



The Role of Parents' Ethnic-Racial Socialization Practices in the Discrimination–Depression Link among Mexican-Origin Adolescents

Irene J. K. Park , Han Du , Lijuan Wang , David R. Williams & Margarita Alegría


To cite this article: Irene J. K. Park , Han Du , Lijuan Wang , David R. Williams & Margarita Alegría (2020) The Role of Parents' Ethnic-Racial Socialization Practices in the Discrimination–Depression Link among Mexican-Origin Adolescents, Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 49:3, 391-404, DOI: [10.1080/15374416.2018.1547969](https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2018.1547969)


To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2018.1547969>

 View supplementary material 

 Published online: 28 Jan 2019.

 Submit your article to this journal 

 Article views: 383

 View related articles 

 View Crossmark data 



The Role of Parents' Ethnic-Racial Socialization Practices in the Discrimination–Depression Link among Mexican-Origin Adolescents

Irene J. K. Park

Department of Psychiatry, Indiana University School of Medicine – South Bend

Han Du

Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles

Lijuan Wang

Department of Psychology, University of Notre Dame

David R. Williams

*Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health;
Department of African and African American Studies, Harvard University*

Margarita Alegría

*Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital; Departments of Medicine & Psychiatry,
Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School*

The present study investigated the moderating role of parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices (T1) in the link between adolescents' discrimination experiences (T1–T3) and adolescent anxiety and depression, respectively (T1–T3). Using a 3-wave longitudinal design with multiple informants (adolescent, mother, father) reporting on parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices, the data analytic sample comprised a total of 251 (T1) Mexican-origin families from the midwestern United States. Mother and father reports of their own ethnic-racial socialization practices (i.e., cultural socialization, preparation for bias, promotion of mistrust) were entered simultaneously into multilevel moderation models. Results from these multilevel moderation analyses indicated that *fathers'* promotion of mistrust was a significant moderator in the adolescent discrimination–depression link over time. Specifically, fathers' promotion of mistrust *exacerbated* the youth discrimination–depression association. Moreover, the difference between the moderating effects of fathers' versus mothers' promotion of mistrust on the youth discrimination–depression association was significant. Cultural socialization and preparation for bias did not significantly moderate the adolescent association between discrimination and mental health, regardless of parent gender (fathers or mothers) or mental health outcome (anxiety or depression). The results are discussed in light of a socioecological framework, with special emphasis on the importance of including (and differentiating between) both fathers and mothers in the investigation of ethnic-racial socialization and implications for future theory building, research, and clinical practice.

Correspondence should be addressed to Irene J. K. Park, Department of Psychiatry, Indiana University School of Medicine–South Bend, 1234 Notre Dame Avenue, South Bend, IN 46617. E-mail: ijpark@iupui.edu

The problem of racism continues to plague the United States and has been pinpointed as a social determinant of health. According to one recent meta-analysis (Paradies et al., 2015), the association between racism and poor mental health has been

shown to be twice as large as the association between racism and physical health, with depression being the most frequently studied mental health outcome. Further, Latinx (a gender neutral term that is increasingly used instead of *Latino* or *Latina*) populations have been identified as more vulnerable to the adverse effects of racial/ethnic discrimination on mental health compared to African Americans (Paradies et al., 2015). Given this mounting evidence on the deleterious effects of racial/ethnic discrimination on mental health among Latinx individuals, it becomes paramount that researchers, psychologists, and public health officials examine protective factors that may help shield this growing population from the pernicious effects of discrimination.

Currently, 17.9 million Latinx youths represent the largest group of children younger than age 18 in the country (Patten, 2016). Latinx youths have been shown to experience higher rates of attempted suicide (Zayas, 2011) and higher levels of internalizing symptoms compared to other racial-ethnic groups (McLaughlin, Hilt, & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2007). Mexicans comprise the largest group (63.2%) within the Latinx population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017), and within the context of racism, longitudinal research has linked discrimination experiences prospectively with anxiety and depression among Mexican-origin youths (e.g., Berkel et al., 2010). Yet, congruent with a risk and resilience approach (e.g., Neblett et al., 2008), not all Mexican-origin youths who experience discrimination will suffer the same level of deleterious effects in terms of depressive or anxiety symptoms. It may be that some sources of risk or resilience may increase or decrease susceptibility to worse mental health outcomes.

Moreover, adolescence is a critical developmental stage when experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination may be especially impactful given the importance of identity negotiation during this period (e.g., Phinney & Ong, 2007; Tatum, 2017). During these adolescent years, parents may be more likely to broach the topics of race and ethnicity with their children (e.g., Tatum, 2017). Adolescents too may be more emotionally and cognitively prepared to wrestle with these issues (Espinoza, Gonzales, & Fuligni, 2016) and more ready to internalize cultural values as their ability to abstract and reason about value systems increases (Knight et al., 2011). As adolescents grow in their autonomy, they may be more frequently exposed to discriminatory experiences in extrafamilial spaces (e.g., stores, restaurants) and situations (e.g., dating, driving) that elicit discussions with their parents about issues of race and ethnicity (Neblett et al., 2008). From a life-course perspective, the degree to which adolescents and their parents successfully negotiate these racial/ethnic identity development tasks within the context of racism may affect the emergence of mental health problems over time and into adulthood (Jones & Neblett, 2017).

