Familism Through a Developmental Lens

By: Gabriela L. Stein, Alexandra M. Cupito, Julia L. Mendez, Juan Prandoni, Nadia Huq, Diana Westerberg

Stein, G.L., Cupito, A., Mendez, J.L., Prandoni, J., Huq, N., & Westerberg, D. (2014). Familism through a developmental lens. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology, 2(4)* 224–250. doi:10.1037/lat0000025

Abstract:

This article reviews an emerging literature examining the effects of familism across childhood and adolescence. Familism has been described as a Latino cultural value that emphasizes obligation, filial piety, family support and obedience, and its effects have been documented as primarily protective across childhood and adolescence. This review seeks to organize and critique existing research using a developmental science framework. Key tenets of this perspective that are highlighted in the review are close consideration of how familism develops within an individual across time, manifests itself at different points in development, and impacts child, adolescent, and family functioning. Forty-four articles were examined and categorized with results showing that the protective influence of familism is most evident during the period of adolescence. Consideration of expressions of familism and the impact of familism on outcomes during earlier and later periods of development is offered as a recommendation for deriving a more complete understanding of the function of familism in Latino families.

Keywords: familism | developmental science

Article:

Research conducted over the past 40 years finds that familial cultural values, primarily termed familism, function as one of the core cultural values guiding Latino families in the United States (e.g., Knight et al., 2010). While the roles of family and familism have been firmly established as impacting the lives of Latinos (Sabogal, Marín, Otero-Sabogal, VanOss Marín, & Perez-Stable, 1987), familism was primarily conceptualized and researched within adult populations. More recently, the construct has been extended downward and applied to research with younger

populations as researchers examine the role familism plays in predicting psychosocial and educational outcomes in Latino youth. However, despite this increased research activity, the majority of the current literature has overlooked the potentially dynamic nature of familism and has not considered the construct from a developmental science perspective (see Calzada, Tamis-LeMonda, & Yoshikowa, 2013 for an exception).

To fill this critical gap in the literature, this article will apply a developmental science framework to the study of familism, with a focus on how familism develops, how it is perpetuated across development stages, and how it relates to outcomes within these stages. We begin by briefly summarizing the existing definitions of familism, describing tenets of developmental science, and proposing an organizational framework for the study of familism. To better illustrate the relation between developmental principles and the emergence of familism, we review articles within developmental stage, and critique the findings according to an understanding of stage-salient issues differentially impacting children and adolescents.

Historical and Definitional Issues

Introduced in 1945 by Burgess and Locke (Burgess & Locke, 1945), the construct of familism was defined as a value that characterized the social structure of traditional modern peasant-based societies as opposed to the individualism that was characteristic of modern urban societies, and at this point, the value was not specific to Latinos. Although familism was discussed as an important value specific to Latinos in the 1970s, it was not until the late 1980s that the first widely used familism scale was developed for Latinos (Sabogal et al., 1987). Familism was conceptualized as being comprised of three factors: familial obligations (obligation to provide material and emotional support), perceived support from the family (the extent to which family members are reliable sources of support), and family as referents (the use of relatives as behavioral and attitudinal referents). In their revision of the familism construct, Lugo Steidel and Contreras (2003) argued that past conceptualizations had failed to capture key aspects of familism (e.g., protecting the family name, family reciprocity and interconnectedness, and the subjugation of self for the family), and incorporated these aspects in their new measure.

Although all of these conceptualizations were rooted in the experience of adult Latinos, new research has examined the definition of familism in younger populations, thereby establishing its role in earlier in development. Fuligni and colleagues (1999, Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002) examined the salience of filial obligations in Latino youth, taking account the developmental tasks of adolescence. Similarly, in focus groups with Mexican American adolescents and their families, participants discussed three distinct aspects of familism: the importance of close family relationships, obligations to the family, and the family serving as a referent (Knight et al., 2010). In a study with Dominican and Mexican origin mothers, Calzada and colleagues (2013) reported that parents discussed the four factors of attitudinal familism suggested by Lugo Steidel and Contreras (2003). In summary, familism appears to be salient to younger populations and

comprised of the same factors, but research has yet to consider how familism develops within the individual and how its development predicts psychosocial functioning.

Developmental Science

Developmental science offers a valuable perspective to the study of familism and we propose that using this perspective will further our understanding of how familism develops overtime and also how it impacts developmental processes and outcomes. Masten (2006) outlined six principles that can be applied to the study of familism. They included the importance of a developmental perspective when examining psychopathology, normative development within a historical and cultural context, existence of individuals within complex systems, individual functioning dependent upon integrated, multilevel systems from genetics to behavior to surrounding systems, individuals who are active agents in their own development, normal and abnormal outcomes or behaviors that are mutually informative and reveal how different trajectories arise in development, and finally, longitudinal research best illustrates the interplay among aspects of development and context over time. In our conceptual analysis, we seek to show how individual trajectories could be impacted by the cultural familial value of familism at different developmental stages. Moreover, we argue that examining familism without an appreciation of the context in which it occurs may result in flawed conclusions about the contributions that familism makes to eventual adaptive or maladaptive outcomes for Latino youth. Finally, this review highlights the clear need for specific longitudinal work that can capture how familism functions differently for youth, depending upon their earlier development, current level of risk and/or protection, as well as differentially across key contexts.

Integrating across the past literature on familism and the developmental science perspective, we propose an organizational framework to guide future research and our current review (see Table 1). We posit that obligations, respect, support or cohesion, and family as referent are four central components of familism that could be studied across each major stage of development. Further, we argue that the accurate study of this construct requires a consideration of both parental and child perspectives. Although some work distinguishes *respeto* from familism, we place respect along with obedience in our framework for two reasons. We argue that *respeto* is a developmentally appropriate component of familism evident in early childhood. The parenting practices designed to instill *respeto* serve as a foundation to the value of familism, primarily because *respeto* provides children with a role within the family and an expected behavior to which to conform, that also serves to promote family cohesion during the early childhood years (Calzada, Fernandez, & Cortes, 2010). Second, adolescent familism research suggests that there may be a theoretical overlap among the constructs as obedience, deference and respect for adults, and family as referent are included in their definitions (e.g., Fuligni et al., 1999; Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003). In adolescent studies examining familism and *respeto*separately, there are high correlations between the constructs further suggesting conceptual overlap (e.g., Esparza & Sanchez, 2008; Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2012). By placing*respeto* and familism within a developmental organizational framework, this review applies a developmental science model to

guide longitudinal studies that are necessary to characterize how the emergence of these aspects of familism relates to one across development, and to important stage salient outcomes. However, we acknowledge that the relationship of *respeto* and familism across time needs to be studied longitudinally to ascertain whether they indeed operate as one construct across development.

Table 1. Proposed Organizational Framework for the Impact of Familism on Children and Parents Throughout Development

	Early childhood (2–6)		Middle childhood (7–11)		Adolescence (12–18)	
	Child	Parent	Child	Parent	Child	Parent
Familism	Primarily behavioral manifestations	Parent lays foundation for cultural values and expectations; primarily focused on respeto and behavioral compliance	Child starts internalizing values that undergird behaviors	Parents continue emphasize obedience, compliance, respect; start increasing obligations demands	Values internalized and impact behaviors	Parent expects internalization of values and congruent behavior
Obligations Attitudinal	Emerging	Obligations to other family; need to help others	Develops understanding of things should be doing in the home	Continuation of demands in early childhood; greater expectations of obligations for children	Internalized value of obligations; sophisticated	Obligations and expectations the greatest
Behavioral	Comply with parental requests for assistance (e.g., set the table)	Additional adults in home; time spent with other family members; socializing obligations through modeling	Time spent doing chores, helping family members, interpreting	Continuation of demands in early childhood; requests of child's obligation and socialization obligations verbally	Increased obligations in the home due to age (caretaking, cooking, and cleaning)	Obligations communicated to child
Respect Attitudinal	Emerging understanding of behavioral expectations in the home	Guide expectations for children's behavior in home	Internalized values of obedience or respect	Expect children to be bien educados and have internalized respeto	Internalized values of obedience	Expect children to demonstrate respect, not disagree or argue
Behavioral	Primary form familism may be expressed; obedient, quiet,	Parent socialization messages direct and indirect;	Continues to demonstrate respeto; behavioral compliance	Continuation of early childhood messages	Compliance with parental rules, low levels of externalizing	Continue to provide socialization on respeto or obedience; low

	respectful to adults	model respeto to elders	extended to other contexts; fewer externalizing problems		behaviors, less open disagreement with parents, low levels of conflict with parents if comply but high levels if not exhibited	conflict if child conforms but high conflict if parental expectations for respect not being met
Support or cohesion Attitudinal	Emerging	Feel support by others as parent; need to provide support to others; need to be a good parent	Develops an understanding of needing to provide support for others	Continuation of early childhood beliefs	Internalized values of provision of support	Provide support to child as transition to adulthood
Behavioral	Development of attachment; development of sibling or family closeness (e.g., time spent with siblings)	Supporting attachment; sensitive parenting; provided with social support; model social support or warmth	Relationship measures of parent-child relationship; develops warm, caring relationship with parent	Continues to build a strong emotional relationship with child; provides support to others; socialization messages of united, strong family	Warm relationship with parents, siblings, family; high levels of family cohesion; satisfaction with parents	Continue to show positive relationship characteristics: warmth, support caring
Family as referent Attitudinal	Emerging	Viewing family as experts in parenting; views child comportment as reflection of parenting self	Develops an understanding that parents are ultimate authority; behavior at school reflects on family	Continuation of early childhood beliefs	Internalized values; view parents as legitimate authority	Believe ultimate authority, expect positive behavior as reflection of family
Behavioral	Behave in settings to reflect well on the family	Taking advice from family about parenting decisions; gives messages that behavior reflects family	Communication with parents; seeking advice; behavioral compliance or academic success as reflection of family	Provide child with direct messages regarding behavior reflecting family and parental authority	Less open disagreement with parents, perform well in school, less involvement in negative behaviors	Continued messages provided to children; conflict if parental expectations for behavior not met
Primary stage-salient issues that may relate to familism	Attachment Self-regulation Individuation from caregiver		Development of peer relations Transition to school Academic skills Burgeoning independence		Individuation and identity Dating and relationships Preparation for higher education	

