, Mariela laughed about how she liked to celebrate her children’s birthdays saying, “Los cumpleaños – los cumpleaños siempre somos solos. Siempre estamos un siempre yo, yo soy de las que piensa de que un cumpleaños tu le das de comer a la gente y la gente luego habla de ti cualquier cosa. Yo en la gente, la gente Salvadoreña así es. Bueno yo pienso que la mayoría. Vas y invitas y por más bonita que está tu mesa y tu comida, la gente siempre termina hablando algo mal. Entonces yo digo, no.” (Birthdays - birthdays we are always alone. We are always, um always I, I am one of those who thinks that at a birthday you give people food and after people say anything about you. I un- the people, the Salvadoran people are like that. Well, I think the majority. You go and invite people and however pretty your table and food are, the people always end up saying something bad. So I say no.) Mariela displayed a somewhat reserved attitude toward hosting Salvadorans in this recounting, but she also stressed her enjoyment of large celebrations at other family members’ homes for big holidays like Mother’s Day. Beyond familial social supports, her friendship network consisted of Salvadoran heritage and other Latino heritage individuals. Social encounters with these friends likely reinforced aspects of her cultural socialization practices with Martin.

Mariela’s neighborhood context was also congruent with the implicit socialization to Salvadoran culture that she exposed her children to since they lived in a predominantly Latino neighborhood. For example, Mariela spoke almost exclusively Spanish when she was doing errands in their community and she often bought pupusas at a local spot for a quick weeknight dinner. From Mariela’s perspective features of her daily life did not stand out as significant sources of cultural socialization for Martin likely due to the congruence in practices that she found in her community
and social networks. She recognized that their home language environment and the foods they ate were not typical for mainstream ‘American’ culture. However, they were also not significant sources of cultural socialization because they did not stand out as unique in her context where most people (family, friends, and neighbors) engaged in similar practices.

Inez

Inez is a Mexican heritage woman, age 45, who immigrated to the United States in her early thirties. At the time of the study, she was married to a Mexican heritage man who immigrated to the United States as a teenager. They lived with their two daughters, ages 7 (Rocío, who was included in the study) and 9, in an ethnically and racially diverse, upper middle-class neighborhood in southern California. Similar to Mariela, Inez was a little nervous about participation in the study, joking that she didn’t know if they had anything of interest to share with the research team. Our first interview took place on a hot day and Inez was waiting with lemonade and pastries on a serving tray to welcome the research team into her home.

Inez was a full-time mom and did not work outside of the home for pay. Her husband worked in management at a technology company during standard business hours and their life seemed economically stable. She reported her household income was more than $150,001 in the year prior to data collection. They owned their home in a neighborhood that was clean and appeared to be safe with no bars on windows and open front yards with well-kept gardens. Her home was in an exclusively residential neighborhood although businesses and stores were not far away. All of the nearest billboards and restaurants and store signs were in English. Their home was clean and decorated in coordinated furnishings with several Mexican artifacts displayed in a formal sitting area, where the parent interview took place. Rocío was interviewed outside in the backyard at a table in a shaded spot.
Like each family case that has been presented, Inez and her husband had a goal of educated children and structured their lives to support their daughters’ education. The girls attended a private, religious school that the parents felt embodied the values they hoped to instill in their children, while maintaining an adequate level of academic rigor. Also, similar to other families in my sample, Inez and her husband’s high valuation of education was reflected in their frequent endorsement of ideals related to an egalitarian perspective (4.5, higher than the sample mean), “A trabajar y estudiar - que aquí todo se puede.” (To work and study - here you can do everything.) Finally, Inez, like other mothers in my sample, did not frequently discuss racism or prepare her child for potential situations of discrimination based on race or ethnicity (2.66, slightly higher than sample mean of 2.43, $SD = 1.09$). However, she did not avoid the topic of race and when she did discuss issues like racism with Rocio, Inez stressed the importance of treating people equally, despite people being different and unique.

The most salient features of Inez’s context that impacted her ERS practices were her social support networks and the racial and ethnic composition of her neighborhood. When I asked Inez about cultural socialization, specifically what she taught her children about their heritage culture and how she taught them, her response varied from that of Mariela. Inez spoke of the many ways in which their Mexican heritage culture permeated their daily lives as well as the intentional ways in which she and her husband tried to build and strengthen their children’s affective ties to Mexico. Her reported levels of implicit cultural socialization (4.0) placed her in the top quartile of the sample while her reported levels of explicit cultural socialization (2.25) were about average for the sample. That her daughters knew they were of Mexican heritage and felt some sense of pride about their heritage was important to her.

The features of Inez’s daily life that stood out to her as uniquely Mexican were obvious to her because she had more constant contact with individuals from other cultural backgrounds as
compared with Mariela. In some sense Inez had to work harder than Mariela to infuse her heritage culture into Rocío’s life since they did not live in a Latino neighborhood and her family lived in Mexico. Inez was almost swimming upstream to inject her heritage culture into the dominant, mainstream ‘American’ environment that her children were immersed in outside of the home. Perhaps in reaction to this, inside the home was full of Mexican artifacts, Spanish was their home language, they ate mostly Mexican foods, and they were in close and constant contact with her husband’s family that lived in the same neighborhood such that their social life echoed family life in Mexico. Despite Inez’s family living in Mexico, she saw them several times a year either when family members came to the United States or when Inez took her children to visit Mexico in summers for an extended period of time. Those summer trips were full of family time with Rocío’s aunts, uncles, and cousins. Inez’s husband’s family lived in the United States, all within several blocks of each other. They spent significant amounts of time with her in-laws on the weekends and for holidays and celebrations. She stated that most of the family gatherings were held at her house since she was the Mexican heritage woman of her generation. “Me toca a mi mucha. Y realmente yo creo que tiene que ver con que soy la Mexicana.” (It’s my turn a lot. And really I think it has to do with my being the Mexican.) She implied that she knew how to host events in an appropriate way that her husband’s family enjoyed because she was Mexican while her sister-in-law was not. Travel, religion, holidays, family celebrations, and spending time with extended family were all essential components of their children’s implicit and explicit cultural socialization. This was necessary given their neighborhood context and somewhat dispersed social support network with lots of family still in Mexico. In addition, Inez and her husband were able to provide their children with these opportunities due to their stable economic situation and immigration status.

The way in which mainstream ‘American’ culture was incorporated into Inez’s life was somewhat seamless. Being American and living in the U.S. were very important to Inez’s husband
since he had served in the U.S. armed forces. This translated into elaborate celebrations for the 4th of July and Veteran’s Day with family BBQ’s. While for other families in my sample mainstream ‘American’ traditions were a point of contrast with their own, for Inez, they were also a part of her life. This was in part also related to her higher SES and racially and ethnically diverse neighborhood as compared with other families included in this study. Clearly in Inez’s life, SES, informal social supports, neighborhood context and immigrant trajectory worked in concert to shape the racial and ethnic socialization practices that she engaged in with Rocío.

Luisana

Luisana is a 35-year-old Mexican heritage woman who immigrated to the United States when she was 17. She and her husband, who was also of Mexican heritage and had immigrated to the United States when he was 16, lived with their three children in an apartment in a low-income neighborhood in southern California. Luisana and her husband had both studied partway through elementary school in Mexico and she reported that her household income was between $10,001 and $20,000 in the year prior to data collection. Luisana was warm and welcoming to the research team and had opened her home for us to conduct interviews with two other friends of hers who were eligible and interested in participating. Initially, she appeared to be nervous, but her nerves seemed to subside as she laughed and cried as she recounted her daily life. Her youngest daughter, Ariela was included in the study and was 6 years old, a first grader, at the time of the study. Ariela had two older brothers, ages 11 and 17.

Luisana’s apartment was located in a small complex where the majority of residents were of Latino heritage. There was a group of about five families at the apartment complex whose children played together frequently and the mothers seemed to be friends. These families were all from Mexico and Central America. The complex was located in racially and ethnically mixed neighborhood where business signs were written in a mix of Spanish, English, and Korean. Ariela’s
school was ethnically and racially diverse too where the dominant non-English language was Korean, not Spanish.

The most salient aspect of contextual factors influencing Luisana’s parenting was how her husband’s work situation impacted their interactions with Ariela. Luisana’s husband worked two low-wage, part-time jobs to make ends meet and was hardly home to spend time with his family both during the week and on weekends. Luisana was responsible for home life including caring for the children, cooking and cleaning. She also took English classes during the day.

Luisana struggled to describe a typical weekday routine and then spoke of the exception of Tuesday evenings with tears in her eyes saying:

“Los martes a veces también porque mi esposo tiene su día libre entonces disfrutamos como salir un poquito más este… como salir de la rutina de la semana un poquito, convivir en familia…. Los martes es más como mis hijos este en semana no miran a su papá porque él por lo mismo que tiene sus dos trabajos él este tiene que nada más el día que lo pueden ver dos horas más porque pues van a la escuela y lo pueden ver un ratito más en la mañana y en la mediodía entre cuando llegan de la escuela salimos a comer, disfrutamos un ratito en el parque.”

(Tuesdays sometimes too because my husband has his day off so we enjoy going out a little more… like breaking our weekly routine a little, spend time together as a family… Tuesdays are more since my kids don’t see their father during the week because he for the same that he has his two jobs he has to it’s just the day they can see him two more hours because they go to school and they can see him a little bit in the morning and at mid-day between when they get home from school and we go to eat, we enjoy the park a little while.)

Due to low wages, Luisana’s husband had to work two jobs as a waiter and as a cashier at a gas station and as a result the children did not get to see their father much. Luisana was visibly upset by this situation and it did not go unnoticed by Ariela. Luisana mentioned, “Ella mire dice, ‘mami porque mi papi trabaja todo el día?’ Le digo porque él no estudió, no tuvo la oportunidad.” (She asks me, ‘mommy, why does my daddy work all day?’ I tell her that he didn’t study, he didn’t have the opportunity.) Luisana had educational goals for her children, like all families in my sample. Her husband’s work situation resulted in her frequent endorsement of egalitarian ideals (5.0, daily). She encouraged Ariela to achieve higher education levels than she and her husband did so that they
would not be limited in their work options in the future. Besides helping with homework, one way in which Luisana was involved in her daughter’s education was by volunteering at her school once a week. She wanted her daughter to be proud of having her mom in her classroom.

Luisana’s husband’s work impacted other aspects of their ERS practices as well. Luisana reported talking about race relations frequently with her older children. Ariela was often privy to these conversations despite them not being directed at her. When asked if she talked about racism with Ariela, Luisana responded, “Le voy a decir. Todos los días lo hablamos aquí porque mi esposo donde el trabaja este convive todos los días con gente de la raza negro, morenito… Entonces siempre es tema de conversación cuando o a veces que estamos platicando … o sale a la conversación que mi esposo me lo platica a mí y yo converso a mi hijo entonces ella lo escucha y ya sale a la conversación de que no deberíamos de tener diferencias.” (I am going to tell you. We talk about it every day here because my husband, where he works, he spends time with people from the black race, morenito… So it is always a topic of conversation when or sometimes that we are talking… or it comes up in conversation that my husband chats about it to me and I converse with my son so she [Ariela] hears it and it comes up in conversation that we should not have differences.) At the same time Luisana reported that they did not have conversations with Ariela about what to do if she ever experienced prejudice based on her ethnic heritage. Her composite score for preparation for bias, was 2.67, which as the median response for the full sample. Luisana’s case exemplifies how her husband’s daily context at work influenced ERS interactions with Ariela at home.

**Conclusion**

The cases of Mariela, Inez, and Luisana illustrate the ways in which ERS practices were influenced by contextual factors including parental work, social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition. In many respects Mariela and Luisana’s cases contrasted with Inez’s situation due to the differing constraints that SES (both income and parental work), social supports,
and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition placed on them. However, similarities in implicit cultural socialization practices emerged across the three families. Each family spoke Spanish at home, ate mostly traditional ethnic foods and had contact with family members with varying degrees of frequency. Because Mariela’s family lived in an ethnic enclave with mostly Latino heritage families, there were additional sources of cultural socialization surrounding them at all times due to their neighbors and local restaurants, shops, and markets. A similar situation was evident for Luisana despite her living in a more diverse neighborhood. There still seemed to be a critical mass of Spanish speakers and Mexican heritage individuals such that many of her families’ practices were reinforced in their community. In contrast, Inez’s family did not have this added layer of community-based cultural socialization due to the diversity of her neighborhood and her child’s school. In some respects this made speaking Spanish, eating Mexican foods, and frequent contact with family more explicit in nature than those same practices were for Mariela and Luisana.