Ethnic-Racial Socialization Practices

Guided by an ecological perspective (García Coll, Crnic, Lamberty, & Wasik, 1996), the present study sought to identify sources of resilience vis-à-vis the development of mental health problems among Mexican-origin adolescents by examining contextual factors such as cultural and family processes. Ethnic-racial socialization is one cultural and familial mechanism by which parents strive to equip their children so that they are better able to navigate a racially stratified society. According to a seminal review by Hughes et al. (2006), ethnic-racial socialization may be defined as “the mechanisms through which parents transmit information, values, and perspectives about ethnicity and race to their children” (p. 747), particularly in a societal context in which racism and discrimination are pervasive. Based on Hughes et al.’s (2006) review, the present study focused on three ethnic-racial socialization practices: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust. Cultural socialization refers to “parental practices that teach children about their racial or ethnic heritage and history; that promote cultural customs and traditions; and that promote children’s cultural, racial, and ethnic pride” (Hughes et al., 2006, p. 749). Generally, cultural socialization is often associated with positive youth outcomes, including fewer internalizing problems (Hughes et al., 2006). Preparation for bias refers to “parents’ efforts to promote their children’s awareness of discrimination and prepare them to cope with it” (Hughes et al., 2006, p. 756). As with cultural socialization, preparation for bias has also been associated with favorable youth outcomes (Hughes et al., 2006; Jones & Neblett, 2017), though evidence from prior research is mixed (e.g., Liu & Lau, 2013). There is also evidence that cultural socialization and preparation for bias messages can attenuate the link between discrimination and maladjustment among racial/ethnic minority youths (Jones & Neblett, 2017). Promotion of mistrust refers to “practices that emphasize the need for wariness and distrust in interracial interactions” (Hughes et al., 2006, p. 757). Generally, promotion of mistrust is typically viewed as a risk factor associated with poor adjustment outcomes (Caughy, Nettles, O’Campo, & Lohrfink, 2006; Huynh & Fuligni, 2008; Liu & Lau, 2013). Consistent with the prior empirical literature, we hypothesized that cultural socialization and preparation for bias would serve as protective factors, whereas promotion of mistrust was hypothesized to act as a risk factor in the link between discrimination and mental health. Further, the present study sought to investigate these ethnic-racial socialization practices in Mexican immigrant families with a special focus on examining potential differences among fathers versus mothers in their ethnic-racial socialization practices.

Fathers, Mothers, and Ethnic-Racial Socialization in Mexican Immigrant Families

Because family processes, such as ethnic-racial socialization, are embedded within cultural contexts, it is important to consider cultural influences on how parents go about ethnic-racial socialization. In Mexican culture, strong gender role expectations (or adherence to traditional gender roles) may sculpt the way in which mothers versus fathers interact with their children. Theoretically, mothers are traditionally viewed as the carriers of culture, passing on cultural traditions to the next generation and inhabiting the domestic sphere (e.g., Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). In contrast, fathers are traditionally seen as bridging their families to the outside world, and consequently, fathers may be more likely to encounter racial/ethnic discrimination (Umaña-Taylor & Guimond, 2010). Thus, mothers and fathers, respectively, may exert quite different influences on their children and thereby affect their children's mental health in unique ways.

Due to the paucity of empirical research on parent gender effects in ethnic-racial socialization processes in Latinx families, and the rich literature on racial socialization that has historically focused on African Americans (McLoyd, Cauce, Takeuchi, & Wilson, 2000), we turn to research on racial socialization in African American families as well as Latinx families for further insights. It is important to acknowledge racial/ethnic differences in ethnic-racial socialization in these two populations (e.g., given the historically pervasive and extreme discrimination faced by African Americans, there is evidence indicating that African American parents engage in more extensive racial socialization compared to other parents of color; McLoyd et al., 2000). Latinx parents, too, face unique pressures (e.g., immigration, acculturation) and access unique cultural resources in their ethnic-racial socialization practices (e.g., Aldoney & Cabrera, 2016; Cabrera & Bradley, 2012). Yet the common experience shared by both Latinx and African American families is that rendered by their minority status. With these caveats in mind, we turn now to ethnic-racial socialization research that may shed light on potential differences in Latinx mothers versus fathers.

Among African American families, McHale et al. (2006) found that fathers' cultural socialization was negatively associated with youths' depressive symptoms, whereas mothers' preparation for bias was positively associated (at a trend level) with youth symptoms. Moreover, even when mothers and fathers engage in the same ethnic-racial socialization strategy, the effects on their children may be quite different because mothers and fathers may engage in these socialization practices differently. For example, in a study of African American parents' racial and ethnic socialization and adolescent academic grades, Brown, Linver, Evans, and DeGennaro (2009) found that parent gender played a role in how ethnic socialization was associated with

grades. Specifically, even the same socialization dimension (e.g., ethnic socialization of African American heritage) was found to operate differently depending on caregiver gender.

Among Mexican immigrant families, there have also been some mixed findings regarding the effect of mothers' versus fathers' ethnic socialization practices on their children. For example, one study (Knight et al., 2011) found that mothers' ethnic socialization practices were more influential than those of fathers in the transmission of Mexican cultural values to their children; mothers' (but not fathers') ethnic socialization practices were related to youths' ethnic identity and adherence to Mexican American cultural values 2 years later. Yet, contrary to the conclusions drawn by the Knight et al. (2011) study regarding maternal only effects on ethnic socialization, two recent studies (Hernández, Conger, Robins, Bacher, & Widaman, 2014; White, Knight, Jensen, & Gonzales, 2018) have found combined maternal and paternal ethnic socialization effects. Specifically, Hernández et al. (2014) found that *both* mothers' and fathers' cultural socialization in fifth grade predicted children's ethnic pride in seventh grade; these results indicated that mothers' and fathers' cultural socialization practices *independently* influenced the development of ethnic pride. Similarly, White et al. (2018) found that mothers and fathers both promoted different components of ethnic attitude and identity development. Given these mixed findings regarding the role of mothers versus fathers in the ethnic socialization of adolescent children in Mexican immigrant families, scholars (e.g., White et al., 2018) have called for more research in this area.

It is reasonable to ask, then, would the ethnic-racial socialization practices of mothers versus fathers yield similar moderating effects (in degree and direction) in their adolescent child's link between discrimination and mental health? Or might there be "gendered" patterns in parents' ethnic-racial socialization? For example, would fathers have different and unique effects, controlling for the effects that mothers exert on their children via ethnic-racial socialization? These types of questions have not yet been adequately addressed in the empirical literature to date. Thus, in an exploratory manner, we tease apart the effects of fathers versus mothers by testing whether the strength of the moderating effects of fathers versus mothers is significantly different.