					Values internalization	
Potential risk	People in home overcrowding; Selection of daycare	Caring for other family members (financially, emotionally) strain of care taking	Obedient, respectful behavior leads to less assertiveness in settings; receive United States mainstream messages potential conflict with parents	Caring for other family members (financially, emotionally); strain of caretaking; messages different from United States mainstream culture	Internalizing pathology; high levels of guilt or shame; extreme levels of obligations; cultural values gap	Caring for other family members (financially, emotionally); strain of caretaking; messages different from United States mainstream culture; cultural values gap
Potential protection	Foundation of prosocial behavior; compliance; foundation of positive parent–child relationships secure attachment leads to emotion regulation	Social support provided to parents; financial support provided to parents	Obedient and prosocial skills facilitate interactions outside the home (e.g., with peers and teachers)	Support provided by others; child exhibits compliance and respeto and internalizes values	Sense of purpose, positive ethnic identity, motivate school engagement; and academic performance	High levels of monitoring, warm relationships with child, congruent values at neighborhood or school

Our framework also organizes existing research by a closer consideration of attitudinal and behavioral aspects of familism as they emerge in development (e.g., Sabogal et al., 1987; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). Attitudinal familism refers to the actual beliefs and values, whereas behavioral familism refers to the behavioral expression of those beliefs. This distinction is particularly useful as many have used behavioral and attitudinal measures interchangeably leading to confusion in the literature. We argue that it is important consider the interplay of behavioral and attitudinal familism *throughout* development. It is possible that behavioral manifestations of familism would be more predictive of functioning in a preschooler but that attitudinal familism becomes more relevant in adolescence as children become more cognitively advanced and develop greater awareness of the values that undergird their behavior. The behavioral expression of familism likely results from attitudinal beliefs interacting with contextual factors (Calzada et al., 2013), and these need to be considered carefully. Within each stage, we consider whether research has examined the impact of familism on important stage salient issues as well the contextual factors that may influence its effects as outlined below.

Method

We identified qualitative and quantitative articles by using Google Scholar and PsycInfo databases for all years up to 2013. We used the following search terms: familism, familial cultural values, familismo, family, family values, affiliative obedience, *respeto*, filial obligation, and family obligation, and located 55 articles within our age range. Given that our focus was on the development of familism, we selected 44 articles that fell into early childhood (birth to 7), middle childhood (8–12), and adolescence (12–18) and measured an aspect of familism with a Latino sample (the majority of studies had 100% Latino participants; only four studies had multiethnic samples and examined Latino participants in separate analyses or was a significant portion of the participants). Table 2 presents the salient demographic information, age of child population, familism measure, reporter, and main findings. The majority of studies were conducted in adolescence (73%) and involved attitudinal measures of familism (84%).

Table 2. *Review Articles*

Citation	**Demographics**	**Sample size**	**Child age**	**Reporter**	**Measure used (attitudinal vs. behavioral)**	**Main findings**
Early childhood						
Calzada, Fernandez, and Cortes (2010)	Immigrant Mexican, Immigrant Dominican and U.S.-born Dominican mothers of preschoolers (ages 3–6) *Child generation status not provided*	48	Immig. Mex = 31.47 years (5.66) Immig. Dom. = 35.26 years (9.47) U.S.-born Dom. = 28.71 (4.82)	Mother	Focus groups with open ended questions about cultural values.	Across groups, a focus on family described as both support and closeness to family members ("extended family serving a primary role in providing social and emotional support") and in proximity ("Beyond family as a support system, mothers talked about family living and spending time together").
Calzada, Tamis-LeMonda, and Yoshikawa (2013)	11 Mexican and 12 Dominican families *Child generation status not provided.*	23 dyads	Child age ranged from 3–36 months or 10–12 years	Observation by fieldworker Caregiver	Behavioral	Results also showed that frequent and regular interpersonal contact, including living with extended kin, is normative in Latino families. Results identified five areas in which behavioral

						familismo manifests, including financial support, shared daily activities, shared living, shared childrearing, and immigration.
Gamble and Modrey-Mandell (2008)	Families of Mexican descent (86% of mothers were first generation Mexican American)	55 dyads	M age = 57.5 months (SD = 4.94) Younger sibling = 36 months (13.09) Older sibling = 72 months (38.04)	Mother	12-item subscale from the family relationships values Q-sort measure of cultural constructs among Mexican-Americans (Wozniak, Sung, Crump, Edgar-Smith, & Litzinger, 1996). Items were converted to a Likert scale. (attitudinal)	Familism was found to act as a moderator, where warmth and closeness in family relationships coupled with the endorsement of familism was associated with more optimal functioning in preschool classrooms (emotional adjustment, peer acceptance, lower internalizing problems).
Valdés (1996)	Mexican American parents	10	Not reported	Mother	Qualitative data about how parents use strategies to teach children about appropriate interactions with adults, representing the value of respeto.	Mothers reported that they preferred to leave children with relatives instead of nonrelative care, which was upsetting, though acceptable.
Childcare use						
Karoly and Gonzalez (2011)	Families with a child or one parent born in any country outside the U.S. (immigrant) Families with children and parents born in the U.S. (native)	NA	Use is looked at for children age 0–2 yeas, 3– years, and 4– years	NA	The surveys examined childcare usage (both nonparental home-based care and centerbased childcare)	Immigrant children of all ages were less likely to be in center-based care or nonparental home-based care (both relative and nonrelative).
Mulligan, Brimhall, and West (2005)	Children under 6 in the U.S. (grouped by White (61%),	NA	Birth–6	NA	Childcare usage	Hispanic children were less likely to participate in nonparental care at

	Black (15%), Hispanic (18%), and Other (6%)) *Country of origin not provided*					least 1 time per week, compared with White and Black children. Of those Hispanic children who did participate in childcare, rates for relative based care and center based care were comparable.
Yesil-Dagli (2011)	Hispanic preschool age children *Country of origin not provided*	657	36–59 months	NA	Demographic variables and childcare usage	The data suggested that use of center-based childcare is more frequent than use of parental care, relative care, or nonrelative care. In general, family poverty status, mother's education, household composition, mother's work status, and acculturation are all significant predictors of center-based childcare use.
Middle childhood						
Calderón-Tena, Knight, and Carlo (2011)	Mexican American; 29% of youth U.S. born (54% of their parents foreign born); 51% female youth; Arizona	204	M age = 10.9 (SD = 0.84) (9–13)	Child-report; Parent-report	Familism subscale (MACVS; Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Mothers' familism values predicted proscocial parenting which in turn predicted prosocial behavioral tendencies in adolescence, Child familism values partially mediated the relation between adolescents' perception of prosocial parenting practices and prosocial behavioral tendencies.
Morcillo, Duarte,	Puerto Rican children age 5 to	NY = 1,138 dyads	M age = 9.2 (SD	Parental	Abbreviated adapted version	Parental familism was protective

Shen, Blanco, Canino, and Bird (2011)	13 living in the Bronx, NY and San Juan and Caguas, Puerto Rico and their caregiver	PR = 1,353 dyads	= 0.1)		of the Sabogal Familism Scale (10 items on a 4-point Likert scale; attitudinal) child familism did not have good internal consistency (< 0.30)	against antisocial behaviors in girls at each stage. For boys, parental familism was only protective in 5- to 9-year-olds. The protective effect of parental familism on antisocial behaviors was mediated by caregiver structuring and warmth.
Romero, Robinson, Haydel, Mendoza, and Killen (2004)	4th grade students and their mothers who identified as Mexican	219 dyads	M age = 9.5 (SD = 0.37)	Mother Child	Mother familism: A scale developed for collectivistic groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) child familism: Family Impact Scale (11 items assessing values and behaviors (Colon, 1998; attitudinal and behavioral)	Higher parent education was associated with higher maternal familism. Child preference for English or bilingualism was related to higher child familism.
Taylor, Larsen-Rife, Conger, and Widamin (2012)	Mexican origin; 30% of youth Mexico-born; 51% female youth; California	549 triads	M age = 10.85; age range 10–12	Child-report; Parent-report	16-item familism scale (MACVS; Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Parents' familistic values were negatively associated with interparental conflict for both mothers and fathers. Parents' familistic values were also indirectly associated with parenting through the marital relationship.
White, Zeiders, Gonzales, Tein, and Roosa (2013)	Mexican origin families; 78.6% mothers and 79.9% fathers born in Mexico; 48.1% female youth; Southwest	462 mother, father, youth triads	*M* age = 10.4 (*SD* = .55)	Child-report; Parent-report (both mother and father)	Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Parents' cultural values were associated with the likelihood of using a responsive and demanding parenting style compared with other less involved