*Explicit* cultural socialization practices differed across these three families, largely as a function of socioeconomic status, but also due to immigration experience and the proximity of family. For example, Inez’s family had the financial resources and immigrant status that allowed them to take annual vacations in Mexico and promote ties with her family members who lived there. Mariela and Luisana’s families did not have the financial resources and immigration status was not clear, so it is possible that international travel was not possible. In Mariela’s case, she had fled El Salvador due to violence, so returning was perhaps not feasible safety reasons.

Finally, parents’ work situations impacted the time they could spend with their children and sparked conversations about race relations in Luisana’s case. Intense work schedules and low wage jobs also motivated Luisana’s emphasis of the importance of education with her children. Parental work (both wages and work schedules), informal social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition intersected to influence the parenting practices of Marcila, Inez, and Luisana.
For each case, which contextual feature mattered most for family life differed, yet each contextual feature explored previously mattered in some way for each family.

**Contextual Factors Influencing ERS Across the Full Sample**

In this section, I relate the experiences of Mareila, Inez, and Luisana to findings based on the full sample to assess the extent to which these three cases are representative of the other mothers interviewed as part of this study.

**The Constraints of Irregular Work Schedules and Low Wages**

The constraints that parents’ work placed on families’ daily routines was evident in several interviews with mothers in my sample. Children did not talk often about their parents’ work, but the challenges mothers faced with either their own or their husband’s non-traditional schedules including juggling multiple jobs and low remuneration were palpable in many cases. Non-traditional schedules, in particular, were sources of stress and tension for 4 Salvadoran-heritage families, and 2 Mexican-heritage families, with implications for their children’s daily lives due to limited time with one or both parents.

Elena was a single mother who immigrated from El Salvador to the United States when she was 24 years old. She had a 10-year-old son at the time of the study and was raising him on her own. Elena worked 7 nights a week at a *pupusería* (Salvadoran restaurant) that was walking distance from her apartment. Every afternoon around 5:00 PM Elena left her son with a trusted babysitter who lived in the same apartment complex until she returned home around midnight. Sometimes she left her son sleeping all night at the babysitter’s to avoid waking him up, but other nights she brought him home. Elena spoke of her work with appreciation, but acknowledged how challenging it was to manage single-motherhood and work due to her non-traditional schedule. When asked, Elena mentioned that she rarely took her son on outings, “*A veces… casi casi no fin de semana muy raro porque como paso bien cansada.*” (Sometimes… almost almost no on weekends rarely because I am so tired.)
Her son also noted Elena’s full work schedule saying of a past outing to the movies, “But it was fun because we actually, I actually spend time with my mom and I really don’t because she is always like working.” Elena’s work schedule limited many of her interactions with her son beyond outings even including more mundane routine activities like homework help. However, Elena taught her son about her Salvadoran heritage implicitly by speaking Spanish at home and eating ethnic foods on a daily basis. In addition, Elena lived in a Latino dominant neighborhood where her closest friends and neighbors were of Latino heritage thereby reinforcing aspects of her home culture in the broader community. Elena provided the sole financial support for her son and herself and also sent remesas (remittances) home to El Salvador to her ill mother. She had to work and while her hours were not ideal and she didn’t have much family nearby, she did have sufficient social supports (explored below) to make it functional.

Pati (introduced on page 1) another Salvadoran immigrant and mother of three children ages 14, 13, and 7, faced dramatic challenges in her family life due to her irregular work schedule. Pati’s home situation was particularly difficult, largely due to the late nights she worked cleaning a health clinic weekday evenings from 5:00 PM to 3:30 AM. Her family life was further impacted by a lack of social supports making her work schedule almost unbearable and resulting in the most chaotic family life of my study participants. When we arrived to her apartment for both interviews, Pati was still sleeping since she had arrived home just hours before. At our first interview I expressed concern that the interview was imposing too much of a burden on her weekend, but she laughed and said she was glad to be up since she and her older children were trying to get tickets to a show at a near-by theater that morning. Pati’s house was disorganized and dirty and she seemed embarrassed for us to see the apartment as she started to pick things up. There were empty soda cans, mounds of clothing, dirty dishes, garbage and stuff strewn over each area of the apartment that we could see. We moved outside and continued with our interview there. At multiple points during our conversations her
work came up and she expressed concern that she could no longer spend time with her children in
the afternoons saying, “Mi meta es buscarme otro trabajo. Porque yo soy de las mamás que me gusta andar
participando con mis hijos. Por ejemplo en la tarde cuando vengan, salir a caminar, irnos al parque, andar explorando
con ellos pues entonces yo extraño todo eso. Entonces para mi todo eso es muy- me pongo a pensar le digo los niños, el
trabajo…” (My goal is to look for another job. Because I am one of those moms who likes to
participate with my kids. For example in the afternoon when they arrive, go out walking, go to the
park, explore with them so I miss all that. So for me all of this is very- I start to think I tell you the
kids, work…) Pati was worried about the obvious toll it was taking on her and her children
especially because she felt that she didn’t have the support from her husband to keep things
functional at home. She said that she was the only one who took the kids out, and the weekend was
the time to do it. So despite working late nights, she was determined to get them out and do
something on the weekend like go to the park, see a free concert, go to a mall or just walk around.

The cases of Pati and Elena were especially challenging. Social supports had a protective
influence in Elena’s case yet further exacerbated the circumstances in Pati’s situation. Four other
families also faced the challenges of raising families while working non-standard hours. For Lilibeth,
a Mexican mother of 2 boys, working in the evenings meant constant telephone calls and text
messages to her boys while she was at work in the evenings to make sure that homework was getting
done and the boys got to bed on time. Lilibeth was careful to leave food prepared in the evening
such that her husband or her mother would only have to serve the food and get the children to bed.
Marleny, a Mexican heritage mother of 2, struggled to balance her work, her husband’s work, which
was most evenings and on weekends, and household care for her children, but she could rely on her
mother-in-law for help with dinners. Hazel and Andrea, both Salvadoran heritage mothers who were
born in the United States to immigrant parents, worked weekends in retail; one at Costco and the
other in her family-owned flower shop. Working weekends was stressful and meant time away from
their children and families, but both women had higher household incomes than the families of Elena and Pati and they also had extended family networks to draw on for support. In the case of Hazel, her job at Costco meant such long hours that her mother-in-law, Camila, actually participated in the interviews since they lived together and the mother-in-law did most of the child care for her 9-year-old granddaughter who participated in the study. For each of these families, non-standard work schedules meant reduced time and limited interactions with their children. This influenced racial and ethnic socialization and other parenting practices since special activities like attending a cultural event or celebrating holidays were often not possible. However, informal social support systems interacted with parents’ work schedules to exacerbate or alleviate already stressful situations.

Challenges arose for additional families in my sample who earned low wages. In some two-parent households, the father worked particularly long hours or multiple jobs and the mothers stayed at home taking on the household and child rearing duties (similar to Luisana). In other cases, the mothers also worked outside of the home thereby supplementing the family’s income. In all cases social support networks mattered for how low wages impacted family functioning either by living with extended family or relying on family for child care.

For families with fewer social supports, it was common for the husband to work outside of the home and for the mother to work at home and care for the children. This was evident in six households in my sample. Gaby, a Mexican heritage mother of 2 young boys and her husband divided work by her being responsible for everything at home, while he worked for pay outside of the home. Gaby’s husband worked as a day laborer and was typically gone 6:30 AM – 8:30 PM Tuesday - Sunday. The strain of low-income status was exacerbated by her older son’s special needs related to speech and language; he did not start speaking until he began speech therapy at age 3 and still had difficulties with pronunciation and verbal expression at the time of their study participation. Gaby expressed that she and her husband were not satisfied with his work situation, but for now it
was the only option. According to Gaby, her husband equated his work style of waiting on the street looking for jobs as “como las putas en México” (like the whores in Mexico) and they hoped for something better in the future. Similarly, other fathers in these six families worked long hours in low-wage jobs, such as in construction, as drivers or waiters, while mothers were responsible for food preparation, taking care of the children, homework help, interfacing with schools, housework and healthcare with dads pitching in at home when they could. Beatriz, a Mexican heritage mother of five reflected on her morning and afternoon routines during the week and said, “Basically almost all the time it’s me.”

For other families in my sample, the balancing act of work and family life was threatened on a weekly basis by hectic, regular, full-time schedules for both the mother and the father in two-parent families (like Marleny) or full-time studies in the case of one single mother. Consistent with prior cases, social support networks were important for these families too in alleviating the stress of full-time work with child care demands.

**Family Networks and Social Supports**

The social supports that families in my sample relied on, both familial and non-relative, were essential in sustaining their daily routines not only by making work and often low levels of income manageable with elementary school-aged children, but also in giving mothers important psychological support. There was heterogeneity in my sample in the levels of social support that mothers and families had. Not surprisingly, fewer supports co-occurred with more chaotic home environments and more stress for mothers. Only four families in my study did not have family nearby and of those, only two did not have other friends who they could rely on.

Family supports also mattered for cultural socialization because they reinforced traditional cultural practices and values in many cases. For example, grandparents often only spoke Spanish, which reinforced their grandchildren’s Spanish language abilities. Similarly at large, multi-generation
family gatherings, the grandmothers often knew the traditional recipes such as making tamales at Christmas in Margarita’s case.

Pati, Elena, and Gaby were the three cases of women who did not have substantial social supports at home, which exacerbated the challenges of their families’ work situations. Pati’s case was described in detail, and her husband’s lack of engagement with their family life was pushing her to contemplate separation. Gaby, who was also described above in terms of her husband’s extended work schedule as a day laborer also stood out as having fewer than typical social supports in my sample. However, Gaby did not work outside of the home as Pati and Elena did. As a result, Pati and Elena struggled to sustain their families’ daily routines in ways that Gaby did not.

Two other women in my sample mentioned that they did not have family support nearby, but they each found tremendous support in close friends who helped make their daily lives acceptable. In contrast to Gaby and Pati, these two women were single parents so perhaps the additional need to have some sort of support in emergencies forced them to seek out close friends. Elena, a Salvadoran heritage mother of one, (introduced above) worked nights as a waitress at the local pupusería. Elena had a few key friends and one relative (her son’s aunt from his biological fathers’ side) that made her routine sustainable. For example, her babysitter, who had cared for her son for 8 years, was indispensible. The babysitter was like family to Elena and her son, who called the babysitter mamá and the babysitter’s husband papá. In addition, her boss proved to be a valuable source of support for her son both financially and affectively. He threw her son a birthday party each year at the pupusería. Finally her son’s aunt took him on the weekends when Elena worked. While Elena’s day-to-day routine was certainly challenging, the way she made it work was with the support of some key friends and her boss who helped her in emergencies and promoted her psychological well-being.
Similar to Elena, Ariadna was a single mom of Mexican heritage and a full-time graduate student with an 8-year-old son, a 20-year-old daughter and an infant granddaughter. Ariadna was close with her family, but all of her family lived in other states so she was alone with her son in southern California. When I asked Ariadna how she celebrated special occasions like birthdays or holidays she immediately responded, with her local family. Her son was reading nearby but chimed in at the time and named all of his “tías” and “tíos” or close family friends who were considered family. She was very intentional about building a network of friends who could substitute for her family to some extent since they lived far away. She also signed her son up for the Big Brothers program to make sure that he had additional male family-like friends involved in his life. By seeking out friends to provide essential social supports, Ariadna was able to craft a sustainable life routine that offered her the psychological support needed to balance graduate school and motherhood without family close by.