Addressing Gaps in the Ethnic-Racial Socialization Literature: Contributions of the Present Study

The present study builds upon and extends the empirical research literature on ethnic-racial socialization among racial/ethnic minority families in several ways, primarily through key study design features. First, the present study used multiple informants (i.e., youths, mothers, and fathers) to report on ethnic-racial socialization processes within

Mexican immigrant families. The use of multiple informants on this critical measure not only addresses the shortcoming of relying solely on one family member (e.g., youths) to assess this dynamic process and overcomes inflated associations due to reporter bias but also moves beyond generic reports about “parents” in their ethnic-racial socialization practices to specifically examining mother and father reports of their own ethnic-racial socialization practices in tandem. Past research on ethnic-racial socialization has tended to focus on mothers or has failed to distinguish between mothers’ versus fathers’ ethnic-racial socialization practices, but the current study includes both mothers and fathers reporting on their own ethnic-racial socialization practices. In so doing, the present study addresses a need for more research on the role of Mexican-origin fathers in ethnic-racial socialization and implications for youth mental health.

Second, we analyzed how the *combined* ethnic-racial socialization efforts of both mothers and fathers interact with the association between discrimination and mental health of their adolescent children. Past studies have not consistently differentiated between mothers and fathers in testing ethnic-racial socialization as a moderator (e.g., Espinoza et al., 2016). The present study actually tested whether mothers’ and fathers’ ethnic-racial socialization strategies make an impact on the link between discrimination and mental health among their adolescent children. That is, do parents’ ethnic-racial socialization practices make a difference on their child’s mental health *when* their child is experiencing discrimination? Analytically, mother and father reports of their own ethnic-racial socialization practices were entered simultaneously into multilevel moderation models, which responds to a call in this literature to “examine maternal and paternal ethnic socialization in the same model” (White et al., 2018, p. 15).

Third, we used a *within-family approach* by contrasting the moderating effects of mothers’ versus fathers’ ethnic-racial socialization strategies. This type of within-family design provides a more sensitive test of mother–father *differences* in ethnic-racial socialization practices. Thus, although we entered mothers’ and fathers’ ethnic-racial socialization strategies in pairs together in the same analytic model, we also tested whether and how each parent’s respective ethnic-racial socialization practices were more or less impactful (in terms of both the size and the direction of the moderating effect) than that of their counterpart.

Fourth, the present study accounted for the *multidimensional* nature of ethnic-racial socialization by examining three types: cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust. Finally, the present study employed a longitudinal design with assessments at three time points, which allows for greater confidence in making inferences about within-person or intraindividual effects or effects at the person level (Molenaar & Campbell, 2009) and contributes to the relatively small pool of studies that have examined ethnic-racial socialization over time (vs. the larger

proportion of studies that have investigated ethnic-racial socialization via cross-sectional snapshots). As Jones and Neblett (2017) recommended, adopting a developmental perspective will advance knowledge of risk and protective mechanisms for racial/ethnic minority youths over the life course.

The Current Study

Thus, using a longitudinal, multiple informant and multi-level design, the present study sought to address the following question: How does the association between youth discrimination and mental health vary by parents’ ethnic-racial socialization practices? We tested three pairs (father and mother reports at Time 1) of ethnic-racial socialization practices as moderators in the intraindividual link between youths’ discrimination experiences and mental health using youth data from three time points. The three types of ethnic-racial socialization practices were cultural socialization, preparation for bias, and promotion of mistrust. Based on prior reviews of the literature (e.g., Hughes et al., 2006; Jones & Neblett, 2017), we hypothesized that cultural socialization and preparation for bias would serve as protective factors, that is, we expected that cultural socialization and preparation for bias, respectively, would *attenuate* the association between youths’ discrimination and youths’ depressive and anxiety symptoms, respectively. On the other hand, we expected that parents’ promotion of mistrust would serve as a risk factor and *exacerbate* (or strengthen) the association between youths’ discrimination and mental health problems (e.g., Caughy et al., 2006; Huynh & Fuligni, 2008; Liu & Lau, 2013). Finally, because we were interested in teasing apart the effects of fathers versus mothers in their ethnic-racial socialization strategies, we compared the strength of the hypothesized moderating effects of fathers versus mothers. Given the paucity of research along these lines, we did not forward any hypotheses about which parent’s ethnic-racial socialization strategies would have a stronger moderating effect on the association between youth discrimination and mental health. In all analyses, we controlled for age, gender, and nativity status due to age and gender differences in depression (Hooper, Mier-Chairez, Mugoya, & Arellano, 2016) and anxiety (Kessler et al., 2012), as well as variations in reporting discrimination by age, gender, and nativity status (Córdova & Cervantes, 2010; Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Pérez, Fortuna, & Alegría, 2008).

METHOD

Participants

This sample originated from a three-wave longitudinal study of racial/ethnic discrimination and mental health among

Mexican-origin adolescents and their families (Park, Wang, Williams, & Alegría, 2017, 2018a). For the purposes of the present article, the data analytic sample at Time 1 comprised 251 adolescents (12–17 years of age; 57% female), 249 mothers, and 218 fathers. Using an ethnic-homogenous design as recommended in studies of cultural influences (Roosa et al., 2008), the present sample comprised Mexican-origin families. At T1, youths' mean age was 14.1 years ($SD = 1.6$), mothers' mean age was 39.9 years ($SD = 5.6$), and fathers' mean age was 41.8 years ($SD = 6.8$). The socioeconomic status of participating families was assessed by annual household income. According to mothers' reports, the median income for fathers was \$20,000 to \$29,999 ($n = 227$ valid responses), whereas median income for mothers (self-report) was below \$20,000 ($n = 244$ valid responses). This suggests a combined household income that approaches the national median income level of \$42,491 for Latinx households (DeNavas-Walt & Proctor, 2015).