						parenting styles.
Adolescence						
Ayón, Marsiglia, and Bermudez-Parsai (2010)	Mexican and Central American descent parent-child dyads; parents: 94% mothers; 87.3% immigrant parents; adolescents: 60% female youth; 55% U.S.-born; Southwest	150 dyads	M age = 15.50 (SD = 1.25)	Child-report; Parent-report	6 items from the familism scale used by Gil, Wagner, and Vega (2000) and developed by Olson and colleagues (1983). Items assess attitudes of respect and loyalty towards one's family (attitudinal)	Familism was associated with decreased mental health symptomatology among families, and familism did not reduce the negative effects of discrimination.
Bámaca-Colbert, Umaña-Taylor, and Gayles (2012)	Mexican origin; 7th graders: 62.1% U.S.-born; 10th graders 60.6% U.S.-born; 100% female youth; Southwest	271 dyads	7th graders: M age 12.26 (SD = 0.46); 10th graders: M age 15.20 (SD = 0.43)	Child-report; Mother-report	Behavioral autonomy expectations Teen Timetable Questionnaire (Feldman & Quatman, 1988; attitudinal)	Mother–daughter autonomy expectation discrepancies were positively associated with mother–daughter conflict, but this association was found only among early adolescents.
Baumann, Kuhlberg, and Zayas (2010)	Latina (73% U.S. born; 32% Puerto Rican, 28% Dominican, 15% Mexican, 11% Colombian); 100% female youth; 51% had attempted suicide; Northeast	169 dyads	M age = 15.19 (SD = 1.87)	Child-report; Mother-report	Familism Scale (Lugo-Steidel and Contreras, 2003; attitudinal)	Familism gaps predicted less mother–daughter mutuality and more externalizing behaviors in the adolescents.
Berkel et al. (2010)	Mexican American (74.3% of mothers and 79.9% fathers foreign born); 49% female youth; Arizona	711	M age = 10.42 (SD = 0.55) at Time 1	Child-report; Parent-report	The Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Discrimination predicted greater Mexican American values which then predicted less internalizing symptoms and better academic outcomes.
Bush, Supple, and Lash (2004)	Mexican youth living in Mexico; 55% female youth	534	M age= 13.43 (SD = 1.31)	Child-report	The Bardis Familism Scale (Bardis, 1959; attitudinal)	Age and parental education negatively related to familism. Emotional connection to parents related to

						familism in girls but not boys. Parental monitoring associated with familism but not after taking into account parental authority. Parental legitimate authority was associated with familism.
Delgado, Updegraff, Roosa, and Umaña-Taylor (2011)	Mexican origin (66 and 67% of parents foreign born; 62% of target youth U.S. born); target youth (7th graders) 51% female; older siblings: 50% female; Arizona	246 triads	Target children: M age = 12.8 (SD = .57); older siblings M age = 15.70 (SD = 1.50)	Child-report; Parent-report	16-item familism scale (MACVS: Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Paternal attitudinal familism predicted fewer deviant peer associations, adolescent familism associated bivariately with less depressive symptoms, risky behaviors, and deviant peers.
East and Weisner (2009)	Mexican American; 85% of youth U.S. born; 60% female youth; older siblings in sample had teenage pregnancy; southern California	110 dyads	M age = 13.9 (SD = 1.83)	Child-report	5 items on familial obligations scale by Sabogal, Marín, Otero-Sabogal, VanOss Marín, and Perez-Stable (1987; attitudinal) caregiving hours to baby (behavioral)	Caregiving predicted an increase in school absences and disciplinary problems. Family obligations were not protective against caregiving stress but, rather, further compromised youths' wellbeing for those who were highly involved in their family's care.
Esparza and Sánchez (2008)	42%; Mexican origin 39% Puerto Rican origin; 16% other Latino; 3% biracial; 32% 1st generation; 51% 2nd generation; 52% female youth; urban areas	143	17.87 years (SD = 0.66)	Child-report	The Familism Scale (Lugo-Steidel & Contreras, 2003; attitudinal)	High attitudinal familism predicted greater academic effort. Also, when mothers' educational level was low, attitudinal familism was positively associated to students' GPA.
Fuligni and	34% Filipino,	745	M age =	Child-	Family	Family obligations

Pederson (2002)	15% East Asian, 26% Latin American, 25% European American; 53% female		20.1	report	obligation scales: family respect, current assistance, and future support (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; attitudinal)	increased in late adolescence and were related to better emotional well-being and educational persistence for adolescents receiving low to moderate grades in 12th grade.
Fuligni, Tseng, and Lam (1999)	38% Filipino origin, 13% Chinese origin, 15% Mexican origin, 12% Central/South American origin, 23% European origin; 29% 1st generation; 44% second generation; 27% 3+ generation; 54% female youth; southern California	820	10th graders (M age = 15.7 years); 12th graders (M = 17.7)	Child-report	Family obligation scales: family respect, current assistance, and future support (Fuligni, Tseng, & Lam, 1999; attitudinal)	All three scales associated greater paternal and material cohesion and better communication with family. All three scales associated with greater study time, and respect and current assistance associated with educational aspirations and expectations. Curvilinear association with grades such that the moderate endorsement of current assistance most protective.
Germán, Gonzalez, and Dumka (2009)	Mexican origin families; did not report % foreign born; 50.6% female youth; 79.1% U.S.-Born adolescents Phoenix, Arizona	598 adolescents, 573 mothers, 331 fathers	M age = 12.3; (age range = 11–14)	Child-report; Parent-report	16 items were taken from three familism subscales from the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Adolescent, maternal, and paternal familism values interacted protectively with deviant peer affiliations to predict lower levels of teacher reported externalizing problems. These relations were not found with parent reports of adolescent externalizing problems although these models showed a direct, protective effect of maternal familism

						values.
Gil, Wagner, and Vega (2000)	40% Cubans; 13% Nicaraguans; 47% other Latino; All male sample; 52% foreign born; South Florida	2,019	6th and 7th graders followed 3 years	Child-report	7-item familism measure (Olson and colleagues, 1983; attitudinal)	Acculturation and acculturative stress associated with increased alcohol use through the deterioration of Latino family values, attitudes, and familistic behaviors. The relationship between acculturative stress and alcohol use was influenced by nativity.
Guilamo-Ramos et al. (2007)	70% Dominican and 30% Puerto Rican; 80% mothers foreign born; 50% female youth; Bronx, NY	63 mother adolescent dyads	11–14 years old	Child-report; Mother-report	Focus groups (attitudinal and behavioral)	Content analysis of parents' focus groups revealed five essential Latino parenting practices described by both youth and their mothers.
Kiang and Fuligni (2009)	41% Latin American 38% Asian, and 21% European; 50% female youth; Los Angeles area	679	M age = 14.87 (SD = 0.40)	Child-report	Family respect (Fuligni et al. 1999); family obligations scale (Fuligni et al. 1999; attitudinal) Daily diary data for completion of 8 filial obligation tasks (behavioral)	Ethnic identity was more strongly related to family respect and obligations than cohesion. Adolescents from Latin American and Asian backgrounds reported significantly higher levels of obligation and assistance as compared with adolescents with European backgrounds, and these ethnic differences were mediated by ethnic identity.
Knight et al. (2011)	Mexican American (74.3% of mothers and 79.9% fathers foreign born); 49% female	750 adolescents and mothers, 467 fathers	M age = 10.42qa (SD = 0.55) at Time 1	Child-report; Parent-report	Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (MACVS; Knight et al.,	The socialization of Mexican American values was primarily a function of mothers' Mexican

	youth; Arizona				2010; attitudinal)	American values and ethnic socialization. Fathers values or socialization not related to youth endorsement.
Kuhlberg, Peña, and Zayas (2010)	Latina (72% U.S. born; 35% Puerto Rican, 28% Domincan,12% Mexican, 10% Colombian; 15% other) 100% female youth; 53.54% suicide attempters; Northeast	226	M age = 15.47 (SD = 2.01)	Child-report	Familism Scale (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003; attitudinal)	Familism was associated with lower levels of parent–adolescent conflict, but higher levels of internalizing behaviors. Not associated with suicide attempt history.
Kuperminc, Jurkovic, and Casey (2009)	Latino (65.3% Mexican origin; 16.3% Central American 12.2% Caribbean; 6.1% South American) 74% youth foreign born; 64% female youth; Southeast	129	M age = 16.8 (SD = 1.15)	Child-report	Filial Responsibility Scale-Youth (FRS-Y; Jurkovic, Kuperminc, Sarac, & Weisshaar, 2005; behavioral)	Filial obligations related to less psychological distress, more social competence, and greater self-efficacy; Perceived fairness of obligations also a predictor of psychological distress.
Lorenzo-Blanco et al. (2012)	Hispanic (84% U.S. Born; 84% had Mexican parents; 9% El Salvadorian parents, 6% Guatemalan parents); 53% female youth; Southern California	1,922	9–11th grade students; 86% of sample was 14	Child-report	Three of the items from the familism scale Sabogal et al. (1987), and one item came from the familism scale described by Cuellar, Arnold, and Gonzalez (1995) and Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado (1995). Four items assessed the cultural value of respeto (Unger et al., 2002; attitudinal)	Familism and respeto were associated with higher family cohesion and lower family conflict, and this effect was stronger for girls than boys. Both acculturation and enculturation were related to greater familism and respeto.
Marsiglia, Parsai, and Kulis (2009)	Mexican descent; 56% born in the U.S.; 60% female; Arizona	151	M age = 15.53 (SD = 1.25)	Child-report	The Familism Scale (Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000;	Familism is predicted less aggressive behavior, conduct