The remaining participants in my sample did have family living close to them and for the most part relied on family for child care, emotional supports, and celebrations of holidays and special occasions. In nine cases, three generations were found residing in the same home, sometimes also with aunts, uncles, and cousins of the child participants in my study. In these families, both single and married mothers were afforded a degree of flexibility in their work and social schedules that the 4 women described above did not have. For example, two Salvadoran heritage participants were sisters living in the same home with their complete families, their mother, and one of the sister’s mother- and father-in-law. Child care was a distributed responsibility at times such that one sister could take on the other’s children or sometimes grandparents stepped in. In another multi-generation Mexican heritage household, Alma, mother of 3 was able to work and endure a long daily commute because she had her parents to help her with her children at home. Lilibeth, a Mexican
heritage mother of 2, lived with her mother who often helped put her children to bed if her husband was not available since she worked evenings.

Other families in my sample did not live in the same households as their family, but lived close enough to have weekly engagements and much of their social life revolved around their families. Beatriz, the young Mexican-heritage mother of five mentioned that she didn’t have many close friends, but all of her family members lived close by and they spent weekends together socializing, playing soccer with the kids, and celebrating birthdays and special occasions. Just three mothers in my sample lived close to family but preferred not to depend on them or socialize with them to a great extent, although did enjoy large family celebrations together.

**Neighborhood Ethnic and Racial Composition**

There was substantial variability in my sample in where and what kinds of housing families had. Several families were living in predominantly Latino, low-income neighborhoods, yet some in more urban and others more suburban areas. Other families lived in lower-income yet somewhat ethnically and racially diverse areas and a few families lived in middle class to affluent neighborhoods that tended to be racially and ethnically diverse. These varied contexts mattered for cultural socialization and likely for children’s ethnic and racial identities. Neighborhood context influenced the extent to which being of Salvadoran or Mexican heritage was salient for mothers and children and impacted mothers’ felt need to explicitly socialize their children to their heritage culture.

Ten families in my sample lived in what might be considered ethnic enclaves, surrounded by families from Latin American countries, often Mexico. Most of these mothers and their partners (when present) were immigrants as well. The racial and ethnic composition of these neighborhoods was largely confounded with low-income status. In these neighborhoods, billboards and store signs were usually in Spanish, local restaurants served Mexican, Salvadoran or Guatemalan foods and were
named after small towns in those countries (e.g., Pupusería Sacatecoluca Abojo) and the majority of their
eighbors were from Mexico or Central America. The parent generation in these communities spoke
Spanish almost exclusively when out and about in the community doing errands. One Saturday
morning I arrived with my research assistant to conduct a second interview with Belén, a Salvadoran
mom and her 5-year-old daughter. They lived in an ethnic enclave that was reminiscent of many
major Latin American cities. On the sidewalks of the streets surrounding their apartment building
there were countless market stalls set up with people selling clothing, electronics, toys and
housewares. Just outside my participant’s building a man had set up a charcoal grill, cooler, and
several plastic chairs and was cooking *carme asada* (grilled meat) and *elote loco* (grilled corn with
condiments such as mayonnaise, cheese, mustard and ketchup). Arriving to other participants’
homes and apartments the prevalence of street vendors at stoplights and corners was also
reminiscent of Latin American cities where flowers and water (among other things) are sold quite
extensively in the streets. For families who lived in this kind of environment, the heritage culture
that influenced and guided their daily lives at home was largely congruent with what they saw when
they stepped outside their front doors. Their children were often in schools where teachers and
parents spoke Spanish. Therefore, for these families, implicit cultural socialization was pervasive
inside and outside of the home, diminishing the need for explicit cultural socialization. In some
respects teaching their children about their heritage culture was not an issue, it was simply a way of
life. In contrast, families living in more ethnically and racially diverse neighborhoods (which often,
but not always, coincided with higher socioeconomic status) were confronted with incongruent
cultural scripts on a daily basis and therefore navigated their own heritage culture in constant
comparison with others.

Four Mexican-heritage families from my sample lived in a somewhat ethnically and racially
diverse neighborhood comprised of mostly Asian and Latino heritage families. While their most
immediate neighbors tended to be from Mexico or Central America, the children of three of these families went to schools where the majority of students were of Asian heritage according to parents’ perceptions. While these parents experienced cultural congruence to some extent with their immediate neighbors (with whom they often did special celebrations like *Las Posadas* or *piñatas*), just beyond their housing complex the neighborhood composition changed. Local street signs were mostly in Korean with some Spanish and English billboards and signs as well. Spanish was not the norm when they left home to do things in the community, although it was prevalent. At the children’s schools in particular, Spanish-speaking teachers and administrators were scarce. At school, these participants relied on their limited English, their children’s English language abilities, and one available translator to make sure messages were received from and transmitted to their children’s teachers appropriately. In these neighborhoods and schools, the children and parents in my sample had more opportunity to notice cultural, ethnic, and racial differences, yet heritage practices were maintained to a large extent through implicit socialization.

Finally, five families in my sample lived in ethnically and racially diverse areas. In just one of these families, the parents were immigrants to the United States. These families tended to have the highest levels of income in my sample or education in one case. Cultural socialization was more explicit and intentional in these families than in other families, for multiple reasons. Implicit cultural socialization practices such as speaking Spanish at home or eating ethnic foods were not as common in these households, except for the case of Inez, who was the only immigrant mother in this group. These families lived in areas where English was the norm outside of the home, although several mothers reported speaking Spanish somewhat frequently in their communities as well. The signs for local businesses in their communities were mostly in English, with some Spanish mixed in on occasion. In comparison with the parents who lived in ethnic enclaves or areas that were less racially and ethnically diverse, these mothers had to work harder to foster their children’s identification with
their heritage cultures. Therefore cultural socialization took on more explicit forms for these families. For example, these parents were more likely to have traveled to El Salvador or Mexico with their children than other participants. In the case of Inez, getting Rocío to speak Spanish was a particular struggle. Two of these mothers talked about their heritage culture with nostalgia and with awareness of the extent to which their traditions might be lost in their children’s generation. While neighborhood composition was likely a subtler contributor to parents’ cultural socialization practices in my sample as compared with their immigrant trajectories or the proximity of extended family, there was evidence that differing neighborhood racial and ethnic compositions related to what and how parents’ taught their children about their heritage cultures.

**Conclusion**

Results from this section illustrated how parental work, social support networks, and neighborhood contexts influence family processes, including ERS. In addition, these contextual features intersect with one and other such that vulnerabilities in one contextual factor can be ameliorated or exacerbated by the influence of another aspect of the family’s context. This was seen particularly in the case of non-standard work hours and social support networks. Furthermore, variability in which contextual feature exerted the most influence over particular families was also described. For all families their social support networks, neighborhood contexts, and work hours and wages, mattered for their family functioning.
CHAPTER 5. CONVERSATIONS ABOUT DAILY ROUTINES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Another aim of my dissertation study was to explore what additional information about ERS might be elicited through a photo elicitation task in which Mexican and Salvadoran heritage mothers and their children engaged in conversations about their daily routines and cultural heritage. In general, the conversations that mothers and children had about the photographs allowed the research team to see how they experienced culture and heritage and the meaning making they engaged in with respect to their heritage cultures. The photographs encompassed implicit and explicit cultural socialization, in a much broader conceptualization of ERS based on their lived experiences as compared with the narrowly defined components of ERS captured on the survey measures.

Given the low levels of explicit cultural socialization practices reported in my sample, it is not surprising that less than a quarter of dyads overtly discussed being of Mexican or Salvadoran heritage. Most dyads’ pictures and conversations were related to their daily lives where implicit cultural socialization permeated meal times, family gatherings, children’s education, and pictures of family with whom they had frequent contact. These photos of daily routines were not void of heritage culture, rather they captured the integrated way in which families live and experience their race and ethnicity. The six dyads that did talk extensively and explicitly about being of Mexican heritage (each of these six dyads was of Mexican heritage and none were of Salvadoran heritage), did so mostly through photographs of past trips to their heritage country and pictures of grandparents and past generations. To illustrate what these conversations entailed in greater detail I present one case that depicts implicit cultural socialization as part of a family’s daily life and one case where the photo elicitation task itself was used as a didactic moment for the mother to tell her family’s story and share her heritage culture with the research team and her child. Next I compare these two cases.
to the full sample to assess the extent to which the exemplar cases are representative of the remaining sample.

**Conversations about Cultural Heritage with Two Mother-Child Dyads**

*Beatriz*

Beatriz is a young mother, age 27, of five children ranging in age from 4 to 13. She was born in Mexico, but moved to the United States when she was two years old. She married a Mexican-born man who immigrated to the United States at age nine and were living in a largely Latino, low-income neighborhood with their children at the time of her participation in this study. She reported that her household income was less than $10,000 annually and both she and her husband had studied through elementary school and part of middle school.

Their house was located at the back of the property, behind a larger house, and was small and dark once inside. Beatriz’s oldest daughter led us back to their house past a barbeque and two cages for their pet birds, Colito and Hawaiano, on the way to the front door for our second interview. The living area was small and furnished with a sofa, shelving, storage boxes, and a television and the walls were filled with pictures of family. Beatriz and her 7-year-old son, Alfredo, sat on the couch to share their stories about the pictures they took while I pulled up the photographs on my computer. The youngest daughter was doing a large foam puzzle near by and came over to talk with us and look at the pictures frequently.

Beatriz and Alfredo took seven pictures of their daily life. We spoke in English and Alfredo did most of the talking with Beatriz adding in clarifications or occasionally asking additional questions of Alfredo to help him elaborate on what the pictures captured. Four of the pictures they took were related to school: one of the kids and their dad on the front porch heading to school, one in the car on the way to school, and two of homework time. They also took two pictures of Alfredo
taking out the trash, which was his daily chore. Finally, there was one picture of Alfredo in his soccer uniform.

At one point in the conversation about school-related photos Alfredo shared what they typically ate for breakfast at saying, “We eat bagel and today we ate a burrito with beans and cheese inside and that’s it.” The interviewer followed up asking if he liked Mexican food and he responded that he did and that they ate chicken, rice and beans for dinner. The conversation shifted to talking about how they celebrated special occasions. Alfredo said, “We give out presents and we cook turkey when it’s Thanksgiving and my mom said on Christmas we’re going to pop fireworks.” The interviewer asked if it was typical in the neighborhood to set off fireworks for Christmas and the mom responded that it was. The interviewer then asked the mother if she thought setting off fireworks for Christmas was related to her Mexican heritage and Beatriz laughed and responded that it was. This conversation illustrates that Beatriz’s Mexican heritage culture permeates their daily lives through the foods they eat (both at school and at home) and how they celebrate holidays. However, in the course of the interview Beatriz did not spontaneously mention her Mexican heritage or how it was evidenced in her family life unless the interviewer directly prompted her.

Ariadna

Ariadna was a single mother of two children; one older daughter who lived in a different state and had a young daughter of her own and the target child, Marco. Ariadna was born in the US and grew up in the south. She was a full-time graduate student and reported an annual income within in the $10,001-$20,000 range.

Ariadna and Marco lived in a large apartment complex with a diverse population of many international families and families of varying races and ethnicities. Their apartment was spacious for two people, clean and organized. Lots of children lived in their apartment complex and there were green areas and playgrounds for the children throughout. Marco was eight years old and was a
second grader at a local public school that offered a bilingual Spanish-English immersion program. Ariadna and Marco had taken 56 pictures to share with the research team.

Ariadna and Marco took the following pictures: three related to school (both Marco’s school and Ariadna’s), three of Marco’s extracurricular activities, six of food, 14 of family, 13 of celebrations such as Day of the Dead or birthday parties, seven of books and artifacts, five of outings (e.g., to the zoo), and five of close friends who Ariadna called her ‘local family.’ In contrast to Beatriz and her son, Ariadna spoke extensively about her Mexican heritage and what it meant to her and her children.