Adolescents and their parents were recruited from public schools, community-based organizations, and churches in a midsize midwestern region in the United States using a purposive sampling strategy. Recruitment and retention strategies recommended for Latinx immigrant families (e.g., Latino-focused community events) were used (C. R. Martinez, McClure, Eddy, Ruth, & Hyers, 2012). Inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) The family has an adolescent, 12–17 years of age, of Mexican descent who was (b) residing with his or her biological mother, also of Mexican descent, and (c) the adolescent's biological father was also of Mexican descent. Exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) The adolescent has a severe learning or developmental disability which would prevent them from understanding or responding to survey questions, and (b) the family participated in the pilot study (2011–2012), which assessed similar constructs. For families meeting these eligibility criteria, "father figures" more broadly (e.g., stepfathers, uncles, older brothers, etc.) were permitted to participate when the biological father was not present in the youth's life (e.g., separated from youth's mother; deceased; living in Mexico, etc.).

As reported in Park et al. (2017), families recruited through public school systems were mailed bilingual (Spanish and English) letters and flyers describing the study. Interested recipients of these mailings were asked to call the bilingual, bicultural Latina project staff, who then conducted follow-up screening interviews by phone to answer questions and determine study eligibility. Similarly, families recruited from churches and community-based organizations were given flyers or were asked to provide their names and contact information if they were interested in the study. Follow-up screening interviews were then conducted by project staff. Out of 342 families screened for eligibility, 82.6% ($N = 270$) of the 327 families deemed eligible completed the T1 assessments. During the initial

data cleaning phase, one family was dropped because the youth reported that the father was not of Mexican origin, leading to a total sample of 269 youths and families as reported in Park et al. (2017).

Given the present study's focus on parents' ethnic-racial socialization, only families with a biological father ($n = 186$), stepfather ($n = 22$), or "residential partner"¹ ($n = 10$) were included in the data analytic sample; residential partners reported an average length of relationship with the target adolescent of 9.4 years, and mothers reported an average length of relationship with the residential partner of 9.8 years. All other families with a more peripheral "father figure" ($n = 15$; e.g., brothers, uncles) were dropped given the current study's focus on the role of parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices. We also dropped three additional families: one family had a stepmother (vs. a biological mother, as stipulated in the inclusion criteria), and two families with stepfathers born in Guatemala and Honduras, respectively, were dropped to preserve an unbiased focus on Mexican-origin parents and adolescents, given that cultural socialization was one ethnic-racial socialization practice under investigation. This led to the current data analytic sample of 251 adolescents, 249 mothers, and 218 fathers.

Written parental permission for their child's participation, parental consent for the parents' own participation, and youth assent (obtained after the parent gave permission) were obtained prior to survey completion at the Time 1 assessment point by trained bilingual, bicultural research staff. Information about the study and permission, consent, and assent procedures were presented in the participant's preferred language; written materials were read aloud with opportunities for participants to ask questions prior to providing consent, permission, and assent.

Parents were surveyed on the study measures only at T1, whereas adolescents were surveyed at T1, T2, and T3. The following retention and attrition statistics are based on the current sample of 251 youths at T1. At T2, 90.8% of T1 youths ($n = 228$) completed surveys; at T3, 100.9% of T2 youths ($n = 230$) were surveyed again. From T1 to T2, the attrition rate for youth participants was 9.2% ($n = 23$ youths missing at T2), and from T2 to T3, the attrition rate was -0.9% (sample size increased by 2 youths; $n = 21$ youths missing at T3; this was because 13 T1 participants skipped T2 but returned at T3, and 11 other T2 participants dropped out at T3).

Participating families received up to \$190 as compensation for their total time in the project (target adolescent received \$20 at T1, \$30 at T2, and \$40 at T3; each parent received \$40 at T1; mothers received \$20 at T3 for a brief

¹"Residential partner" was defined as a father whose self-report of marital status matched mother's self-report as being either married ($n = 5$) or unmarried and living with partner ($n = 5$) and who could not be categorized as a biological father or stepfather due to missing data ($n = 7$) or a unique "other" response ($n = 3$; e.g., "padre" or "no").

interview). All research procedures were approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at the first author's institution. The identity of participants was further protected by a Certificate of Confidentiality (CC-MH-13-127) issued by the National Institute of Mental Health (for more study sample or procedural details, see Park et al., 2017; Park, Wang, et al., 2018a).

Measures

All measures were available in either English or Spanish for adolescents and their parents.

Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination

The 10-item Perceptions of Racism in Children and Youth (PRaCY; short version) questionnaire was used to assess self-reported perceived racial/ethnic discrimination (Pachter, Szalacha, Bernstein, & Garcia Coll, 2010). Adolescent participants provided yes/no responses to whether they had ever experienced each of 10 scenarios in their life. Sample items included "Have you ever had someone make a bad or insulting remark about your race, ethnicity, or language?" and "Have you ever seen your parents or other family members treated unfairly or badly because of the color of their skin, language, accent, or because they came from a different country or culture?" Sum scores were used. This measure was originally developed using a sample that was predominantly Latinx and African American (Pachter et al., 2010), and the authors developed a Spanish version as well (also used in the present study). As reported in prior research using this sample (e.g., Park et al., 2017), there are two developmentally appropriate versions of the PRaCY (for 8- to 13-year-olds and for 14- to 18-year-olds); both versions contain 10 items, differing only on two items, and all items are not biased by age (Pachter et al., 2010). In the present study, only the eight items that were common across both age groups were used to reduce the possibility of problems of competing interpretations of the findings; this was deemed appropriate by the developer of the measure (L. M. Pachter, personal communication, February 4, 2016). The PRaCY has been used Cronbach's alphas indicated adequate reliability of the PRaCY across the three waves of the study, as follows: .71 (T1), .68 (T2), and .72 (T3).