	and North Carolina				attitudinal)	problems, and rule breaking. Familism and cohesion did not interact to predict functioning.
Nolle, Gulbas, Kuhlberg, and Zayas (2012)	Sub-sample of Kuhlberg et al. (2010); 88% born in the U.S. or Puerto Rico; 50% attempted suicide; Northeast	24 triads (youth, mother, father)	M age = 15	Child-report; Parent-report	Qualitative interviews. (attitudinal and behavioral)	Familism emerged as a theme for both attempters and nonattempters. For attempters who expressed a desire to kill themselves in their attempt reported wanting to make things better for their families.
Peña et al. (2011)	35.7% Puerto Rican, 29.6% Dominican, 10.2% Mexican, 10.2% Colombian, 14.4% other Hispanic; 50% suicide attempters; 100% female youth; New York City	216	M age = 15.5 (SD = 2.0)	Child-report	Familism Scale (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003; attitudinal)	Familism positively associated with adolescents being part of tight-knit families, and adolescents in these families were significantly less likely to attempt suicide compared with less tightly knit families.
Polo and Lopez (2009)	Mexican origin (52% of youth U.S. born); 50% female youth; Los Angeles area	159 dyads	M age = 13.2	Child-report; Parent-report	The Affiliative Obedience versus Active Self-Affirmation measure (Díaz-Guerrero, 1994; attitudinal)	Greater child-reported affiliative obedience predicted fewer depressive symptoms and internalizing problems controlling for demographic characteristics.
Smokowski and Bacallao (2007)	13% Mexico, 21% Central America, 21% South America; 97% born outside the U.S.; 51% female youth; North Carolina	323	*M* age = 15 (*SD* = 1.8)	Child-report	Familism Measure (Gil, Wagner, & Vega; 2000; based on Olson et al, 1983; attitudinal)	Familism associated with fewer internalizing problems and higher self-esteem. The protective effect of familism on internalizing problems was mediated by parent-adolescent conflict
Smokowski,	Latino (66% of	349 dyads	Median	Child-	Familism	Attitudinal

Rose, and Bacallao (2010)	adolescents foreign born); a subsample of Smokowski et al. (2010)		grade: 10th	report; Parent-report (90% mothers)	measure (Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000; based on Olson et al, 1983; attitudinal)	familism associated with fewer internalizing symptoms and higher self-esteem across time and effects mediated by parent– child conflict.
Stein, Gonzalez, Cupito, Kiang, and Supple (2013)	Latino youth: 78% Mexican-origin, 2% Nicaraguan, 2% Dominican, 2% Salvadorian, and 8% Latino mixed; 53% female youth; North Carolina	173	*M* age = 14.08	Child-report	18-item Attitudinal Familism Scale (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003)	Familism associated with positive psychosocial and educational outcomes, but it did not moderate the negative effects of perceived peer discrimination on these outcomes.
Stein and Polo (2013)	Mexican origin (52% of youth U.S. born); 50% female youth; Los Angeles area	159 dyads	M age = 13.1 (SD = .73)	Child-report; Mother-report	The Affiliative Obedience versus Active Self-Affirmation measure (Díaz-Guerrero, 1994; attitudinal)	Cultural value gaps on obedience related to adolescent depressive symptoms, and this relationship was most pronounced for older adolescents.
Telzer, Fuligni, Lieberman, and Galvan (2013)	Mexican backgrounds; 56% female youth (no other information provided); southern California	48	14 to 16.5 years (M age = 15.23)	Child-report	12-item Family Obligations Scale (current assistance; Fuligni et al., 1999; attitudinal)	Family obligation was associated with decreases in neurologically evidenced reward sensitivity and enhancements in cognitive control, thereby reducing risk-taking behaviors.
Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, Bamaca, and Guimond (2009)	Latino (77% Mexican origin, 15% Latino/Hispanic; 6% Puerto Rican); 49.9% female youth; Midwest	323	M age = 15.21 (SD = 0.73)	Child-report	The Cultural Values Scale (Unger et al., 2002; attitudinal)	Generational status was not directly associated with adolescents' reports of familistic values, but its effect was fully mediated by families' ethnic socialization practices. Argued that familism measured support not obligations.

Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, and Delgado (2005)	Mexican American (70% of parents born outside the U.S.); 51% female youth; Arizona	234 sibling dyads	Older siblings M age = 15.7 (SD = 1.6); younger siblings M age = 12.8 (SD = 0.58)	Child-report	17-item familism scale (MACVS; Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal) and time spent with adult-kin, siblings (behavioral)	Attitudinal familism associated with better sibling relationship quality (greater intimacy and less negativity) but not with time spent together.
Updegraff, Umaña-Taylor, Perez-Breña, and Pflieger (2012)	Data used is from Updegraff et al. (2005); Mexican origin families; 62% of adolescents U.S.-born; 51% female youth Southwest	240 families	M age = 12.8 (SD = 058)	Child-report; Parent-report	Familism values and traditional patriarchal gender role attitudes measured using subscales of the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Families endorsing traditional gendered parenting role attitudes displayed the highest levels of familism. More acculturated families displaying congruent parenting role attitudes reported significantly lower levels of familism.
Updegraff, Umaña-Taylor, McHale, Wheeler, and Perez-Brena (2012)	Data used is from Updegraff et al. (2005); Mexican origin families; 62% of adolescents U.S.-born; 51% female youth Southwest	Phase 1 = 246 families Phase 2 = 184 families	Phase 1 (M age = 12.8) Phase 2 (M age = 17.75)	Child-report	Familism values and traditional patriarchal gender role attitudes measured using subscales of the Mexican American Cultural Values Scale (Knight et al., 2010; attitudinal)	Females showed steeper declines in traditional gender role attitudes than did males. Overall, all adolescents declined in familism values, time spent with family, and involvement in Mexican culture. Found bidirectional relationships between cultural orientations and adjustment some of which were moderated by adolescent nativity and gender.
Valenzuela and Dornbusch (1994)	84% Anglo and 16% Mexican origin; primarily adolescents with US born parents 52% Mexican-origin female youth; San	3,158	High school students; specific age of the sample not	Child-report	1-item behavioral familism (talk to nonparental kin); 1-item structural familism (relatives in	When high levels of attitudinal familism were coupled with high levels of parental education, the interaction was associated with

	Francisco area		reported		proximity); 14-item attitudinal familism scale (4 items from Keefe, 1984; attitudinal and behavioral)	self-reported higher grades. This result was only found for the Mexican-origin participants.

Studies examining familism have been conducted with Latinos from different countries of origin demonstrating that this value cuts across subethnicity. However, much of this work has been conducted with Mexican origin samples as seen in Table 2 (43% of samples Mexican American). Although not a focus of this review, future work should examine whether these values operate differently across Latino subethnicities.

Results

Early Childhood (Birth to 7)

Literature review

The majority of research on familism at this stage focuses on understanding the parenting practices and goals of Latino parents, and only two articles were located examining familism in particular, and thus, we include articles examining *respeto.* This reflects our conceptualization of the role of *respeto*, as we argue that it is an early manifestation of familism and that parenting aimed at instilling *respeto* lays the foundation for the internalization of familism later in development. For example, in her study of *respeto*, Valdés (1996) found that parents used verbal and nonverbal strategies to teach children about appropriate interactions with adults, such as greeting elders politely, not challenging elders' points of view, and not interrupting adults. Valdés (1996) explained that these behaviors represented the value of *respeto* that specifically teaches children about how they should defer to adults and their role in the family as a daughter, son, sister, and so forth. Similarly, Latino mothers voiced the importance of teaching their children about Latino cultural values, including the centrality of family, religious beliefs, and *respeto* (Calzada et al., 2010). Finally, research on social behavior for Mexican American children at home and school points to the role of *respeto* in fostering "bien educado" in Latino children, which is defined as appropriate social competencies such as comportment and obedience within the family and other settings. Indeed, researchers studying the transmission of cultural values during early childhood point to *respeto* as creating cooperation and cohesion among members of the family, which is closely linked to the development of attitudinal familism (Bridges et al., 2012).

While instilling cultural values are a central parenting goal for Latino parents, familism may also serve to foster positive parent–child interaction and promote adaptive social behavior. Because these values emphasize familial interconnectedness, support, and cohesion, parents may demonstrate high levels of warmth, foster positive attachment, and spend time with their children

(see Table 1). One study directly examined this question in early childhood and established that mothers who report high levels of familism report greater warmth and closeness (Gamble & Modry-Mandell, 2008). Moreover, familism moderated the relation between maternal-child closeness and children's emotional adjustment as rated by teachers, such that children's adjustment scores were significantly lower when mothers reported low levels of familism, despite higher levels of mother—child closeness. Maternal familism also predicted emotional and peer adjustment in the context of high levels of sibling warmth. Thus, maternal familism related to behavioral adjustment of children at school, thereby illustrating the saliency of examining two important socialization contexts of home and school.