When a picture of Ariadna’s portrait of Frida Kahlo came up, Marco did not recall who was in the portrait. Ariadna responded to a question regarding why this portrait was important to her saying, “She’s important to me just because I… growing up I didn’t know about where I came from and my culture. I grew up in the northern part of (state), predominantly White, middle-class neighborhood, and during that time of my mom raising us it was more about assimilate and sort of you know deny your culture and so it’s really sad. And as I grew up and went to college and realized like I had this rich history and I didn’t really know anything about it. So being able to bring that into my home and honor that and talk to my children about it. It’s you know, it’s important for me that they get that… some history and some pride in our culture.” Ariadna had clear objectives regarding her son’s cultural socialization. She wanted her son to grow up with a knowledge of and appreciation for her heritage culture that she was denied as a child.

The next series of photographs were pictures of old black and white family pictures of her mother and grandparents and gave Ariadna the opportunity to teach both her son and the research team about her family’s history in Mexico and the United States. Marco was quiet for the majority of this portion of the interview although he listened attentively and asked questions or made jokes.
from time to time. He expressed interested in wanting to visit the places in Mexico that Ariadna had included in the set of photographs.

In addition to the picture of Frida Kahlo, Ariadna also included several pictures of books that were important to her in terms of her own learning about her heritage culture and a few that she used to teach Marco about his heritage. Marco was able to show his knowledge about their heritage foods with pictures of *tinga*, a southwestern chile stew, and *huevos con salchica* (eggs with sausage). Yet, Ariadna often elaborate on the meals talking about how particular dishes blended aspects of her heritage and how she had adapted them to the ingredients more readily available in southern CA. For Ariadna, the interview itself was an opportunity to engage in explicit cultural socialization with her son and reinforce their family history and cultural heritage with him.

**Conversations about Cultural Heritage across the Full Sample**

The case of Beatriz and Alfredo, represents the majority of dyads in my sample (n=21, 78%). Most mothers and children took pictures of their daily lives including getting to school, doing homework, extracurricular activities, family meals and favorite foods, outings on the weekends to restaurants or shopping centers, different members of the household, and children’s belongings including toys and pets. On average, across the full sample, dyads took 25 photographs to share with the research team (SD=21.45, ranging from 4 to 98). The conversations felt like opportunities for the mother and child to share their daily lives with the research team, but they were not approached as opportunities for the mother to teach the child or research team about her heritage culture in explicit ways. Rather, culture was embedded into the pictures and conversations since they reflected families’ daily lives and lived experiences as Salvadoran and Mexican heritage families living in the United States.

For these 21 conversations, children’s education was almost always discussed with photographs of children getting to school, in front of their schools, doing homework in the
afternoons or reading in bed. Traditional foods were also commonly captured in the photographs discussed by these dyads. Many also shared photographs of family and weekend outings. Similar to Beatriz and Alfredo’s case, these dyads did not explicitly discuss their cultural heritage to a great extent, rather their heritage culture was implicitly woven into the fabric of their daily lives through the foods depicted, strong ties to family who were present in photographs, or representation of educational values. These pictures depicted how families and children understood and lived their culture and ethnicity on a daily basis. In many of these families, one or two photographs of artifacts or religious symbols were included in the set of pictures (e.g., *La Virgen de Guadalupe*, rosary beads, their native town in Mexico), but these were usually not discussed at length. They served as concrete reminders of ties to the heritage country that complemented the daily routines that were captured in photographs and were also imbued with each families’ heritage culture. There was substantial variability in the sociodemographic characteristics of the families who took photographs of their daily lives, rather than explicitly addressing cultural socialization. For example there was a mix of immigrant and native-born mothers, lower and higher SES backgrounds, and ages and genders of the children.

Just six conversations elicited through the photo elicitation task, were reminiscent of Ariadna and Marco’s conversation and were characterized by a didactic approach through which the mother taught the child and research team about her heritage culture. These conversations typically revolved around photographs of past trips to the dyad’s heritage country or old photographs of family members or ancestors and were characterized by more explicit discussions of heritage culture. Often, the mother selected the photographs that served as the springboard for conversations about cultural heritage and mothers tended to lead those conversations. For example, Sara included the photograph of her deceased father, which set the stage for the entire interview by starting off with her family history. Sara let her son begin the conversation and share what he knew of the family’s
history, but she quickly interjected to elaborate on the story adding detail and correcting inaccuracies. Similarly, Alma, a second-generation Mexican heritage mother of 3, included a photograph of Vicente Fernandez’s ranch, which she had visited in her travels and several pictures of her uncle's ranch, which was where her family went to enjoy rodeos and special occasions. Alma’s son Carlos, did not contribute extensively to the explanations about these photographs, but he did show his knowledge about them by saying the names of people in the pictures or where the pictures were taken. Inez, also shared many photographs of her family's trips to Mexico and almost tested Rocío’s knowledge of who each family member was as we viewed the photographs together.

The dyads that engaged in the conversation with explicit cultural socialization were varied in terms of immigrant generation and SES, although 4 of the 6 families were higher than average SES based on either household income or maternal education level. Each of these families seemed to have daily and weekly routines that were sustainable and they did not live in situations of extreme stress. In addition, only two dyads lived in a predominantly Latino neighborhoods. The other four dyads lived in racially and ethnically diverse neighborhoods. Interestingly, all of the mothers and children in these dyads had heritage ties to Mexico. There were no Salvadoran heritage families in this group.

The photo elicitation task allowed families to show how ERS was embedded in other parenting practices, not only through the content of the photographs but also in how the mothers and children engaged with each other while they spoke about the photographs. In general the mood was warm and jovial between mothers and their children, who seemed to have a sense of pride in being able to share about their families with the research team. Mothers and their children often joked or teased in the photographs. For example, Regina laughed as her 5-year-old daughter Carmen focused on the issue of seat belts on the bus as she described a recent family outing. Regina laughed and asked, “Pero que viste?” (But what did you see?) In some moments mothers scolded their children
for speaking too softly or for not sitting up straight. Overall, the photo elicitation task offered an additional window into the family routines of study participants and gave children a new way to participate in the conversation and share more about their lives with the research team.
CHAPTER 6. CHILDREN’S RACIAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITY

Given the limited engagement in explicit cultural socialization as reported by mothers in my sample, yet fairly high degree of engagement in implicit cultural socialization, how do children identify racially and ethnically and why? In this section, I answer this question. I present data on children’s self-reported racial and ethnic identities including the racial and ethnic labels they chose to describe themselves and why. In addition, mothers’ perceptions of their children’s racial and ethnic identity are explored in addition to why they chose the labels they did to describe their children.

Children’s Racial and Ethnic Identification

Children were presented with 11 racial and ethnic labels and asked to indicate which described them, being able to respond ‘yes’ to all or none of the labels. When given the chance to provide additional labels, 6 children provided terms such as “kind” or “respectful,” but no relevant racial or ethnic terms were provided. On average, children identified with 4.30 different racial or ethnic labels ($SD=2.22$). Mostly commonly children chose American ($n=21; 78\%$), followed by Mexican and Mexican-American ($n=17; 63\%$ and $n=15; 56\%$, respectively), then Salvadoran-American and Hispanic ($n=11; 41\%$ and $n=10; 37\%$, respectively; Figure 1). Each child was then asked to choose just one label that most described her or him; one child chose both Salvadoran and American, but not Salvadoran-American and two children were unable to complete this task ($n=25$). For the label most like each child, American, Salvadoran-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican ($n=5, 19\%$ for each) were the most common terms that children chose. No children chose Latino and one child chose Hispanic as most describing her (Figure 2).

Children’s Racial and Ethnic Label Meaning Making

Each child described why she or he was Salvadoran-American or Mexican (i.e., the label that best described them) and what it was like to be a child in that racial or ethnic category (Table 3). Of the 25 children who chose a label as most describing them, 23 children (92\%) were able to articulate
why they made their choice, while 2 children (8%) said they didn’t know why they were the label they chose and did not articulate a reason. In 23 instances, children drew on tangible aspects of their ethnicity when justifying their racial or ethnic label choice including language, geography (e.g., child’s or parent’s birthplace, parents’ heritage or travel), foods, and clothing. In 11 instances children stated two or more tangible reasons as to why they were the label they chose. Five children gave global evaluations of being the chosen label or stated affective ties to the place(s) represented by the label along with stating more tangible reasons (e.g., saying that being of their chosen label was good due to bilingualism). Finally, in two cases, children gave an overarching evaluation of what it was like to be the label they chose, but could not articulate why. These categories of label choice are discussed in greater detail below.

Tangible aspects of children's racial or ethnic identity

Language and communication were the most salient markers of ethnic or racial label choice for children. Twelve of the 23 (52%) children who were able provide a reason for the racial and ethnic label they chose cited the language(s) they or their family members spoke as a reason for why the label they chose described them. For example Ariela, who was 6 years old, chose Mexican as her label said, “It’s because I speak Spanish and English.” Elena’s son, Pablo, a 9-year-old who identified as American said, “Cause it feels like cause when you’re American cause you know more English because since some of my friends were from El Salvador in my school they really didn’t know English ‘till like they like went to school.” Pablo went on to distinguish the language abilities of American versus Salvadoran-American or Mexican-American children saying, “And I think if like if you’re Salvadoran-American or Mexican-American you do know some- you do know some Spanish, but I think like you have to learn English to be like an actual American.”

Follow-up prompts for children who mentioned language included asking them who they spoke Spanish and English with and if there were good or bad things about speaking Spanish and
English. Most children reported that they spoke Spanish with family members although in a few cases Spanish was the school language. Children reported speaking English mostly with friends and teachers. Speaking Spanish or bilingualism had positive aspects for almost all children, but in one case, it was also a source of stress. For example, Ernesto (Sara’s 9-year-old son) identified as Mexican-American and said, “I would say it’s really good because my dad says alguien like someone alguien que que que bable dos (translation: someone who who who speaks two) languages es vergón (translation: is awesome)⁵.” Claudia, a 7-year-old girl who identified as Mexican, said that she thought speaking Spanish was important, “Because so my cousins can understand what I say and my my tías (translation: aunts) and my aunts and my grandpas and grandmas.” Mariela’s son Martin who was 7 years old and chose Salvadoran and American as the labels that best described him said, “It’s good. I feel good that I know more languages.” Rocío, Inez’s daughter, a 7-year-old Mexican heritage girl, presented her language preferences comparing Spanish with English saying, “I like more English than Spanish. [Interviewer: When do you speak Spanish?] Like my mom and dad say that if I don’t speak Spanish with them then they don’t understand my words, but they actually do speak English.” One case in particular presented a conflicted view of speaking Spanish and English. Maite’s son Eduardo, who was 8 years old and identified as Salvadoran-American said about speaking Spanish, “I feel like I try to be confident and try to at least speak the- some words of Spanish and sometimes when I get scared I can’t handle the pressure I just leave. I just leave the house. I’m like I’m out of here. Bye. But I mostly go to my room or my mom’s. [Interviewer: Are there any good things about speaking Spanish do you think?] I think you- I think speaking Spanish let’s you know more about what a, what a Spanish culture would feel like.”

Birthplace, both children’s and their parents’, or where children lived and were being raised gave meaning to their racial and ethnic labels in 10 cases. For example when asked why she was

⁵ The word vergón can have multiple translations in English, but the interviewer asked the child what this word meant and he said that he thought it meant awesome so this is the definition used.
American, Sol, an 8-year-old girl responded, “Because I was born in America, in (named area of city where she was born).” Jeffrey, a 10-year-old boy who identified as Mexican-American said, “Because my mom’s Mexican, because my mom and dad were both born in Mexico and I was born in (city).”

Children also mentioned their parents’ race or ethnicity as informing their own label choice in nine cases. For example, Vicente, a 6-year-old boy who chose Black as the label that best described him stated, “Porque tengo un negro que es mi familia.” (Because I have a black person that is my family).

Vicente’s mother did not identify him as Black or African-American, but her boyfriend, who Vicente called ‘Dad,’ was Black and therefore influenced Vicente’s label choice. Another 9-year-old girl who identified as Hispanic said, “Because my father is and that’s it.” The geographic location tied to the heritage label either as a birthplace or where parents where from, was salient in informing children’s racial and ethnic label choices.