Anxiety

The 10-item Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (March, Parker, Sullivan, & Stallings, 1997) is a widely used measure to assess youths' anxiety symptoms across four basic dimensions (physical symptoms, harm avoidance, social anxiety, separation/panic). Participants

were asked to rate the frequency with which a given statement described their thoughts, feelings, or behaviors recently. Each item was rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (*never true about me*) to 3 (*often true about me*). Sample items include "I feel restless and on edge" and "I feel shy." Sum scores were used. The Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children has been successfully administered to Latinx youth samples in prior research (e.g., Martinez, Polo, & Carter, 2012). Internal consistency was adequate across the three waves of the present study with Cronbach's alphas of .68 (T1), .71 (T2), and .73 (T3).

Depression

Youths' depressive symptoms were assessed with the 12-item Children's Depression Inventory-2 (CDI-2 Short Form; Kovacs, 2011). The CDI-2 measures cognitive, affective, somatic, and behavioral symptoms of depression during the previous 2 weeks. Participants were asked to endorse the sentence that best describes themselves (0 = *absence of symptoms*; 2 = *definite symptoms*). Sample items include "I am sad once in a while; I am sad many times; I am sad all the time" and "I am tired once in a while; I am tired many days; I am tired all the time." CDI scores were calculated using the sum of the items. The CDI has been successfully administered to children from various ethnic minority groups (Kovacs, 2011), including Latinx adolescents (e.g., Kornienko & Santos, 2014). Internal consistency for the CDI-2 was adequate in the present study with Cronbach's alphas of .79 (T1), .77 (T2), and .81 (T3).

Demographic background

Youths' age, gender, and nativity status (coded as being U.S.-born, born in Mexico, or Other) were assessed as control variables in the analyses.

Parents' ethnic socialization practices

The 13-item Ethnic Socialization Scale (Huynh & Fuligni, 2008) was used to assess parents' ethnic socialization practices at Time 1; this measure was based on Hughes and Chen's (1997) ethnic socialization scale (see also Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Three subscales tapped three types of ethnic socialization practices: (a) cultural socialization (five items), (b) preparation for bias (six items), and (c) promotion of mistrust (two items). Mothers and fathers separately reported how many times in the past year they talked with their adolescent child about various issues related to ethnic socialization by responding to items on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*six or more times*). Sample items include "Celebrating cultural holidays of his/her ethnic group" (cultural socialization), "Talked to your child about discrimination or prejudice against his/her ethnicity"

(preparation for bias), and “Done or said things to keep your child from trusting students from other ethnic groups” (promotion of mistrust). Mean scores were computed for the three subscales. This ethnic socialization measure has shown good reliability in prior research on Mexican-origin adolescents and their parents (Espinoza et al., 2016; Huynh & Fuligni, 2008). Mothers’ and fathers’ cultural socialization ($r = .32, p < .001$), preparation for bias ($r = .18, p < .01$), and promotion of mistrust ($r = .19, p < .01$) were significantly correlated. Internal consistency for the three Ethnic Socialization subscales was adequate in the present study: fathers: $\alpha = .81$ (Cultural Socialization), $\alpha = .82$ (Preparation for Bias), and $r = .50$ (Promotion of Mistrust); mothers: $\alpha = .82$ (Cultural Socialization), $\alpha = .80$ (Preparation for Bias), and $r = .38$ (Promotion of Mistrust). Although the r s for Promotion of Mistrust are relatively low, previous researchers have also reported similarly low (or lower) r s on this subscale (e.g., French & Coleman, 2013; $r = .23$).

Data Analytic Strategy

To examine the moderating effect of parents’ ethnic socialization practices (T1) on the link between youth discrimination and youth mental health (T1, T2, T3), we used multilevel moderation analyses given the nested nature of the data. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) were computed for the dependent variables, youth depression (ICC = 0.59) and youth anxiety (ICC = 0.65). Data on youths’ discrimination experiences and youths’ mental health (depression and anxiety) were collected across three waves, therefore detrending was needed to test the relations between these time-varying variables after controlling for the time effect. In addition, to disaggregate within- and between-person effects (Wang & Maxwell, 2015), we used person-mean centering on the time-varying predictor, youths’ discrimination, to create two new variables: the person mean of youths’ discrimination for adolescent i (mPRACY_{*i*}) and the person-mean centered youths’ discrimination for adolescent i (cPRACY_{*it*}). mPRACY_{*i*} is the average discrimination score averaged across T1 to T3 for the i th adolescent. The person-mean centered youths’ discrimination for adolescent i (cPRACY_{*it*} = PRACY_{*it*} - mPRACY_{*i*}) is the i th adolescent’s deviation score at time t , subtracted from his or her average discrimination level.

A within-person effect indicates how two time-varying variables within an individual are related over time (e.g., degree to which an adolescent experiences worse mental health when he or she perceives more discrimination than when he or she does not), whereas a between-person effect indicates how the two time-varying variables covary across individuals (e.g., degree to which adolescents who

experience more discrimination differ in mental health problems than those who experience less discrimination). The focal effect is the *cross-level moderation effect*, which indicates how the relation between two time-varying variables varies by different levels of time-invariant variables. More specifically, it is the effect that represents the degree to which the within-adolescent relation between youths’ discrimination and mental health differs with higher levels’ of parents’ ethnic socialization strategies.

Mothers’ and fathers’ reports of the three ethnic socialization practices at Time 1 were entered into the multilevel moderation analyses simultaneously in pairs. For example, mother’s promotion of mistrust and father’s promotion of mistrust were both entered into the model simultaneously as a pair of moderators of the link between youth discrimination and depression. Using depression as an example for the outcome variable and promotion of mistrust as an example for the moderator, the multilevel moderation model is described next:

$$\text{Level 1 : Dep}_{it} = \gamma_{0i} + \gamma_{1i} * \text{cPRACY}_{it} + \gamma_{2i} * \text{time}_{it} + e_{it}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Level 2 : } \gamma_{0i} = & \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} * \text{mPRACY}_i + \gamma_{02} * \text{PM_M}_i \\ & + \gamma_{03} * \text{PM_F}_i + \gamma_{04} * \text{AGE}_i \\ & + \gamma_{05} * \text{GENDER}_i + \gamma_{06} * \text{NATIVITY}_i + u_{0i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{1i} = & \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11} * \text{PM_M}_i + \gamma_{12} * \text{PM_F}_i + \gamma_{13} * \text{AGE}_i \\ & + \gamma_{14} * \text{GENDER}_i + \gamma_{15} * \text{NATIVITY}_i + u_{1i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{2i} = & \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21} * \text{PM_M}_i + \gamma_{22} * \text{PM_F}_i + \gamma_{23} * \text{AGE}_i \\ & + \gamma_{24} * \text{GENDER}_i + \gamma_{25} * \text{NATIVITY}_i + u_{2i} \end{aligned}$$

where time_{*it*} is the measured occasion t for adolescent i , and cPRACY_{*it*} (perceived racial/ethnic discrimination; person-mean centered predictor variable) and Dep_{*it*} (Youth Depression; outcome variable) are the observed scores for adolescent i at time j . The two moderators, PM_{*i*}M_{*i*} and PM_{*i*}F_{*i*}, indicate promotion of mistrust for adolescent i ’s mother and father, respectively. AGE_{*i*}, GENDER_{*i*}, and NATIVITY_{*i*} are control variables for adolescent i . Accordingly, γ_{11} and γ_{12} are cross-level moderation effects, quantifying the moderating effects of mothers’ and fathers’ promotion of mistrust, respectively, on the within-person link between youths’ perceived discrimination and youths’ depression, after controlling for the time effect. Simultaneously including PM_{*i*}M_{*i*} and PM_{*i*}F_{*i*} into the model provides a way to compare the moderating effects of mothers and fathers with the contrast $\gamma_{11} - \gamma_{12}$. Note that γ_{02} and γ_{03} measure the main effects of mothers’ and fathers’ ethnic socialization practices (T1), respectively, on youth mental health, and γ_{10} measures the within-person main effect of youth discrimination on mental health, controlling for

the other variables (see the preceding Level 2 equations and Supplemental Table A).

To examine whether entering mothers' and fathers' ethnic socialization strategies separately into the model would make a difference from the simultaneous model, a separate model was also fitted. Using mothers as an example, the Level 2 equations would change to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Level 2: } \gamma_{0i} = & \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} * mPRACY_i + \gamma_{02} * PM_M_i \\ & + \gamma_{03} * AGE_i + \gamma_{04} * GENDER_i \\ & + \gamma_{05} * NATIVITY_i + u_{0i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{1i} = & \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11} * PM_M_i + \gamma_{12} * AGE_i + \gamma_{13} * GENDER_i \\ & + \gamma_{14} * NATIVITY_i + u_{1i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{2i} = & \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21} * PM_M_i + \gamma_{22} * AGE_i + \gamma_{23} * GENDER_i \\ & + \gamma_{24} * NATIVITY_i + u_{2i} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the separate model ignores the noninterdependence between mothers and fathers, and thus we cannot statistically infer whether fathers' effects differ from mothers' effects (Planalp, Du, Braungart-Rieker, & Wang, 2017).

RESULTS

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of the study variables. Table 2 displays results from the multilevel moderation analyses. First, when each ethnic-racial socialization strategy was entered in pairs for mothers and fathers simultaneously (referred to as the "simultaneous model" in the Table 1 note and the Data Analytic Strategy section), we found significant moderating results for depression but not anxiety. When depression was the outcome variable, fathers' promotion of mistrust significantly *exacerbated* (strengthened) the youths' link between discrimination and youth depression ($\gamma_{12} = 0.31, p = .01$), with a standardized coefficient of 0.12, 95% confidence interval (CI) [0.01, 0.24]. Results indicated that mothers' promotion of mistrust operated in the *opposite* direction ($\gamma_{11} = -0.24, p = .056$), *attenuating* the link between youths' discrimination and youth depression, albeit at a trend level; note that the associated 95% CI [-0.20, 0.01] indicated that the effect was not significant (see Table 1).

Second, again in the simultaneous model, we were able to test for any differences between mothers and fathers in the moderating effects of their respective ethnic-racial socialization practices. Results showed that there was indeed a significant difference between mothers' and fathers' moderation effects when the moderator was promotion of mistrust ($\gamma_{11} - \gamma_{12} = -0.55,$

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

Variable	Time	M (SD)
Youth Perceived Racial/Ethnic Discrimination	T1	2.9 (2.2)
	T2	2.5 (2.0)
	T3	2.1 (2.0)
Youth Anxiety	T1	12.5 (4.5)
	T2	11.2 (4.6)
	T3	10.8 (4.7)
Youth Depression	T1	4.0 (3.5)
	T2	3.6 (3.2)
	T3	3.5 (3.5)
Youth Age	T1	14.1 (1.6)
Youth Nativity Status	T1	0.3 (0.5)
Mothers' Cultural Socialization	T1	3.2 (1.1)
Fathers' Cultural Socialization	T1	3.3 (1.0)
Mothers' Preparation for Bias	T1	2.8 (1.0)
Fathers' Preparation for Bias	T1	3.0 (1.0)
Mothers' Promotion of Mistrust	T1	1.6 (0.9)
Fathers' Promotion of Mistrust	T1	1.6 (1.0)

Note: The values outside the parentheses are the means, and the values inside the parentheses are the standard deviations.

$p = .001$), with a standardized coefficient of -0.21 , 95% CI [-0.38, -0.04], in the association between youth discrimination and depression.

Third, when the ethnic-racial socialization practices were entered as moderators singly (e.g., for mothers only) in what we referred to as the "separate model" (see the Table 1 note and the Data Analytic Strategy section), fathers' promotion of mistrust persisted in exacerbating the link between the youths' discrimination and youth depression ($\gamma_{11}^F = 0.27, p = .022$), though the standardized coefficient ($0.10, p = .084$) and 95% CI [-0.01, 0.21] were no longer significant. Mothers' promotion of mistrust was no longer even marginally significant as a moderator ($\gamma_{11}^M = -0.09, p = .426$).