Empirical literature examining familism in early childhood across key contexts is limited (only two studies located). For example, studies have examined how familism may relate to parental decision-making about childcare usage and relative care. National studies have suggested that Latino parents utilize out of home childcare, including center based care, at a lower rate than non-Hispanic White and Black families (Karoly & Gonzalez, 2011), but other studies have found comparable rates of center based care among Latinos (Mulligan, Brimhall, & West, 2005; Yesil-Dagli, 2011). Limited data are available to inform whether Valdés' (1996) observation that mothers preferred to leave children in the care of relatives because of familism values remains accurate today, as other factors are likely involved in childcare access, such as financial and language barriers and awareness of resources (Karoly & Gonzalez, 2011; Mulligan et al., 2005). In the domain of neighborhood and community factors and familism, a qualitative study by Calzada and colleagues (2013) observed that frequent and regular interpersonal contact is normative for Latino families. Participants in her study spent extended periods of shared living arrangements with extended kin. However, they also found examples of the behavioral expression of familism that may either influence families positively (e.g., child rearing support, financial support) or negatively (e.g., overcrowding, financial strain of other relatives). Taken together, these studies suggest that parental familism attitudes may impact day-care selection, living arrangements, and contact with extended kin, which in turn likely predicts psychosocial outcomes. Greater exploration of these relations over time (during early childhood) is needed.

Critical synthesis and future directions

Research conducted at this stage in development suggests that Latino families may be expressing the importance of familism, primarily via the messages involving respect for adults within the family; however, we contend that the roots of familism as expressed within families with young children is less well understood. Studies have not precisely examined how parental attitudinal familism influences parental socialization at this stage, and the only study that examined familism impact on parenting behaviors relied solely on self-report. More research is necessary to understand how familism values influences parental behaviors using observational methodology to rule out single-method bias. The research on the selection of child-care is flawed in that the large-scale studies assume that familism may influence selection but no large-scale

studies have specifically measured this question. More research needs to examine how parental attitudinal familism predicts behavioral manifestations (e.g., selection of childcare, parenting practices) especially within different contexts (e.g., urban vs. rural, economic stress). For example, familism influences housing arrangements in urban environments (Calzada et al., 2013), but understanding how a range of community characteristics could play a role in the expression of behavioral familism among families with young children is necessary especially as it relates to housing, childcare selection, and the transition to school.

Middle Childhood (Ages 7–11)

Literature review

During the period of middle childhood, children may start internalizing the values and beliefs that underpin the construct of familism and their behavior may be influenced by their own beliefs in addition to parental directives. However, only five studies were located examining familism solely at this stage. Four studies focused on parental attitudinal familism predicting parent behaviors, such that parental attitudinal familism was associated with less interparental conflict (Taylor, Larsen-Rife, Conger, & Widaman, 2012), more responsive, warm, and structured parenting (Morcillo et al., 2011; White et al., 2013), and parenting practices aimed at promoting prosocial behaviors (Calderón-Tena, Knight, & Carlo, 2011), confirming that these values shape the familial context at this stage in development. Two of these studies linked these values and practices to outcomes. In a longitudinal examination across childhood, parental attitudinal familism was associated with lower levels of parent reported antisocial behavior over the two yearly follow-ups, controlling for other environmental and child risk factors, parental warmth and structure were found to mediate these relationships (Morcillo et al., 2011). However, only one of these studies examined the impact of these parenting practices on child behaviors via child familism values such that maternal attitudinal familism was directly and indirectly associated with child prosocial behavior partially through child familism values (Calderón-Tena et al., 2011). One other article at this stage examined family contextual predictors finding that higher levels of parental education were associated with higher maternal familism, and also surprisingly, preference for English or bilingualism was also associated with higher child familism (Romero, Robinson, Haydel, Mendoza, & Killen, 2004).

Critical synthesis and future directions

Although studies increased in frequency, middle childhood is an underdeveloped stage for familism research relative to adolescence. In general, the majority of studies focused on parental familism values, despite the fact that youth at this stage of development (particularly the latter period of middle childhood) have begun to internalize these values. Although it is clear that parental attitudinal familism impacts parental behavior, it is less clear how parental familism impacts the internalization of child familism. The only study linking parental and child attitudinal familism at this stage (Calderón-Tena et al., 2011) was limited in that the prosocial

parenting scale appeared to include items directly associated with familism expectations (e.g., “My mother expects me to take care of younger siblings”) and was cross-sectional. In a rare longitudinal investigation, consistent with a developmental science perspective, Morcillo et al. (2011) was innovative in its design, but unfortunately, it did not measure child attitudinal familism to link whether the internalization of these values also contributes to its positive effects.

Moreover, the manifestation of attitudinal versus behavioral familism at this stage may be particularly important to clarify. In addition to predicting parental behaviors, attitudinal parental familism may also predict child manifestations of behavioral familism (e.g., compliant behavior), which has not been examined at this stage in development. Additionally, studies have intermixed both behavioral and attitudinal components in its measurement making it difficult to disentangle whether it was the internalization of these values or the behavioral enactments that lead to positive outcomes (e.g., Romero et al., 2004). Therefore, a developmentally appropriate measure of attitudinal and behavioral familism needs to be developed that can guide these questions at this stage, and to critically examine the interplay of these two aspects of familism throughout development (e.g., their alignment vs. misalignment). Additionally, contextual factors need to be considered more fully. For example, the behavioral manifestation of familism may also pose a risk in school contexts if the child shows overly deferential behavior toward adults. Thus, research at this stage should be mindful of how attitudinal and behavioral child familism influences the development of relationships outside of the home context (e.g., peer, teachers).

Adolescence (12–18)

Literature review

We located 32 studies examining familism values in adolescence that will be discussed below.

Family functioning

Contrary to work earlier in development, research conducted in adolescence examines how familism manifests itself from both a parent and adolescent perspective. Across studies, Latino mothers demonstrate parenting strategies that are consistent with familism: closely monitoring their children, controlling their activities, having expectations of obedience, and maintaining warm and supportive relationships that foster interconnectedness (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2007; Updegraff, Umaña-Taylor, Perez-Brena, & Pflieger, 2012). Adolescents often interpret these parental behaviors as the manifestation of familism; for example, they report feeling that parents should closely monitor them and spend time with them, viewing this behavior as being driven by parental love and concern (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2007). Latino adolescents also demonstrate many behaviors consistent with familism as evident with studies documenting time spent interpreting for parents (Sy, 2006), completing household chores (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004), caring for siblings (Hafford, 2010), and time spent with siblings and other family members (Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Delgado, 2005).

Not surprisingly, familism has been associated with a positive parent–child relationship (Delgado, Updegraff, Roosa, & Umaña-Taylor, 2011; Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2012; Taylor, Larsen-Rife, Conger, & Widaman, 2012). Adolescents who value familism reported greater feelings of connectedness and cohesion with the family and better parent–child communication (Fuligni et al., 1999; Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2012), and families high in familism were characterized as having high cohesion (Peña et al., 2011). Adolescent familism also predicted low levels of parent-adolescent conflict (e.g., Smokowski, Rose, & Bacallao, 2010), and conflict served to mediate the positive effects of attitudinal familism. However, consistent with tenets of developmental science regarding the individual's transaction with the surrounding context, research has found that family conflict in the presence of high levels of attitudinal familism may be more detrimental as it violates the expectations of family harmony (Hernández, Ramírez Garcia, & Flynn, 2010; Kuhlberg, Peña, & Zayas, 2010).

During midlate adolescence, the increased desire for autonomy and individuation from the family may impact how familism is expressed within the family context, particularly how adolescents perceive their parents' behavior. Attitudinal adolescent familism has been associated with the perception of parents serving as legitimate sources of guidance and authority (Bush, Supple, & Lash, 2004), such as for making decisions about dating (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2007). This perception of parents' legitimate authority leads to improved family functioning as well as positive adolescent outcomes, including less distress and more prosocial behaviors (e.g., Kuperminc et al., 2009). However, when Latino adolescents do not align with their parents on autonomy expectations, there is increased risk for parent–child conflict and greater psychopathology (e.g., Bámaca-Colbert, Umaña-Taylor, & Gayles, 2012). One longitudinal study has examined the natural trajectory of familism values across adolescence, and consistent with the notion that familism may change in adolescence because of autonomy, attitudinal familism across 7th and 12th grade decreases (Updegraff, Umaña-Taylor, McHale, Wheeler, & Perez-Brena, 2012), whereas another study documented increases in filial obligations in the transition out of 12th grade (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002). Likely the distinct aspects of familism (i.e., respect vs. obligations) may demonstrate differential growth across adolescence, but more research is needed to clarify these trajectories.

Psychosocial and academic outcomes

The majority of research suggests that attitudinal adolescent familism serves a compensatory function and predicts better psychosocial functioning (i.e., fewer depressive symptoms, less substance use, and less behavioral problems) (e.g., Ayón, Marsiglia, & Bermudez-Parsai, 2010; Germán, Gonzales, & Dumka, 2009; Gil, Wagner, & Vega, 2000;Marsiglia, Parsai, & Kulis, 2009; Polo & Lopez, 2009). Additionally, behavioral familism, as conceptualized as fulfilling familial obligations, has also been shown to predict the development of competence and maturity in Latino adolescents (Kuperminc, Jurkovic, & Casey, 2009). However, although attitudinal and behavioral familism can often be protective, it can also result in detrimental outcomes in stressful contexts acting as a potentiating factor. East and Weisner (2009) found that

extensive family responsibilities predicted adolescent stress, internalizing symptoms, and worse school outcomes, and familism did not buffer against the detrimental effects of extensive caregiving in the context of sibling teenage parenting. Similarly, in their study of suicidal adolescents (Nolle, Gulbas, Kuhlberg, & Zayas, 2012), participants sacrificed their material needs or subjugated their emotions to avoid unduly burdening their families, and when they failed to fulfill their obligations, they felt that sacrificing themselves through suicide would serve as an appropriate solution.