Additional tangible aspects of children’s racial and ethnic labels included the foods they ate and clothing in one case. Four children mentioned eating ethnic foods as something that made them of Salvadoran or Mexican heritage. Carlos, a 6-year-old boy who identified as Mexican justified his choice saying, “I drink Mexican Pepsi.” When prompted by the interviewer for anything else that made him Mexican he responded, “And Mexican Coke.” Blanca, an 8-year-old Salvadoran-American girl said, “I love Salvadorian food.” Finally, one girl mentioned wearing Mexican dresses as something that made her Mexican-American.

_Evaluative or affective aspects of children’s racial or ethnic identity_

Seven of the 23 children provided general evaluations of what it was like to be a child with the particular racial or ethnic label that she or he chose (30%). Eric, a 7-year-old boy thought it was ‘good’ to be Mexican and Ariadna’s son Marco, an 8-year-old boy thought it was ‘awesome’ to be Mexican-American, but neither could articulate why. Of the other five children who provided evaluative responses, four thought it was ‘good/really good’ and one thought it was ‘really tough,’
yet they also provided tangible reasons behind their label choices (as described previously). Four children also mentioned liking their heritage culture or the US. For example, Maite’s son Eduardo said, “I’m Salvadoran and American cause I really love America, this is the best place I’ve ever been and Salvadorian and Salvador is also a good place.” However, when asked what it was like to be a Salvadoran-heritage child Eduardo stated, “It's like really tough. You- My mom mostly says I'm Salvadoran, so people um talk to me Spanish, and um like I actually really used to English language, which is why I picked English, and yeah I really feel really like like, ‘what are you saying?’ I don't, I don’t, I, I might be Salvadoran, but I do not know that much of Spanish.” For Eduardo the stress of being expected to speak Spanish to a certain level of fluency, but not feeling like he was able to do it tainted his overall evaluation of what it meant to him to be of Salvadoran heritage.

**Mother’s Racial and Ethnic Identification of their Children**

Mothers did the same racial and ethnic labeling task as their children. On average, mothers chose 5.22 labels ($SD=1.05$) as descriptive of their children. Most commonly, mothers chose Latino and Hispanic to describe their children ($n=26; 96\%$ and $n=25; 93\%$, respectively). Many mothers also chose American to describe their children ($n=21; 78\%$; Figure 3). Mothers were also asked to choose one racial or ethnic label that most described the target child. No mother chose Salvadoran or Mexican to describe her child, yet eight mothers chose Mexican-American and six mothers chose Salvadoran-American (31\% and 23\%, respectively; Figure 4). Three mothers (11\%) described their children as American, while 9 mothers (35\%) chose either Hispanic or Latino as the best descriptor of their child.

**Mother’s Reasoning about their Chosen Racial or Ethnic Label for Most Describing their Child**

Mothers were also asked why they chose the label that they chose as best describing their daughter or son. All mothers described tangible aspects of the racial or ethnic label that they chose
as most describing their child. Mothers usually drew on two or more tangible aspects of their heritage; only four mothers had just one reason for choosing the label they did. Within the tangible things mentioned, geography was important with 16 mothers citing birthplace (59%) and 17 stating family heritage (65%) as influencing their child’s race or ethnicity. For example, Lilitheth, 7-year-old Tomás’ mother said about her choice of Mexican-American as best describing her son said, “Porque es de descendencia Mexicana, pero nació en este país que son Americanos.” (Because he is of Mexican descent, but he was born in this country where they are Americans.) Other tangible features of the labels chosen included culture and traditions in 12 cases (44%). Adalia, a Mexican-heritage mother, of Carlos, who she identified as Hispanic, said, “Carlos can be used to both cultures.” Adalia also mentioned their more traditional medicinal practices saying, “Something else will cure him, instead of an actual medicine.” She summed up her views saying, “We can be more family oriented where it’s all of us go… I think we just continue the tradition that we have.” When mothers spoke of culture and traditions some mentioned heritage culture while others mentioned U.S. based practices in which their children engaged. For example, Laura the Salvadoran grandmother of Celia who she labeled as American, said, “Tiene los costumbres de aquí. Ella nació aquí. Todas sus amiguitas desde Chiquita. Todos los costumbres son de aquí porque ella no conoce a El Salvador.” (She has the customs from here. She was born here. All of her little friends from little. All the customs are from here because she doesn’t know El Salvador.) Language abilities and practices were also important in informing mothers’ racial or ethnic label choice for their children and were mentioned by 10 mothers (37%). Inez, a Mexican-heritage mother of Rocío, who Inez considered to be American-Mexican said, “Y mi percepción de Rocío es que ella piensa en Inglés. … Yo creo que ella es más Americana porque piensa primero en Inglés.” (And my perception of Rocío is that she thinks in English. … I think that she is more American because the thinks first in English.) Finally, mothers mentioned food, travel, and race or skin color, in 5, 4, and 2 cases, respectively.
Four mothers mentioned affective ties to their children’s heritage culture and or the United States in justifying their label choices. For example, Mariela mentioned affective ties when describing her son Martin as Salvadoran-American saying, “Le gusta mucho las comidas Salvadoreñas… Y lo de acá a… le gusta la escuela, le gusta el país, le gusta el lugar donde nació, inclusive el hospital.” (He likes Salvadoran foods a lot… And for what’s from here uh… le likes the school, he likes the country, he likes the place where he was born, including the hospital.) Among the instances of affective ties to the heritage culture or place, food was mentioned in two cases, travel in one and language in the other.

**Congruence in Mothers’ and Child’s Racial and Ethnic Identity**

In seven cases mothers chose the same racial or ethnic label that most described her child as her child did. For four dyads the label was Salvadoran-American, for two it was American and for one it was Mexican-American. In two cases mothers and their children chose slight variations of the same label. In one case the mother chose American Mexican for her daughter and her daughter chose Mexican American. In the other case the mother chose Salvadoran American for her son and her son chose Salvadoran and American as separate terms, but insisted on both. The cues that these mothers and children drew on to describe their racial or ethnic label choice were similar to what is described above.

**Conclusion**

The majority of children (n=17; 68%) chose a racial or ethnic label that included their heritage country in the label (i.e., Mexican, Mexican-American, Salvadoran, or Salvadoran-American). Mothers often opted for a hyphenated label (n=15; 56%), in line with the children. However, mothers were more likely to choose Latino or Hispanic as the best descriptor of their children than the children were. Parents, in contrast, tended to choose labels that more often blended their heritage with their children’s birthplace or where they were being raised and did not
opt for either exclusively Salvadoran or Mexican when describing their children. Only one child chose Hispanic and no children chose Latino.

Tangible things like ethnic behaviors (e.g., language(s) spoken and foods eaten) and geography, (e.g., birthplace and parents’ heritage) informed children’s and mothers’ racial and ethnic label choices. They mostly relied on things such as birthplace, heritage, travel, language practices and other ethnic behaviors to justify their choices. However, some children also gave overarching evaluations of what their labels meant to them and in other cases children justified their label choices with affective ties to the places associated with their label. Finally, for a few children and mothers, affective ties to a place were used to rationalize their label choice.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION

ERS in the Context of Daily Routines

The central aim of this dissertation study was to explore variability in Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families’ ERS practices with their school-aged children while situating those practices in the context of their daily lives. Scholars acknowledge that ERS practices are embedded in other types of parenting practices, but little is known about what this looks like in practice because research has mostly looked at ERS in isolation from other parenting practices (Hughes et. al., 2006). Findings from the current study make several initial contributions in addressing this issue.

Goals for Children’s Moral Development

In alignment with ecocultural theory, results from this study demonstrate how parents’ goals for their children’s long-term moral development shaped their daily routines (Berheimer et al., 1990). Consistent with prior research, Mexican and Salvadoran heritage participants in this study valued their children’s education, which was prominent in families’ routines and a key component of ERS (e.g., Goldenberg et al., 2001). Yet, how families structured their routines to support their educational goals differed across the sample. Perhaps not surprising given the age of participant children, activities related to schooling such as doing homework or getting to school were consistent features of families’ daily routines as expressed in open-ended descriptions of family routines and pictures taken of families’ daily lives. Yet, the multiple ways in which parents overcame barriers (e.g., language issues, time constraints) to support their children’s education underscored the importance of their educational goals for their children. Some parents had the opportunity to be personally involved in their children’s homework like Sara who hosted a casual homework club for her son and a few neighbors. Others, like Beatriz,
ensured that older children could help their younger siblings, while in Ángela’s case the afterschool program was the only option due to her limited literacy skills since she had never attended school in El Salvador. A second prevalent way in which these Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families supported their educational goals was through school choice options, such as Marleny and Inez who opted for charter or private schools, that they considered of higher quality than their local public schools. Families also chose religious and bilingual schools, as in the cases of Ludin and Ariadna, because these schools were also important sources of cultural socialization that supplemented and enhanced the cultural socialization that parents could provide at home. Findings from this dissertation study underscore education as an important component of cultural socialization for the Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families in this sample. ERS must be understood by drawing on a family’s perspective regarding what kind of child the family wants to raise for future success in their cultural community. In this sample families’ goals for their children converged on raising educated, literate adults.

Mothers in this sample also highly valued egalitarian ideals and taught their children the importance of equal, fair, and respectful treatment of others. This is consistent with prior research that documents how Latino families stress respeto (obedience toward and respect for elders) with their children (Calzada et al., 2010). Many mothers responded that they talked to their children about hard work and education as mattering in this country in such a matter-of-fact way that they did not elaborate extensively. For example, one mother said that she loved to say this to her child, while others simply reported that they gave these messages to their children several times a week, if not daily. A few mothers also pointed to specific aspects of their contexts that motivated them to share egalitarian messages with their children such as Sara’s neighborhood context and Luisana’s husband’s low-wage work. In general, the Mexican and
Salvadoran heritage mothers who participated in this study espoused egalitarian ideals and structured their parenting practices and ERS messages to instill these values in their children.

Given the large proportion of immigrant mothers from El Salvador and Mexico in this sample (74%), high endorsement of education and egalitarian ideals is not surprising. These values align with many Latino immigrants’ motivations to come to the United States and their endorsement of ‘The American Dream’: the belief in an open society that allows for social and economic mobility based on hard work and educational attainment (Hill & Torres, 2010). In reality, Latino students, a large and growing population in U.S. schools, lag behind their peers from other racial and ethnic groups in school achievement, which also declines across generations as Latino families’ time in the United States increases (Hemphill & Vanneman, 2011; Rodriguez, 2002). This documented paradox in Latino students’ achievement has been attributed to multiple factors including SES, language barriers, attendance in segregated and lower resourced schools, cultural incongruence between home and school, and experiences of discrimination and bias at school (Hill & Torres, 2010; Moreno & Gaytán, 2013). However, given that the United States is currently experiencing higher than ever income inequality and social immobility (Desilver, 2013; Sawhill, 2015), additional resources for and research on promising interventions that reverse this trend is paramount.

**ERS Messages are Multi-Faceted**

Data presented in this study underscore the multi-faceted nature of parent’s ERS messages. Given the tendency of ERS studies to rely on survey measures that ask for self-reports of the frequency in which families engage in specific types of messages or activities, the multi-layered nature of ERS messages is not typically captured (Hughes, Rivas Drake, Foust, Hagelskamp, Gersick, & Way, 2007). Qualitative methods offer an opportunity to hear
expanded responses from parents about the kinds of messages they share with their children and why, allowing the layered nature of ERS messages to be heard. For example, we saw that egalitarian and color-blind perspectives blended in specific examples of ERS messages in Sara’s and Inez’s cases. In addition, mothers often reported that they asked their children not to pay attention to skin color while also stating that they did not avoid the topic of race with their children. Silence about race was not endorsed in this sample, yet the overarching message that parents shared with their children was to treat others equally and fairly.

Mothers’ ERS messages were also multi-faceted in that messages were linked to multiple markers of injustice or unfair treatment beyond just race and ethnicity. For example, Gaby spoke of language issues as a source of unfair treatment that she prepared her son for based on his speech delays and prior experience being mistreated by his peers. Maite spoke about weight when talking to her son about his potential experiences with bias due to her perception that he was overweight. Mothers adapted their messages about equal and fair treatment to their children’s lived experiences. In many cases what mothers reported talking about with their children in terms of ERS were not easily categorized as exclusively either preparation for bias, the promotion of egalitarian ideals, or endorsement of a color-blind perspective. This highlights the need to use diverse research methods to better understand parents’ intentions behind their ERS messages. In addition, how children receive these messages and what they take from them is an important line of future work.