Post Hoc Analysis of Gender Effects

Due to mixed evidence in the literature suggesting that youth gender may play a role in how mothers' or fathers' ethnic-racial socialization strategies impact their children (e.g., Hughes et al., 2006), we conducted an additional post hoc analysis with youth gender interaction terms. Results indicated that none of the three-way gender interactions were significant (see Supplemental Table B). However, the main effect of youth gender on youth mental health was significant, such that girls (vs. boys) were more likely to have higher levels of anxiety and depression, respectively, after controlling for all other variables across the three ethnic-racial socialization strategy models.

TABLE 2
Results from Multilevel Moderation Analyses

<i>Youths' Mental Health</i>	γ_{11}	γ_{12}	$\gamma_{11} - \gamma_{12}$	γ_{11}^M	γ_{11}^F
Cultural Socialization					
<i>Anxiety</i>					
Raw Coeff	0.00 (.983)	-0.05 (.693)	0.05 (.792)	0.06 (.594)	-0.06 (.622)
Std Coeff	-0.07 (.649)	0.01 (.946)	-0.08 (.750)	0.01 (.961)	-0.02 (.880)
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.39, 0.24]	[-0.32, 0.34]	[-0.60, 0.44]	[-0.26, 0.27]	[-0.33, 0.28]
<i>Depression</i>					
Raw Coeff	-0.06 (.607)	0.09 (.435)	-0.15 (.426)	-0.06 (.474)	0.07 (.499)
Std Coeff	0.02 (.798)	0.01 (.833)	0.00 (.980)	0.00 (.968)	0.01 (.824)
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.10, 0.13]	[-0.11, 0.13]	[-0.19, 0.20]	[-0.11, 0.10]	[-0.10, 0.13]
Preparation for Bias					
<i>Anxiety</i>					
Raw Coeff	-0.06 (.627)	-0.03 (.841)	-0.03 (.880)	-0.09 (.405)	-0.05 (.735)
Std Coeff	0.03 (.861)	0.09 (.545)	-0.07 (.782)	0.06 (.633)	0.09 (.541)
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.28, 0.33]	[-0.21, 0.39]	[-0.54, 0.41]	[-0.20, 0.33]	[-0.20, 0.38]
<i>Depression</i>					
Raw Coeff	-0.10 (.369)	0.07 (.557)	-0.17 (.349)	-0.08 (.375)	0.05 (.681)
Std Coeff	-0.05 (.400)	0.01 (.837)	-0.06 (.507)	-0.05 (.299)	0.00 (.950)
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.16, 0.06]	[-0.10, 0.13]	[-0.24, 0.12]	[-0.16, 0.05]	[-0.11, 0.11]
Promotion of Mistrust					
<i>Anxiety</i>					
Raw Coeff	0.08 (.611)	0.00 (.975)	0.07 (.751)	0.04 (.769)	0.03 (.799)
Std Coeff	0.06 (.246)	0.01 (.845)	0.05 (.552)	-0.02 (.875)	0.02 (.794)
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.05, 0.18]	[-0.11, 0.13]	[-0.13, 0.23]	[-0.27, 0.23]	[-0.10, 0.13]
<i>Depression</i>					
Raw Coeff	-0.24 (.056) [†]	0.31 (.010)	-0.55 (.010)	-0.09 (.426)	0.27 (.022)
Std Coeff	-0.09 (.087) [†]	0.12 (.040)	-0.21 (.016)	-0.04 (.411)	0.10 (.084) [†]
95% CI of Std Coeff	[-0.20, 0.01]	[0.01, 0.24]	[-0.38, -0.04]	[-0.14, 0.06]	[-0.01, 0.21]

Note: The values outside the parentheses are the point estimates, and the values inside the parentheses are p values; $ps < .05$ are in bold. The missing data handling method was full information likelihood estimation. γ_{11} and γ_{12} measure the moderating effects of mothers' and fathers' ethnic socialization practices (Time 1), respectively, on the link between youth discrimination and youth mental health (T1–T3) in the *simultaneous* model. γ_{11}^M and γ_{11}^F measure the moderating effects of mothers' and fathers' ethnic socialization practices, respectively, on the link between youth discrimination and youth mental health in the *separate* model. Raw coeff = regression coefficient; Std coeff = standardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval.

[†] $p < .10$.

DISCUSSION

Applying an ecological perspective (García Coll et al., 1996), the present study tested whether and to what extent the ethnic-racial socialization practices of fathers and mothers, respectively, moderate the within-person association between perceived racial/ethnic discrimination and mental health among Mexican-origin adolescents. In so doing, we investigated the broader role of the family and sociocultural contexts in the link between discrimination and mental health and sought to identify sources of resilience that are culturally relevant to Mexican immigrant families. By employing a longitudinal study design with multiple informants as well as the use of multilevel modeling, the present study addressed several calls in the literature (e.g., Jones & Neblett, 2017) to move beyond cross-sectional, single informant studies of ethnic-racial socialization. The longitudinal, multi-informant, multilevel methodological features enabled us to draw more nuanced conclusions not only about the direction of effects but also about which family actors engage in which ethnic-racial socialization strategies with

what kinds of consequences on their adolescent child's mental health. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study testing fathers' and mothers' ethnic-racial socialization strategies as moderators of the link between discrimination and mental health among their adolescent children in a Mexican-origin sample.

Results indicated that fathers' promotion of mistrust significantly *exacerbated* the adverse impact of adolescents' perceived racial/ethnic discrimination on their depressive symptoms. That is, fathers' promotion of mistrust *strengthened* the adolescent discrimination–depression association. This exacerbating effect of fathers' promotion of mistrust persisted, at a marginal level of statistical significance, when mothers were taken out of the equation. These results dovetail closely with the findings from prior research (Park, Du, Wang, Williams, & Alegría, 2018) that tested the “linked lives” hypothesis using a life course perspective; in this prior study, fathers' discrimination experiences exacerbated the association between youths' discrimination stress appraisals and depression. Taken together, results from both studies suggest that fathers who experience discrimination may engage in

promotion of mistrust with their adolescent children; this would make sense that well-intentioned fathers would want to protect their children from the negative discrimination experiences that they themselves have encountered. Yet, it appears from the present study's results that these fathers' ethnic-racial socialization efforts via promotion of mistrust may backfire. Instead of protecting their adolescent children, fathers' promotion of mistrust may increase the risk of depression for children who are dealing with discrimination.