Fewer studies have examined paternal and maternal attitudinal familism predicting adolescent outcomes and produced mixed findings. Paternal attitudinal familism was negatively associated with adolescent deviant peers association whereas adolescent attitudinal familism was associated with fewer depressive symptoms, risk engagement, and peer association, but maternal reports were only correlated with fewer depressive symptoms in older adolescents (Delgado et al., 2011). In another study, maternal, paternal, and adolescent attitudinal familism protected adolescents from deviant peer association in the prediction of externalizing symptoms, but only maternal familism showed direct effects (Germán, Gonzales, & Dumka, 2009). Finally, other studies have considered discrepancies in parent and child reports of attitudinal familism. Parent-child alignment on attitudinal familism was protective against both internalizing and externalizing symptoms (Bamaca-Colbert & Gayles, 2010; Baumann, Kuhlberg, & Zayas, 2010; Kuhlberg, Peña, & Zayas, 2010; Stein & Polo, 2014).

Research examining familism values and academic outcomes has generally focused on attitudes about family obligations. Attitudinal familial obligations and respect contribute to Latino adolescents' academic motivation because of the fact that students desire to help their families in the future (Fuligni et al., 1999; Sánchez, Esparza, Colón, & Davis, 2010). However, other research documents potential risk as family obligation attitudes influenced students to forego attending college to support their families (Sánchez et al., 2010). These contradictory findings suggest that contextual forces are likely leading to differential outcomes. In fact, parental education was a significant moderator, but again findings were conflicting with one study finding less risk at low levels of education and the other finding less risk at high levels of education (Esparza & Sánchez, 2008; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). Furthermore, a curvilinear effect exists between attitudinal family obligations and grades, such that students reporting the greatest obligations had school grades just as low or even lower than those reporting the weakest family obligations (Fuligni et al., 1999). We can conclude from these studies that attitudinal and behavioral familism may differentially impact academic outcomes, and further, these relationships are likely impacted by contextual factors such as SES and generational status, but presently mechanisms are less clear.

Attitudinal familism has also been associated with a greater sense of school belonging (Stein, Gonzalez, Cupito, Kiang, & Supple, 2013), and a strong sense of school belonging has been predictive of higher grade point average (GPA) among Latino students (Sánchez, Colón, & Esparza, 2005). Attitudinal familism may help adolescents develop psychosocial competencies

allowing them to successfully create feelings of connectedness and solidarity in the school setting (Knight & Carlo, 2012). Consistent with this idea, attitudinal and behavioral familism have also been found to promote prosocial behavior tendencies (i.e., actions that are intended to benefit others) (Calderón-Tena et al., 2011) and social competence (Kuperminc et al., 2009). Therefore, familism may lead to adolescents being more cognizant of others before they act leading to positive outcomes in contexts outside of the home.

New research has examined the neural mechanisms underlying the relationship between attitudinal filial obligations, cognitive control, and risk-taking behavior (Telzer, Fuligni, Lieberman, & Galván, 2013); adolescents reporting high filial obligations were found to show a neural pattern consistent with greater risk aversion, lower sensitivity to rewards, and more mature cognitive control. Of interest to the authors, family cohesion and support did not show similar neural responses, indicating that only specific types of family relationships are associated with these protective effects. This work exemplifies a developmental science perspective as it integrates across systems examining the neurological mechanisms that may explain in part the protective function of familism, and suggests that the internalization of these values changes how adolescents may respond to their environments and the neurological pathways that may be implicated in their behavior.

Work on contextual influences has also extended our current understanding of the role of familism by examining the role of neighborhood level familism (Gonzales et al., 2010), calculated by averaging mothers' and fathers' familism in a census block. Neighborhood familism conferred the most robust protective effects of all contextual predictors (e.g., family income, subjective economic hardship, and neighborhood disadvantage). Thus, having a community with shared values about the importance of family may allow for collective supervision of youth, more resources for youth to pursue goals, positive opportunities, more safe places, and may validate and support parents' commitment to family (Gonzales et al., 2010).

Work has also examined how attitudinal familism operates in the context of experiences of discrimination. Although adolescent attitudinal familism was protective against the negative effects of discrimination on risk-taking behaviors at low levels of discrimination, it was not protective at high levels of discrimination (Umaña-Taylor, Updegraff, & Gonzales-Backen, 2011). Similarly, attitudinal familism failed to buffer against peer discrimination in predicting depressive symptoms and psychological distress (Ayón et al., 2010; Delgado et al., 2011; Stein et al., 2013). Moreover, daughters of mothers who report high levels of attitudinal familism perceived greater discrimination (Delgado et al., 2011), and yet, discrimination results in an increase in Latino cultural values (Berkel et al., 2010). As suggested by Berkel et al. (2010), familism may not operate as a buffer but instead a risk reducer in the context of stress and in conjunction with ethnic identity, but more work is needed to elucidate these processes.

Critical Synthesis and Future Directions

Socialization

It is clear that familism impacts family functioning in adolescence, but studies at this period suggest that parents and youth do not universally align on attitudinal familism. Most studies have documented nonsignificant correlations between parent and adolescent reports of attitudinal familism (e.g., Delgado et al., 2011; Germán et al., 2009; Knight et al., 2011). This suggests two possible interpretations. First, consistent with acculturation gap models, it is likely that there are families that align on these values and those who do not align equally on these values. Second, and perhaps more importantly for the field, little is known about how families come to align on these values and, more specifically, how adolescents come to internalize these values (Knight et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that parental, especially maternal, ethnic socialization during early adolescence leads to increases in adolescent attitudinal familistic values (Knight et al., 2011; Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, Bámaca, & Guimond, 2009). Thus, direct ethnic socialization is likely to be one of the many pathways fostering the internalization of attitudinal familism, but socialization measures used in the literature have not been specific to familism. This makes it unclear whether parents explicitly socialize around these values, or as suggested by Valdés (1996), this is done more indirectly. Additionally, research should disentangle whether the messages parents provide are more directly related to the behavioral manifestation of familism (i.e., completing chores) or also include messages about the values themselves (e.g., we should always support our family). Therefore, more work is needed to understand the ethnic socialization of familism in Latino families and how these values are instilled both in the family context and extrafamilial contexts (e.g., school, neighborhoods) as suggested in Table 1.

Attitudinal versus behavioral familism

It is evident that attitudinal familism is associated with family functioning, but how these constructs relate to one another in the prediction of psychological functioning is less clear in adolescence. Clarification is needed as to whether positive family functioning (e.g., warmth, cohesion) constitutes a behavioral manifestation of attitudinal familism, or whether they are distinct constructs. Meditational models finding that attitudinal familism influences family functioning leading to positive psychological outcomes support this notion. However, moderational models would suggest that these are indeed separate constructs and that attitudinal familism functions as the cultural framework that influences how individuals interpret each other's behavior. Although both models can be true in that these values may guide behavior but then also serve as cognitive frames to understand that behavior, researchers should be mindful as to what construct their measure captures and which model is guiding their research questions as suggested by Table 1. Again, longitudinal studies will be particularly useful in disentangling the familial and individual mediating mechanisms.

Similarly, the literature continues to be plagued by a lack of clear theoretical and measurement clarity concerning adolescent attitudinal versus behavioral familism as predicting outcomes. More work needs to examine the differential impact of both aspects of familism, with a specific

focus on the intersection of the two as the review finds that both attitudinal and behavioral familism can pose a threat to psychological and academic functioning (East & Weisner, 2009; Nolle et al., 2012; Sánchez et al., 2010). Because these studies all utilized different methodology, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions, but it is likely that attitudinal and behavioral factors serve as both risk and protective factors and this relationship depends both on the type of familism in question as well as contextual factors (e.g., Calzada et al., 2013).

Attention to context

The contextual influences that may impact the effects of familism need to be elucidated more clearly as suggested in Table 1. Studies demonstrating a detrimental effect of attitudinal familism have been conducted in at risk populations (high levels of psychopathology, Bauman, Kuhlberg, & Zayas, 2010; teenage pregnancy, East & Weisner, 2009; low SES, Sánchez et al., 2010). Similarly, the role of familism, parental education, and broader SES context in predicting academic outcomes is not well understood; disparate findings could be linked to different family or cultural contexts (immigrant vs. United States born parents, Esparza & Sánchez, 2008; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). These findings align with a developmental science perspective suggesting that contextual factors need to be carefully considered to understand how familism operates in adolescence.

The relation between acculturation and familism is complex and studies in adolescence have found no relation between generation status and familism (e.g., Delgado et al., 2011;Esparza & Sanchez, 2008; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009). Similarly, some studies have found no relation between acculturation variables and endorsement of familism values (e.g.,Updegraff et al., 2005), but other studies find that both acculturation to the United States and culture of origin are both related to the endorsement of familism (e.g., Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2012). These differences may be because of measurement and sample characteristics as some of these have included mostly youth living in immigrant families, and generation or acculturation differences may be found in more diverse samples. However, the majority of research on the relation of familism and acculturation fails to consider attitudinal versus behavioral familism, as there may be differences in the enactment of familism but not the values across generations or acculturation. Future research should continue to explore how attitudinal and behavioral familism functions across contexts, with special attention paid to elucidating the mechanisms that may underlie the protective and/or risk mechanisms.