**Cultural Socialization is Prevalent**

Across all families, parents engaged in cultural socialization with their school-aged children, with varying levels of implicit and explicit activities and messages. Implicit practices were defined in this study as those that were commonly occurring and did not have a planned or
didactic intension behind them (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006). In contrast, explicit cultural socialization practices were intentional and planned (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2006). Implicit cultural socialization practices were prevalent in most family routines in this sample, which is not surprising given the large number of immigrant parent participants. Immigrant parents, particularly more recent immigrants, operate with their heritage culture’s scripts, norms, and values at the forefront as they learn new “rules of cultural engagement” over time (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Recent immigrant families necessarily engage in behaviors that are coded as ‘ethnic’ such as eating traditional foods, celebrating traditional holidays, and speaking the heritage language because there are limited alternative scripts to guide their interactions. However, for a few families in this sample, the same practices of speaking Spanish and eating traditional foods took on explicit socialization forms because of the contexts in which they were living such as their neighborhood racial and ethnic composition and social supports (discussed below). For example for Inez, speaking Spanish with her daughter, Rocío, was somewhat of a struggle since Rocío preferred English and knew that Inez spoke and understood English. Yet, for Inez speaking Spanish was very important to maintain ties to her family in México. Cultural socialization through speaking Spanish took on an intentional, explicit nature for Inez, which was not the case for other families where the parents were not proficient in English. The distinction between implicit and explicit socialization mechanisms could be important for developmental science if, for example, they have different impacts on children’s ethnic and racial identity development or other academic or psychosocial outcomes. To my knowledge, this line of research has not been explored.

Explicit socialization practices such as travel to the heritage country or reading books about the heritage country were not common in this study. Limited resources or unauthorized
immigrant status prohibited many families in this sample from traveling internationally. However, several families were able to travel and mentioned these trips as important opportunities to increase affective ties to their heritage countries. For cultural socialization as with other components of ERS, contextual factors, in this case families’ socioeconomic status, contributed to families’ varied engagement in ERS activities with their children.

**Contextual Factors that Influence Parenting and ERS**

The world is not linear, additive, and decontextualized, especially the world of immigrant families (Weisner & Duncan, 2014). Context is a complex array of factors that influence families’ lives in dynamic ways and for the families in the current study led to varied parenting practices, activities, and routines across families who often had similar overarching values for their children and families. Many mothers spontaneously shared rich narratives about their immigration pathways, the challenges of balancing work and family life, and concerns with ensuring a quality education for their children when speaking openly about their daily lives effectively describing what was important to them in influencing their daily routines. Salient factors that impacted parent-child interactions, which are also evidenced in prior research, included parental work (both wages and work schedules), informal social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition (Yoshikawa 2012; Yoshikawa, Weisner, & Love, 2006). Not only did constraints due to parental work, social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition influence the time and resources parents in this sample could invest in their children, but each of these spheres also provided specific interactions or events that sparked conversations linked to ERS for parents and their children.

Researchers often describe groups of families by drawing on a few discrete variables such as immigrant generation, income and education levels, and race or ethnicity. In doing so, they artificially homogenize groups of people categorized into one group to describe tendencies and
patterns that distinguish them from other groups (Rogoff, 2003). These are social address categories (Rogoff, 2003). They might be useful as summaries of patterns within the group, but it is easy to make false inferences about their usefulness in explaining circumstances families face. Unpacking these categories can provide important evidence for the validity of the category itself (high variation within the category would reduce the usefulness) and help discover what other factors actually are making a difference, but are being hidden by the taken-for-granted conventional category. Variability and heterogeneity exist within any population, even one that has similar descriptors on key variables such as ‘low-income’ or ‘Mexican’ or ‘Salvadoran.’ Given the complex influence that contextual factors have families’ lives and ERS practices, future studies should incorporate nuanced measures of multiple dimensions of context to capture these dynamic relations. Qualitative and mixed methods research will likely be necessary in this endeavor (Yoshikawa, Mistry, & Yang, in press).

**Parental Work**

Results from this study suggest that parents’ work (both wages and non-standard hours) has direct consequences for ERS practices with school-aged children. The findings suggest that not only did work impact the time families could spend together, it also had implications for the kinds of experiences families could afford to offer their children, which might promote their learning about and identification with their heritage culture, such as travel to the heritage country. Furthermore, for Luisana’s family, the diverse racial and ethnic composition of her husband’s work place impacted their conversations about race relations at home with their children. These findings align with ecological theory and prior research that documents the influence of household income and parents’ non-standard work schedules on family processes and child outcomes (Han, 2005) while extending prior research to a new domain of family processes, ERS. Additional research assessing the link between parental work and ERS will be necessary to replicate and expand upon these findings in additional samples.
Social Supports

Consistent with prior research, mothers in this study gained valuable help for child care responsibilities and household chores and also emotional support from their social support networks, particularly family members (e.g., Yoshikawa, 2011; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Strong social supports made non-standard work schedules tolerable for some families, and their absence compounded the negative effects of evening or night shifts in others. For example, for Lilibeth and Elena, evening shifts were tolerable because Lilibeth had her husband and mother, while Elena had a trusted babysitter to care for their children while they were at work. In contrast Pati did not have extended family in the United States and her husband did not participate in child care or household chores so her night shift made her family routine unsustainable. One noteworthy finding was that the two most vulnerable families in this study, Pati and Elena’s families, were both of Salvadoran heritage and a primary source of vulnerability was their lack of social supports. This fits with the historical immigration patterns described previously (Coutin 2007; Ortiz & Telles, 2008), yet requires additional research to understand how prevalent this is, given that it was seen in just two families in this sample.

In many cases social supports were important sources of cultural socialization, compensating for cultural socialization not being fully supplied at home in a few cases, but bolstering home-based cultural socialization in many. Margarita is the clearest example of reliance on social support networks, both family and friends, to support her cultural socialization goals with her mixed heritage children since at home they did not get much exposure to their Mexican heritage. For others like Lilibeth, Laura, and Luisana, they drew on friends and neighbors to supplement their children’s exposure to their heritage culture through holiday celebrations like Las Posadas. In several other cases, where three generations of family live together, grandparents were a source of support and cultural socialization that was invaluable to families.
Neighborhood Racial and Ethnic Composition

Neighborhood racial and ethnic composition was the third contextual factor that was salient in shaping Mexican and Salvadoran families’ ERS practices in this sample. This is consistent with prior research drawing on African American samples that documents that parents’ messages regarding preparation for bias and cultural socialization vary as a function of their neighborhoods’ racial and ethnic compositions (Caughy et al., 2006). In Sara’s case her neighborhood context motivated her emphasis on the importance of education with an eye toward her children living in a better neighborhood in the future. For Mariela, her mother’s neighborhood, which was racially and ethnically mixed, allowed for opportunities for her family to have contact with people from different racial backgrounds and sparked conversations about race in her household. For other families, neighborhoods served as a mirror that reflected congruent or divergent cultural practices comparing in versus out-of-home practices. Lastly, for families who lived in ethnic enclaves, their neighborhood context reinforced many cultural practices that were evident at home such as speaking Spanish and eating ethnic foods as in the case of Belén. As a result, additional implicit cultural socialization took place in Latino neighborhoods. For mothers like Inez and Margarita who lived in diverse neighborhoods, their cultural socialization practices stood out more. Prior research has not explored the relation between ethnic and racial neighborhood composition and ERS in Latino samples with school-aged children; therefore additional inquiry into this relation is warranted.

Conversations about Daily Routines and Cultural Heritage

The current study utilized a photo elicitation task as a window into what ERS conversations look like between Mexican and Salvadoran heritage mothers and their elementary school-aged children. Use of this innovative methodology in the study of ERS processes underscores the utility diversifying methods beyond survey-based self-report measures, which have resulted in important findings mostly regarding the prevalence of ERS in families with
young children. There were several advantages in using this method as noted in prior research (Lapenta, 2011):

1. Participants’ perspectives were honored rather than the principal researcher’s interests due to the open-ended prompt that families capture their daily lives and things that were important to them or salient because of their heritage culture. In this way, how families experience ERS was privileged rather than the researchers’ definitions.

2. Actual photograph content directed the initial conversation, but then served as a springboard to launch into varied and rich stories about families in additional topic areas. For example a photograph depicting the school bus could result in an extensive conversation about school friends and what languages children spoke at school.

3. The imbalance in power between researcher and participant that can underlie interviews and assessments shifted somewhat since the participants truly held the expertise in the subject matter of what was captured in the photographs.

In many ways, the conversations held between mothers, their children, and the research team during the photo elicitation task, brought the disparate strands of child and parent data collected in session one, together in a coherent way. Mothers’ explanations of their daily routines and self-reported level of engagement in ERS activities was largely reflected in the pictures they took. In addition, children were given the opportunity to talk about a broader range of topics than had been asked of them (or had emerged) from their first interviews.

Children’s education was a prominent topic captured in the photo elicitation task, as it was in mothers’ interviews. Getting ready for school, getting to school, actual school buildings and homework time were all present in participants’ photos. Children hardly spoke about their schools or education during their first interview, which focused on their ethnic and racial
identities. Therefore, the photo elicitation task provided an opportunity to get children’s perspectives on their schools and other routine activities, which mothers had mostly shared during their first interview. In general children responded positively to pictures of their schools and families and any activities they were involved in (e.g., soccer or gymnastics) or objects (e.g., pets and stuffed animals) that belonged to them. They giggled and laughed when pictures of family members were included. Children mostly described what was depicted in the pictures in literal ways, and then either through prompting from the mother or the research team, they elaborated on their initial comments. Mothers also elaborated on children’s responses and corrected information when they felt it was necessary.

Several families took one or two pictures that were explicitly linked to their heritage cultural. These photographs often included religious artifacts, or past celebrations of traditional holidays like *Día de Los Muertos* (Day of the Dead). In these moments mothers usually waited for their children to provide a general description of the picture or they asked targeted questions about the photograph as if testing the child’s knowledge of her or his cultural heritage. For example mothers often asked who was in a particular picture or what the icon or artifact stood for. Through their responses to these questions children could demonstrate their nascent understanding their racial and ethnic identities. In this way, children were given additional opportunities to share their knowledge about their heritage and spoke about foods, family members and special occasions. The photographs allowed children to provide additional details and evidence of their knowledge of their heritage culture that may not have surfaced in open-ended interview questions, but the knowledge was available to them when looking at a photographic reminder. With the aid of the visual representation, children’s knowledge of and understanding about their heritage culture was more extensive. For example, Ernesto, Sara’s son
knew quite a bit about his grandfather’s death and the impact it had on Sara’s childhood, yet this information did not come up during the verbal interview when the research team asked him about his heritage. Furthermore, in some instances mothers corrected children’s perceptions of what a photograph meant in terms of heritage culture, extended children’s understanding perhaps providing new information, or simply added in missing details. For example, Lilibeth reminded Tomás why he was dressed up in traditional clothing with his cousin holding a doll (to celebrate el Niño Dios) and Cony reminded Abigail why there was a statue of the Virgen de Guadalupe in their kitchen. Prior research suggests that the way children receive ERS messages does not always align with parents’ intentions behind their ERS messages (Hughes, Hagelskamp, Way, & Foust, 2009; Quintana & Vera, 1999). A joint task, such as the photo elicitation task, could provide opportunities to better understand why and when there are mismatches between parents’ intentions behind and children’s understanding of ERS messages.

Only six dyads took extensive photographs of explicit aspects of their heritage culture. For these six mothers the photo task was capitalized upon as an opportunity to teach their children (and perhaps the research team) about their heritage culture. These mothers articulated clear reasons behind their explicit cultural socialization strategies including ensuring connections with family members abroad and pride in their heritage. Each of these mothers was of Mexican heritage and most had higher than average income and or education levels. Beyond that, these mothers were of different immigrant generations, engaged in varying levels of cultural socialization at home, had different kinds of social support networks, and lived in different kinds of neighborhoods.