Reporter

Differential findings across reporter in adolescence are evident in our current review, and some of these differences may be because of age differences in the samples (e.g.,Delgado et al., 2011; Germán et al., 2009). There is some convergence of findings suggesting that maternal familism may be particularly salient (e.g., Knight et al., 2011) because of the primary role mothers play in structuring family environments and maintaining family values in the home.

Given these findings, there is a need for closer consideration of how and why reporters of familism are selected, and how these perspectives can be best considered simultaneously.

Conclusions

Taken together, we can conclude from these findings that parental and child attitudinal familism is associated with positive family functioning, which we argue can be construed as a behavioral manifestation of familism. Moreover, attitudinal familism has also been associated with multiple positive outcomes in Latino youth, primarily in adolescence (e.g., fewer internalizing and externalizing symptoms, greater social competence). However, the literature is plagued with some significant methodological flaws. Without a gold standard measure of attitudinal or behavioral familism, our conclusions across studies are hampered. It is unclear what aspects of familism are particularly protective and whether the aspect of familism matters, and this is particularly salient for clarifying the differential role of attitudinal versus behavioral familism. As noted in Table 1, researchers should specify the particular aspect of familism being assessed in their study to reduce this confusion in the literature.

Across developmental stages, research should more consistently examine how child gender may not only influence the internalization and enactment of familism, but also influence its protective or potentiating effects. Past research suggests that girls may be more heavily burdened by obligations in adolescence compared to boys (Stein et al., 2013;Rafaelli & Ontai, 2004), but few studies have systematically examined how familism may differentially impact psychosocial functioning across gender. Some studies above suggest that familism may confer more protection for girls (e.g., Lorenzo-Blanco et al., 2012; Morcillo et al., 2011), but gender has not been a consistent moderator (e.g., Stein & Polo, 2014). Likely, the effects of familism across gender depends on the aspect of familism under study as well as other contextual factors (e.g., poverty, birth order, or immigrant status) that need to be better elucidated.

Our review highlights the need for further inquiry in the developmental processes associated with familism, especially longitudinal studies that can clarify how familism manifests itself across development and how this manifestation depends on transitions across childhood. There is a dearth of research on familism in early childhood and middle childhood to fully describe how familism unfolds across development, and how it may differentially relate to outcomes. From a parental perspective, further work should examine the continuity in parental attitudinal familism across childhood and adolescence, and how it is influenced by child directed effects or context directed effects. Greater attention to how the behavioral expression of familism during an earlier developmental stage (e.g., early childhood) may influence both attitudinal and behavioral familism during later development may help to differentially predict outcomes in adolescence. In the same vein, research needs to explore whether there is a developmental shift in adolescence such that striving for autonomy leads to lessening of familism values as suggested by Updegraff and colleagues (2012). Likely, there is variability in these trajectories during this time of identity

formation where some adolescents solidify and strengthen their familistic orientation while other adolescents move away from it; we need to understand the familial and contextual predictors of these trajectories. Similarly, risk and protective mechanisms may also differ across development as familism may be protective for a specific psychosocial outcome at one point in development but not at another, and this may also hold true across contexts where expectations may be incongruent (e.g., home and school, or home and peers).

Few studies have used longitudinal methodology to examine the developmental course of familism and this work is necessary to identify causal mediators as well track developmental trajectories associated with familism. As we learn more about how familism intersects with important stage-salient issues, we will be able to clarify some of the mechanisms that underlie familism's effects on functioning across contexts. In summary, future research should consider the attitudinal and behavioral aspects of familism from both the parent and child perspective across development to understand the function of familism for Latino youth.

References

Ayón, C., Marsiglia, F. F., & Bermudez-Parsai, M. (2010). Latino family mental health: Exploring the role of discrimination and familismo. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *38*, 742– 756. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20392

Bámaca-Colbert, M. Y., & Gayles, J. G. (2010). Variable-centered and person-centered approaches to studying Mexican-origin mother–daughter cultural orientation dissonance.*Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *39*, 1274– 1292. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9447-3

Bámaca-Colbert, M. Y., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Gayles, J. G. (2012). A developmental-contextual model of depressive symptoms in Mexican-origin female adolescents.*Developmental Psychology*, *48*, 406– 421. doi: 10.1037/a0025666

Bardis, P. D. (1959). A familism scale. *Marriage & Family Living*, *21*, 340– 341.

Baumann, A. A., Kuhlberg, J., & Zayas, L. (2010). Familism, mother-daughter mutuality and suicide attempts of adolescent Latinas. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *24*, 616– 624. doi: 10.1037/a0020584

Berkel, C., Knight, G. P., Zeiders, K. H., Tein, J. Y., Roosa, M. W., Gonzales, N. A., & Saenz, D. (2010). Discrimination and adjustment for Mexican American adolescents: A prospective examination of the benefits of culturally related values. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *20*, 893– 915. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00668.x

Bridges, M., Cohen, S. R., McGuire, L. W., Yamada, H., Fuller, B., Mireles, L., & Scott, L. (2012). Bien Educado: Measuring the social behaviors of Mexican American children.*Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *27*, 555– 567.

Burgess, E. W., & Locke, H. S. (1945). *The family: From institution to companionship*. New York, NY: American.

Bush, K. R., Supple, A. J., & Lash, S. B. (2004). Mexican adolescents' perceptions of parental behaviors and authority as predictors of their self-esteem and sense of familism.*Marriage & Family Review*, *36*, 35– 65. doi: 10.1300/J002v36n01_03

Calderón-Tena, C. O., Knight, G. P., & Carlo, G. (2011). The socialization of prosocial behavioral tendencies among Mexican American adolescents: The role of familism values.*Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *17*, 98– 106. doi: 10.1037/a0021825

Calzada, E. J., Fernandez, Y., & Cortes, D. E. (2010). Incorporating the cultural value of respeto into a framework of Latino parenting. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*, 77– 86. doi: 10.1037/a0016071

Calzada, E. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Yoshikawa, H. (2013). Familismo in Mexican and Dominican Families from low-income, urban communities. *Journal of Family Issues*, *33*, 1– 29. doi: 10.1177/0192513X12460218

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Gonzalez, G. (1995). Cognitive referents of acculturation: Assessment of cultural constructs in Mexican Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *23*, 339– 356.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *17*, 275– 304.

Colon, R. (1998). Causal relationships of familial influence and adolescents' attitude toward substance use in the theory of planned behavior: A social impact model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *59*, 2482. (UMI No. AAM9835729).

Delgado, M. Y., Updegraff, K. A., Roosa, M. W., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2011). Discrimination and Mexican-origin adolescents' adjustment: The moderating roles of adolescents', mothers', and fathers' cultural orientations and values. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *40*, 125– 139. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9467-z

Diaz-Guerrero, R. (1994). *La psicología del Mexicano: Descubrimiento de la etnopsicología* (6th ed.) [The psychology of the Mexican: Discovery of ethnopsychology]. Mexico City: Trillas.

East, P. L., & Weisner, T. S. (2009). Mexican American adolescents' family caregiving: Selection effects and longitudinal associations with adjustment. *Family Relations*, *58*, 562– 577. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00575.x

Esparza, P., & Sánchez, B. (2008). The role of attitudinal familism in academic outcomes: A study of urban, Latino high school seniors. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *14*, 193– 200. doi: 10.1037/1099-9809.14.3.193

Feldman, S. S., & Quatman, T. (1988). Factors influencing age expectations for adolescent autonomy: A study of early adolescents and parents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 8,* 325– 343.

Fuligni, A., & Pedersen, S. (2002). Family obligation and the transition to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 38,* 856– 868. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.38.5.856

Fuligni, A., Tseng, V., & Lam, M. (1999). Attitudes toward family obligations among American Adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European Backgrounds. *Child Development, 70,* 1030– 1044. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00075

Gamble, W. C., & Modry-Mandell, K. (2008). Family relations and the adjustment of young children of Mexican descent: Do family cultural values moderate these associations?*Social Development, 17,* 358– 379. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00429.x

Germán, M., Gonzales, N., & Dumka, L. (2009). Familism values as a protective factor for Mexican-origin adolescents exposed to deviant peers. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 29,* 16– 42. doi: 10.1177/0272431608324475

Gil, A. G., Wagner, E. F., & Vega, W. A. (2000). Acculturation, familism, and alcohol use among Latino adolescent males: Longitudinal relations. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28,* 443– 458. doi: 10.1002/1520-6629(200007)28:4<443::AID-JCOP6>3.0.CO;2-A

Gonzales, N. A., Coxe, S., Roosa, M. W., White, R. M. B., Knight, G. P., Zeiders, K. H., & Saenz, D. (2010). Economic hardship, neighborhood context, and parenting: Prospective effects on Mexican-American adolescents mental health. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 47,* 98– 113. doi: 10.1007/s10464-010-9366-1

Guilamo-Ramos, V., Dittus, P., Jaccard, J., Johansson, M., Bouris, A., & Acosta, N. (2007). Parenting practices among Dominican and Puerto Rican mothers. *Social Work, 52,* 17– 30. doi: 10.1093/sw/52.1.17

Hafford, C. (2010). Sibling caretaking in immigrant families: Understanding cultural practices to inform child welfare practice and evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning,33,* 294– 302. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.05.003

Hernández, B., Ramírez García, J. I., & Flynn, M. (2010). The role of familism in the relation between parent–child discord and psychological distress among emerging adults of Mexican descent. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24,* 105– 114. doi: 10.1037/a0019140

Jurkovic, G. J., Kuperminc, G. P., Sarac, T., & Weisshaar, D. (2005). Role of filial responsibility in the post-war adjustment of Bosnian young adolescents. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 5,* 219– 235.