An additional benefit of discussing ERS through photographs was to observe mothers and children interacting, which allowed for a better sense of the emotional climate in which ERS
messages and activities took place. Many mothers sat close to their children or had their children on their laps as we viewed the photographs, like Luisana and Ariela. Inez and Rocío engaged in playful disagreements from time to time, yet also displayed warmth and laughter. Mothers reprimanded their children for talking with their fingers in their mouths and asked their children to speak louder so they could be heard. Maternal support has been positively linked to African American adolescents’ racial and ethnic identities, but this research has yet to be applied to Latino samples and elementary school-aged children (Caldwell, Zimmerman, Bernat, Sellers, & Notaro, 2002). It is possible that maternal support more generally, is blended with ethnic and racial socialization, yet additional research is needed. This methodology captured some of the warm and playful interactions between mothers and their children in a more naturalistic way. Future research might employ methods that generate or observe parent-child interactions to then code for different parenting or interaction styles and the types of ERS messages observed to see if particular kinds of messages co-occur with specific interaction styles.

**Mexican versus Salvador ERS Practices**

Differences in the prevalence of ERS practices based on parents’ heritage country were not found in this study. Similarly, qualitative justifications of why or why not parents engaged in particular practices did not seem to vary systematically by heritage country. I hypothesized that different immigrant trajectories and sociodemographic characteristics that are seen at the national level when comparing Salvador and Mexican heritage individuals in the United States, would be related to differing ERS practices. It is possible that the lack of variability along sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., nativity status, income level, parental education) between the Mexican and Salvadoran heritage participants in this study explains this finding. Along many sociodemographic variables, the Salvadoran and Mexican families in this sample were similar.
The only finding that did distinguish Mexican from Salvadoran heritage families was the finding that the 6 mother-child dyads that engaged in explicit and extensive conversations about cultural heritage during the photo elicitation task were each of Mexican heritage. A next step in this line of research would be to draw on a larger sample and test whether or not this is a pattern in a broader population. In addition, the inclusion of measures regarding how the mothers identify racially or ethnically and why (e.g., their experiences with ERS as children) would be interesting since mothers’ racial and ethnic identity is likely associated with ERS practices related to teaching their children about their cultural heritage.

Children’s Racial and Ethnic Identities

Consistent with prior research, the school-aged children in this sample were mostly able to complete the racial and ethnic labeling task and choose one label that most described them (Ruble et al., 2004; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). Additionally, the meaning that children in this sample ascribed to their chosen ethnic or racial label was based mostly on tangible aspects of their heritage such as language and birthplace, although affective reasons were mentioned in several cases as well (Ruble et al., 2004; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014).

A novel contribution of this study was to ask mothers how they would identify their children racially and ethnically and why. Mothers, like their children, often chose labels that included the heritage country name and ‘American.’ However, in contrast to children, mothers were more likely to choose panethnic labels (i.e., Latino or Hispanic) and less likely to use heritage country national labels (i.e., Mexican or Salvadoran). No mothers identified their children as exclusively Salvadoran or Mexican. For mothers in this sample something about the panethnic label captured their children’s bicultural identities, yet these labels are less concrete and likely more difficult for children to define. Like their children, most mothers also drew on
tangible aspects of the racial or ethnic label they chose for their children to justify their label choice.

**Study Limitations and Implications**

The descriptive and exploratory aims of this study dictated the use of qualitative methods to dig deeply into the lives of a small number of participants and better understand ERS practices in the context of daily lives. As with all research studies, the current study is not without limitations. The scope of this study was limited to interviewing mothers only with a focus on the home context. Fathers are known contributors to ERS practices in Latino families (Knight et al., 1993) and should be included in future research studies. Particularly in mixed heritage families (e.g., where the mother is from one country in Latin America and the father is from a different one or where parents are from different panethnic or racial groups), the other parent’s perspective would be important to include. Home-based ERS practices were the focus of the current study, yet there is evidence that children receive ERS messages from additional sources including the media and school (Knight et al., 2011). A more complete picture of what influences children’s identity development would need to include these other spheres of children’s lives, however, it is commonly recognized that parents are a prime source of ERS for children (Knight et al., 2011). Another possible limitation related to the education findings is that parents may have stressed their educational goals for their children due to social desirability. This seems unlikely given the convergence of evidence on this finding from three separate data strands (parents’ open-ended descriptions of daily routines, their self-reported frequent engagement in conversations that stress the importance of education and hard work with their children and the photo elicitation task data). Finally, this study did not include any measure of parents’ own ethnic or racial identities, their personal experiences with racial or ethnic discrimination, or the ERS they received as children, which are known to predict parents’ messages regarding cultural socialization and preparation for bias with children ages 9-14 (Hughes, 2003;
Hughes & Chen, 1997). In a few instances parents talked about how the workplace impacted ERS practices or how their own childhood compared with their children’s, but a more systematic examination of parents’ own experiences with discrimination and the ERS they received as children would be important to continue in future research.

Findings from the present study have several implications for how developmental science approaches ERS. First, diversification of methods beyond self-report survey measures is needed to generate a more complete picture of ERS including parents’ intentions behind ERS messages (Yoshikawa et al., 2008). Our current understanding of ERS is based largely on measures that narrowly define the components of ERS and artificially segregate these components from each other and from how families’ daily lives naturally unfold. While this may be useful for analytic purposes, it does not reflect how parents are interacting with their children in reality. The present study took a first step in diversifying methods by evaluating ERS through a novel method, the photo elicitation task. There were multiple benefits in using this method including a greater understanding of how ERS is embedded into family life while privileging families’ subjective understanding of ERS. In addition, in photographing daily routines, additional components of ERS (e.g., children’s education) that are not typically found on survey measures were included. Future studies on ERS should continue to draw on open-ended research methods to create a more complete understanding of families’ subjective understanding of ERS and then test these definitions and models at scale.

A second implication for how ERS is studied is that contextual factors create opportunities but also constraints on families’ lives with direct implications for ERS. A few research studies have started to look at schools and neighborhoods as possible factors that moderate children’s ERS experiences and resulting identity development (e.g., Caughy et al.,
2006). This is an important first step. Findings from the current study suggest that parental work, neighborhood racial and ethnic composition, and social supports influence Mexican and Salvadoran heritage families’ ERS practices with their elementary school-aged children. Each of these findings could be tested on a larger scale to determine the extent to which these relations are present in a larger population. However, results from this study also underscore how multiple features of a family’s context work in concert to influence daily routines and ERS practices. Simplistic reductions of context into one or two analytic variables will not adequately capture the nuanced and varied ways that parental work, social supports, and neighborhood racial and ethnic composition intersect to influence family lives in synergistic and dynamic ways. For example, in the current study non-traditional parental work schedules coupled with limited social supports pushed a few families toward unsustainable routines, chaotic home lives and limited opportunities for ERS. This finding should be tested on a larger scale to see if it holds in a broader population.

A deeper understanding of Latino families’ ERS practices is needed in part because ERS is linked to children and adolescents’ identity development, which can be promotive of positive academic and psychosocial outcomes for Latino children and adolescents (Umaña-Taylor, 2004; Arellano & Padilla, 2006; Umaña-Taylor & Updegraff 2007). These associations are not universally replicated with all samples and the effects are modest (Hughes et al., 2008). In part these mixed and moderate results could be due to measurement issues. If researchers are not accurately defining the phenomena of ERS for example by imposing narrow definitions that truncate the subject’s experiences and personal definitions of ERS, then how can we begin to understand how it relates to other downstream outcomes? Increased attention to innovative, open-ended
research methods and contextual influences on family functioning and ERS will push the field forward and allow for a more accurate portrayal of ERS, its correlates, and consequences.
## CHAPTER 8. TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Participant demographic information by dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Mother's Heritage Country</th>
<th>Mom Age to U.S.</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Maternal Ed.</th>
<th>Child School Type</th>
<th>Household Comp.</th>
<th>Family Network</th>
<th>Neighborhood Composition</th>
<th>Parental work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara: age 50</td>
<td>Ernesto: age 9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10-20K</td>
<td>Some vocational school post high school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>4 living at home (mom, dad, two sons); Oldest daughter lived at university</td>
<td>Extensive family in U.S. - get together for holidays and celebrations;</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Sara cared for children and house; Father worked full-time packing crackers standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pati: age 35</td>
<td>Andres: age 7</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>5 (mom, dad, sister, brother, target child)</td>
<td>Pati had no family in U.S.; husband had some cousins near-by who they rarely saw</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Pati worked full-time cleaning a health clinic, non standard hours; Father worked full-time as plumbers assistant standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maite: age 38</td>
<td>Eduardo: age 8</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some university studies</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>5 living at home (mom, grandparents, uncle, target child); two older sisters living in El Salvador; father in Mexico</td>
<td>3 generation household; mother's boyfriend lived with them part time each week</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Maite worked full-time cleaning offices, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Maternal Ed.</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp.</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighborhood Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita: age 39</td>
<td>Molly: age 6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>U.S. born</td>
<td>80-100K</td>
<td>Graduated College</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>4 living at home (mom, dad, brother, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family near-by; extensive friendship network</td>
<td>Mostly White, but ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Margarita worked full-time in social services, standard hours; husband worked full-time in architecture, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilibeth: age 39</td>
<td>Tomás: age 7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>5 (mom, dad, brother, grandmother); aunt and her family were temporarily also living there</td>
<td>3 generation household; extended family near-by; extensive friendship network</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Lilibeth worked part-time cleaning offices, non standard hours; husband worked full-time as a forklift driver, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina: age 40</td>
<td>Carmen: age 5</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>Some post university studies</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>10 (mom, dad, 2 brothers, target child, aunt, uncle, cousin, 2 grandparents)</td>
<td>3 generation household; additional family lived near-by</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Regina worked full-time in sales, non standard hours; husband worked full-time in construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisana: age 35</td>
<td>Ariela: age 6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10-20K</td>
<td>Some elementary school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>5 (mom, dad, 2 brothers, target child)</td>
<td>Luisana had sisters near-by, but somewhat limited</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially mixed - Latinos, Asians</td>
<td>Luisana cared for the children and house; husband worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Name</td>
<td>Child Name</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Maternal Education</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp.</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighboring Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inéz: age 45</td>
<td>Roció: age 7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&gt;150K</td>
<td>Completed university</td>
<td>private, Catholic</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, sister, target child)</td>
<td>Inez's family in Mexico, but frequent visits; Husband's family very near with constant contact;</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Inez cared for children and house; husband worked in management at a technology company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariela: age 40</td>
<td>Martin: age 8</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>private, bilingual</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, sister, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family in U.S. - get together for holidays and celebrations;</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Mariela worked full-time as a housekeeper, standard hours; husband worked part-time as a driver, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura: age 29</td>
<td>Vicente: age 6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>9 (mom, boyfriend, target child, aunt, uncle, 2 cousins, grandma)</td>
<td>3 generation household; extended family near-by;</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Laura was a full time student; her partner was a full time student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ángela: age 28</td>
<td>Eric: age 5</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;10K</td>
<td>No formal schooling</td>
<td>public, bilingual</td>
<td>7 (mom, dad, sister, target child, 2 friends, friends')</td>
<td>No family in U.S.</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Ángela cared for children and house; father worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>House- hold Income</td>
<td>Maternal Ed.</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp. (^1)</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighborhood Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria: age 25</td>
<td>Blanca: age 8</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&lt;10K</td>
<td>Completed elementary school</td>
<td>public, bilingual</td>
<td>6 (mom, dad, 2 sisters, target child, cousin)</td>
<td>Some family in U.S. (husband's brothers)</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Gloria cared for children and house; father worked full-time at car wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena: age 48</td>
<td>Eliana: age 9</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some middle school</td>
<td>private, Catholic</td>
<td>3 (mom, dad, target child)</td>
<td>No family in U.S.</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Lorena worked part-time as a seamstress, standard hours; father worked full-time upholstering cars, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara: age 36 (almost 5)</td>
<td>Gaby: age 4</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>declined to respond</td>
<td>Some university studies</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>10 (mom, dad, target child, aunt, uncle, 3 cousins, 2 grandparents)</td>
<td>3 generation household; additional family lived near-by</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Clara cared for the children and house; husband worked full time as a banker, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cony: age 30</td>
<td>Abagail: age 6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>5 (mom, stepdad, sister, grandmother)</td>
<td>3 generation household; ethnically and racially mixed - Latinos, African Americans</td>
<td>Cony was about to start operating a home child care but had been home caring for...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Maternal Ed.</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp.¹</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighborhood Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belén: age 29</td>
<td>Perla: age 5</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>charter, bilingual</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, sister, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family near-by</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>children and studying, standard hours; husband worked full time with IT systems, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marleny: age 31</td>
<td>Sol: age 8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Completed university</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, brother, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family near-by</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Marleny worked full time in social services, standard hours; husband worked part-time as barista, non standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena: age</td>
<td>Pablo: age 9</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>declined to respond</td>
<td>declined to respond</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>2 (mom and target child)</td>
<td>No family in U.S.</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Elena worked full-time as a waitress, non standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella: age</td>
<td>Valentina: age 6</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>U.S. born</td>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>Some university studies</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>3 (mom, dad, sister, target child, grandmother)</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Isabella was a full-time student, standard hours; husband was self-employed, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Maternal Ed.</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp.¹</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighborhood Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariadna: age 43</td>
<td>Marco: age 8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>U.S. born</td>
<td>10-20K</td>
<td>Graduate studies underway</td>
<td>public, bilingual</td>
<td>2 (mom and target child)</td>
<td>No family near-by, but extensive friendship network</td>
<td>Racially and ethnically diverse</td>
<td>Ariadna was a full-time graduate student, flexible hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaby: age 40</td>
<td>Armando: age 5</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10-20K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>charter, bilingual</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, brother, target child)</td>
<td>No family in U.S.</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Gaby cared for children and house; husband worked full-time as day laborer, non standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda: age 40</td>
<td>Jeffrey: age 9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20-30K</td>
<td>Some middle school</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>5 (mom, dad, brother, sister, target child)</td>
<td>Some family in U.S.</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Miranda cared for children and house; husband worked full-time in upholstering furniture, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz: age 27</td>
<td>Alfredo: age 7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;10K</td>
<td>Studied some grade in middle school</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>7 (mom, dad, 2 sisters, 2 brothers, target child)</td>
<td>Extended family near-by; constant contact</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Beatriz care for children and house; husband worked full-time in construction, standard hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Mother's Heritage Country</td>
<td>Mom Age to U.S.</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>Maternal Ed.</td>
<td>Child School Type</td>
<td>Household Comp.</td>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Neighborhood Composition</td>
<td>Parental work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>60-80K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>private, religious</td>
<td>7 (mom, dad, sister, brother, target child, grandparents)</td>
<td>3 generation household; extended family near-by;</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Hazel worked full-time in retail, non standard hours; husband worked full-time in real estate, standard hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>60-80K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>private, religious</td>
<td>3 (mom, dad, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family near-by</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Andrea worked full-time in retail, non standard hours; husband worked full-time in sales, standard hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludin</td>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>declined to respond</td>
<td>Some university studies</td>
<td>private, Catholic</td>
<td>4 (mom, dad, brother, target child)</td>
<td>Extensive family near-by</td>
<td>Ethnically and racially diverse</td>
<td>Ludin worked full-time in child care, standard hours; husband worked full-time as a lab technician, standard hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>charter</td>
<td>7 (mom, brother, sister, target child, grandparents, cousin)</td>
<td>Extended family near-by; constant contact</td>
<td>Mostly Latino</td>
<td>Alma worked full-time as receptionist, standard hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Descriptive statistics for full sample (N=27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Min-Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign born mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican born</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran born</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Born Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age at time of assessment (years)</td>
<td>36.22 (6.27)</td>
<td>25.00- 50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age at time of assessment (years)</td>
<td>7.44 (1.49)</td>
<td>4.73- 10.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child gender (Female)</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First grade</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second grade</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth grade</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth grade</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual household income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $10,000</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001-$20,000</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-30,000</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-40,000</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-80,000</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-100,000</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$150,000</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual household income per capita</strong></td>
<td>7,596.94 (8,512.45)</td>
<td>$714.29- $37,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employed</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employed</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>11 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paternal employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employed</td>
<td>21 (88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employed</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal education level</strong></td>
<td>6.19 (2.88)</td>
<td>0.00-11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school completed or less</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some junior and/or high school</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school completed</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or vocational school</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate studies</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paternal education level</strong></td>
<td>5.72 (2.61)</td>
<td>0.00- 11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school completed or less</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some junior and/or high school</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school completed</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or vocational school</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate studies</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>Min-Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>5.04 (1.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00–10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or living with partner</td>
<td>24 (89%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s School type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>7 (27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (including religious)</td>
<td>6 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child attended bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother speaks Spanish to target child</td>
<td>20 (74%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target child speaks Spanish to mother</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Descriptive statistics split by heritage country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican Heritage</th>
<th>Salvadoran Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=15</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal age at time of assessment (years)</td>
<td>36.87 (6.47)</td>
<td>35.42 (6.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child age at time of assessment (years)</td>
<td>7.36 (1.26)</td>
<td>7.53 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child gender (Female)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First grade</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second grade</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth grade</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth grade</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $10,000</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001-$20,000</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$30,000</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-$40,000</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$60,000</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=$150,001</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual household income per capita</td>
<td>$8,211.73 (9,873.79)</td>
<td>$6,671.43 (6,543.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employed</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employed</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time employed</td>
<td>12 (86%)</td>
<td>10 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time employed</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal education level</td>
<td>6.40 (2.67)</td>
<td>5.91 (3.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school completed or less</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some junior and/or high school</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school completed</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or vocational school</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate studies</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal education level</td>
<td>5.86 (2.85)</td>
<td>5.55 (2.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school completed or less</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Mexican Heritage</td>
<td>Salvadoran Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=15$ M (SD) or Freq. (%)</td>
<td>$n=12$ M (SD) or Freq. (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some junior and/or high school</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school completed</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade or vocational school</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate studies</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>4.67 (1.23)</td>
<td>5.50 (2.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or living with partner</td>
<td>13 (87%)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (including religious)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child attended bilingual education program</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother speaks Spanish to target child</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>11 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target child speaks Spanish to mother</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Composite ERS values for full sample and for Mexican versus Salvadoran heritage participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Mexican Heritage</th>
<th>Salvadoran Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>n=15</td>
<td>n=12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Cultural Socialization (4 items)</td>
<td>3.14 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.06 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Cultural Socialization (4 items)</td>
<td>2.27 (0.80)</td>
<td>2.48 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Perspective (2 items)</td>
<td>4.19 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.37 (0.88)</td>
<td>3.96 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-Blind Perspective (1 item)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.57)</td>
<td>3.60 (1.50)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence about Race (1 item)</td>
<td>1.12 (0.33)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Bias (3 items)</td>
<td>2.43 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.01)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Family ERS practices by item for full sample and Mexican versus Salvadoran heritage families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you or a family member…</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Mexican Heritage</th>
<th>Salvadoran Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N=27$</td>
<td>$n=15$</td>
<td>$n=12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
<td>$M (SD)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. take {insert child’s name} to cultural events (concerts, festivals etc.) related to {heritage culture} (Ex. CS)</td>
<td>1.67 (0.48)</td>
<td>1.80 (0.41)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. tell {insert child’s name} that race or ethnicity doesn’t matter in the United States; everyone is treated the same (CB)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.57)</td>
<td>3.60 (1.50)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. tell {insert child’s name} that he or she can be anything he or she wants to be no matter what his/her heritage is (E)</td>
<td>4.11 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.27 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.92 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. talk with {insert child’s name} about racism (which is when people think or treat other people unfairly because of their race, ethnicity or skin color) (PB)</td>
<td>2.89 (1.37)</td>
<td>2.93 (1.44)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. take {insert child’s name} to religious services, Sunday school, first communion class, or religious events related to your cultural heritage? (Im. CS)</td>
<td>2.35 (0.85)</td>
<td>2.29 (0.99)</td>
<td>2.42 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. tell stories to {insert child’s name} about {heritage culture} or about family in {heritage country} (Im. CS)</td>
<td>3.11 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. eat typical foods from {heritage culture} with your child like tacos or pupusas (Im. CS)</td>
<td>4.26 (0.71)</td>
<td>4.27 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.25 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. tell {insert child’s name} that people might treat him/her unfairly because he/she is {heritage culture} (PB)</td>
<td>1.96 (1.43)</td>
<td>1.87 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. read books to {insert child’s name} or encourage {insert child’s name} to read books about the history or culture of {heritage country} (Ex. CS)</td>
<td>1.89 (1.12)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. have {insert child’s name} talk on the phone to family members in {heritage country} (Im. CS)</td>
<td>2.81 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.27 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. tell {insert child’s name} that through hard work and education anyone, regardless of race or ethnicity, can succeed in the U.S. (E)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.13)</td>
<td>4.47 (0.83)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Sample</td>
<td>Mexican Heritage</td>
<td>Salvadoran Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. tell {insert child’s name} to be proud of being from {heritage culture} (Ex. CS)</td>
<td>3.62 (1.39)</td>
<td>3.79 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.42 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. talk to {insert child’s name} about what to do if he/she experiences discrimination or prejudice (PB)</td>
<td>2.44 (1.42)</td>
<td>2.73 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. avoid talking about race or ethnicity with {insert child’s name} even when she or he has asked questions or made observations about race or ethnicity (SR)</td>
<td>1.12 (0.33)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. tell {insert child’s name} about important contributions that {people of heritage culture} have made to the United States (Ex. CS)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.21 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.75 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ex. CS = Explicit Cultural Socialization, Im. CS = Implicit Cultural Socialization, E = Egalitarian Perspective, CB = Color-Blind Perspective, PB = Preparation for Bias, SR = Silence about Race
## Table 6. Children’s justifications of their racial and ethnic label choice (n=23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Label Justification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Language                        | 12        | For Mexican: "It's because I speak Spanish and English."
|                                 |           | For American label: "Um… I speak English."
|                                 |           | For Mexican American label: "I speak language- I speak Spanish and English." |
| Birthplace or residing in a particular place | 10        | For American: "Because I was born in American, in (area of city)."
|                                 |           | For Mexican American: "Because my Mom's Me- because my mom and dad were both born in Mexico and I was born in (city)." |
| Parents' heritage, race or ethnicity | 10        | For Hispanic: "Because my father is [Hispanic] and that's it."
|                                 |           | For Mexican American: "Um I am Mexican American porque um mami aquí she's Mexican and I'm American."
|                                 |           | For Mexican American: "Because my mom and dad are from Mexico and my mom said so." |
| Evaluative/Affective            | 7         | For Mexican American: "I would say it's um really good…"
|                                 |           | For Salvadoran American: "It's like really tough…"
| Foods                           | 4         | For Mexican: "…eating spicy stuff"
|                                 |           | For Salvadoran American: "I love Salvadorian food." |
Figure 1. Frequency with which children chose specific racial or ethnic labels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran-American</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=25;
*Label added by child.

Figure 2. Children’s racial or ethnic label choice for label that most describes them (frequency).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran and American*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=25;
*Label added by child.
Figure 3. Frequency with which mothers chose specific racial or ethnic labels for their children.

Figure 4. Mothers’ racial or ethnic label choice for label that most describes her child (frequency).

Note: *Mother provided this term when asked if additional labels that were not listed described her child’s race or ethnicity.
CHAPTER 9. REFERENCES


Hughes, D., Witherspoon, D., Rivas-Drake, D., & West-Bey, N. (2009). Received ethnic-racial socialization messages and youths’ academic and behavioral outcomes: Examining the


133


Weisner, T. S. (1996). The 5 to 7 transition as an ecocultural project. In A.J. Sameroff & M. M. Haith (Eds.), The five to seven year shift: The age of reason and responsibility (pp. 295-326), Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.