Keefe, S. E. (1984). Real and ideal extended familism among Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans: On the meaning of close family ties. *Human Organization, 43,* 65– 69.

Karoly, L. A., & Gonzalez, G. C. (2011). Early care and education for children in immigrant families. *The Future of Children, 21,* 71– 101. doi: 10.1353/foc.2011.0005

Kiang, L., & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). Ethnic identity and family processes among adolescents from Latin American, Asian, and European backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38,* 228– 241. doi: 10.1007/s10964-008-9353-0

Knight, G. P., Berkel, C., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Gonzales, N. A., Ettekal, I., Jaconis, M., & Boyd, B. M. (2011). The familial socialization of culturally related values in Mexican American families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 73,* 913– 925. 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00856.x

Knight, G. P., & Carlo, G. (2012). Prosocial development among Mexican American youth. *Child Development Perspectives, 6,* 258– 263. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2012.00233.x

Knight, G. P., Gonzales, N. A., Saenz, D. S., Bonds, D. D., Germán, M., Deardorff, J., . . .Updegraff, K. A. (2010). The Mexican American cultural values scale for adolescents and adults. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 30,* 444– 481. doi: 10.1177/0272431609338178

Kuhlberg, J. A., Peña, J. B., & Zayas, L. H. (2010). Familism, parent-adolescent conflict, self-esteem, internalizing behaviors and suicide attempts among adolescent Latinas. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 41,* 425– 440. doi: 10.1007/s10578-010-0179-0

Kuperminc, G. P., Jurkovic, C. J., & Casey, S. (2009). Relation of filial responsibility to the personal and social adjustment of Latino adolescents from immigrant families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23,* 14– 22. doi: 10.1037/a0014064

Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Unger, J. B., Baezconde-Garbanati, L., Ritt-Olson, A., & Soto, D. (2012). Acculturation, enculturation, and symptoms of depression in Hispanic youth: The roles of gender, Hispanic cultural values, and family functioning. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41,* 1350– 1365. doi: 10.1007/s10964-012-9774-7

Lugo Steidel, A., & Contreras, J. M. (2003). A new familism scale for use with Latino populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25,* 312– 330. doi: 10.1177/0739986303256912

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review, 98,* 224– 253.

Marsiglia, F. F., Parsai, M., & Kulis, S. (2009). Effects of familism and family cohesion on problem behaviors among adolescents in Mexican immigrant families in the southwest United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 18,* 203– 220. doi: 10.1080/15313200903070965

Masten, A. S. (2006). Developmental psychopathology: Pathways to the future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*, 47– 54. doi: 10.1177/0165025406059974

Morcillo, C., Duarte, C. S., Shen, S., Blanco, C., Canino, G., & Bird, H. R. (2011). Parental familism and antisocial behaviors: Development, gender, and potential mechanisms.*Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *50*, 471– 479. doi: 10.1016/j.jaac.2011.01.014

Mulligan, G. M., Brimhall, D., & West, J. (2005). *Child care and early education arrangements of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers: 2001*. Statistical Analysis Report. NCES 2006–039. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC.

Nolle, A. P., Gulbas, L., Kuhlberg, J. A., & Zayas, L. H. (2012). Sacrifice for the sake of the family: Expressions of familism by Latina teens in the context of suicide. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry82*, 3, 319– 327. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-0025.2012.01166.x

Olson, D. H., McCubbin, H., Barnes, H., Larsen, A. S., Muxen, M. J., & Wilson, M. A. (1983). *Families: What makes them work*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Peña, J. B., Kuhlberg, J. A., Zayas, L. H., Baumann, A. A., Gulbas, L., Hausmann-Stabile, C., & Nolle, A. P. (2011). Familism, family environment, and suicide attempts among Latina youth. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, *41*, 330– 341. doi: 10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00032.x

Polo, A. J., & Lopez, S. R. (2009). Culture, context, and the internalizing distress of Mexican American youth. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *38*, 273– 285. doi: 10.1080/15374410802698370

Raffaelli, M., & Ontai, L. L. (2004). Gender socialization in Latino/a families: Results from two retrospective studies. *Sex Roles*, *50*, 287– 299. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000018886.58945.06

Romero, A. J., Robinson, T. N., Haydel, K. F., Mendoza, F., & Killen, J. D. (2004). Associations among familism, language preference, and education in Mexican- American mothers and their children. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, *25*, 34– 40.

Sabogal, F., Marín, G., Otero-Sabogal, R., VanOss Marín, B., & Perez-Stable, E. (1987). Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't?*Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 397– 412.

Sánchez, B., Colón, Y., & Esparza, P. (2005). The role of sense of school belonging and gender in the academic adjustment of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *34*, 619– 628. doi: 10.1007/s10964-005-8950-4

Sánchez, B., Esparza, P., Colón, Y., & Davis, K. E. (2010). Tryin' to make it during the transition from high school: The role of family obligation attitudes and economic context for Latino emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 25,* 858– 884.

Smokowski, P. R., & Bacallao, M. (2007). Acculturation, internalizing mental health symptoms and self-esteem: Cultural experiences of Latino adolescents in North Carolina.*Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 37,* 273– 292. doi: 10.1007/s10578-006-0035-4

Smokowski, P., Rose, R., & Bacallao, M. (2010). Influence of risk factors and cultural assets on Latino adolescents' trajectories of self-esteem and internalizing symptoms. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 41,* 133– 155. doi: 10.1007/s10578-009-0157-6

Stein, G. L., Gonzalez, L. M., Cupito, A. M., Kiang, L., & Supple, A. J. (2013). The protective role of familism in the lives of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues.* Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0192513X13502480

Stein, G. L., & Polo, A. J. (2014). Parent–child cultural value gaps and depressive symptoms among Mexican American youth. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 23,* 189– 199. doi: 10.1007/s10826-013-9724-3

Sy, S. R. (2006). Family and work influences on the transition to college among Latina adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 28,* 368– 386.

Taylor, Z. E., Larsen-Rife, D., Conger, R. D., & Widaman, K. F. (2012). Familism, interparental conflict, and parenting in Mexican-origin Families: A cultural–contextual framework.*Journal of Marriage and Family, 74,* 312– 327. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00958.x

Telzer, E. H., Fuligni, A. J., Lieberman, M. D., & Galván, A. (2013). Meaningful family relationships: Neurocognitive buffers of adolescent risk taking. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 25,* 374– 387. doi: 10.1162/jocn_a_00331

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Alfaro, E. C., Bámaca, M. Y., & Guimond, A. B. (2009). The central role of familial ethnic socialization in Latino adolescents' cultural orientation. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 71,* 46– 60. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00579.x

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Updegraff, K., & Gonzales-Backen, M. (2011). Mexican-origin adolescent mothers' stressors and psychosocial functioning: Examining ethnic identity affirmation and familism as moderators. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40,* 140– 157. doi: 10.1007/s10964-010-9511-z

Unger, J. B., Ritt-Olson, A., Teran, L., Huang, T., Hoffman, B. R., & Palmer, P. (2002). Cultural values and substance use in a multiethnic sample of California adolescents.*Addiction Research Theory, 10,* 257– 279.

Updegraff, K. A., McHale, S. M., Whiteman, S. D., Thayer, S. M., & Delgado, M. Y. (2005). Adolescent sibling relationships in Mexican American families: Exploring the role of familism. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19,* 512– 522. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.19.4.512

Updegraff, K. A., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., McHale, S. M., Wheeler, L. A., & Perez-Brena, N. J. (2012). Mexican-origin youth's cultural orientations and adjustment: Changes from early to late adolescence. *Child Development, 83,* 1655– 1671. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01800.x

Updegraff, K. A., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Perez-Brena, N. J., & Pflieger, J. (2012). Mother–daughter conflict and adjustment in Mexican-origin families: Exploring the role of family and sociocultural context. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2012,* 59– 81. doi: 10.1002/cd.20004

Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Valenzuela, A., & Dornbusch, S. (1994). Familism and social capital in the academic achievement of Mexican origin and Anglo adolescents. *Social Science Quarterly, 75,* 18– 36.

White, R. M., Zeiders, K. H., Gonzales, N. A., Tein, J. Y., & Roosa, M. W. (2013). Cultural values, US neighborhood danger, and Mexican American parents' parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27,* 365– 375. doi: 10.1037/a0032888

Wozniak, R., Sung, S., Crump, T., Edgar-Smith, S., & Litzinger, S. (1996). *The relational family values Q-sort*. Unpublished manuscript, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA.

Yesil-Dagli, U. (2011). Predicting ELL students' beginning first grade English oral reading fluency from initial kindergarten vocabulary, letter naming, and phonological awareness skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 26,* 15– 29. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.06.001