Moreover, there was a robust difference between fathers and mothers in the moderating effect of their promotion of mistrust. That is, the direction and strength of the moderating effect of fathers' promotion of mistrust were significantly different from the direction and strength of the moderating effect of mothers' promotion of mistrust. Of interest, the direction of the promotion of mistrust effect was *opposite* when comparing mothers versus fathers. Whereas fathers' promotion of mistrust significantly *exacerbated* the adverse impact of youths' discrimination experiences on their depressive symptoms, mothers' promotion of mistrust served to *attenuate* the adolescent discrimination–depression link, albeit at a trend level. Thus, even though fathers and mothers were using the same ethnic-racial socialization strategy (promotion of mistrust in this case), the degree to which their use of promotion of mistrust served to impact the adolescent discrimination–depression association was significantly different.

One critical question raised by these results is, Why might promotion of mistrust by fathers yield such a different moderating effect compared to when mothers use the same ethnic-racial socialization strategy in the same family with the same child? In accounting for socio-cultural factors and traditional gender expectations in Mexican families, one explanation may be rooted in the different gender roles occupied by fathers and mothers. Fathers are typically the parent who more frequently accesses the outside world beyond the domestic sphere and consequently may have more firsthand experience as a target of racial/ethnic discrimination themselves. Thus, a father's use of promotion of mistrust may serve as a risk factor, exacerbating the discrimination–depression link for his adolescent child because as the youth takes his or her father's advice to heart, the world seems to become a more threatening place, triggering the cognitive triad (i.e., negative views about the world, the future, and themselves; Beck, 1967) that leads to depression. On the other hand, mothers typically have a more intimate connection with their children as primary caregivers and further are seen as carriers of culture in the Mexican family context; adolescent children may interpret their mothers' promotion of mistrust as a sign of caring for them and preserving their cultural identity; thus, a Mexican mother's use of promotion of mistrust may not have the same negative impact for her child or could even serve as a protective factor in the discrimination–depression link for her adolescent child.

At the same time, neither cultural socialization nor preparation for bias were significant moderators of the association between discrimination and mental health, regardless of parent gender and mental health outcome. Perhaps these types of ethnic-racial socialization messages (i.e., cultural socialization; preparation for bias) were not strong enough to outweigh the adverse effect of discrimination on adolescents' anxiety or depression. With regard to the null findings for anxiety (vs. depression) when promotion of mistrust was the moderator, it may be that this type of message, especially when delivered by the father, is more conducive to triggering depressive symptoms via the cognitive triad but does not coincide as well with anxiety symptoms.

Clinically, these results are meaningful in several ways. First, they highlight the critical importance of including both fathers and mothers in empirical research studies of ethnic-racial socialization as well as in the integration of the whole family unit in clinical practice settings when working with adolescents who are dealing with discrimination. Second, the results underscore the importance of disentangling the effects of fathers versus mothers in their ethnic-racial socialization practices—that the same strategy could yield moderating influences (or not) in different degrees and opposite directions on their children's mental health is very revealing and intriguing. These findings extend the current empirical literature on ethnic-racial socialization; raise several interesting questions; and have some provocative implications for future research, theory, and practice, as discussed next.

The present study makes several contributions to the current empirical knowledge base on ethnic-racial socialization, both methodologically and substantively. First, the present study provides a close examination of both fathers and mothers in their use of ethnic-racial socialization within the context of their adolescents' discrimination experiences and mental health. Using a within-family approach, the present study further tested *differences* between fathers and mothers in the moderating effects of their ethnic-racial socialization practices at Time 1 on their adolescent child's intraindividual association of discrimination and mental health over time. The longitudinal design afforded the use of multilevel modeling and capitalized on these data to test for cross-level moderation effects. Thus, methodologically, the study's longitudinal design, multiple informants, and multilevel moderation modeling features increases confidence in making inferences about effects at the person level (Molenaar & Campbell, 2009), the specificity of how ethnic-racial socialization may differ between fathers versus mothers, and how ethnic-racial socialization may moderate the association between discrimination and mental health among adolescents over time. Substantively, the present findings “move the needle” on the ethnic-racial socialization literature by showing that even the same dimension of ethnic-racial socialization (e.g., promotion of mistrust) can exert a very different moderating influence on the discrimination–distress association among

adolescents depending on whether it is the father or the mother engaging in the particular ethnic-racial socialization strategy. The key finding that fathers' promotion of mistrust *exacerbated* the adolescent discrimination–depression link was consistent with prior research in other racial/ethnic minority populations (Caughy et al., 2006), but it is the first time this moderating effect has been documented in the Mexican American population. The trend-level finding that mothers' promotion of mistrust could protect adolescents from the negative effect of discrimination on depression should be tested in future research. It is important to note that promotion of mistrust could have different moderating influences, depending on the messenger (father or mother) and perhaps depending on the interpretation of the message by the adolescent recipient. These issues merit further empirical study.

Directions for Future Theory, Research, and Practice

The present study findings have some implications for theory, future research, and clinical practice. In future theory-building around ethnic-racial socialization, the current results point to the importance of accounting for parent gender (mother or father) and the specific dimension of ethnic-racial socialization (e.g., promotion of mistrust or preparation for bias). Future models of ethnic-racial socialization should carefully attend to different effects on children's mental health as a function of parent gender and the specific socialization strategy.

The current study results prompt several possible directions for future research. First, given the finding that fathers' promotion of mistrust had quite a different effect on their adolescent children than mothers' promotion of mistrust, it raises the question, How do various ethnic-racial socialization strategies look different or similar across mothers and fathers? In other words, *how* do mothers and fathers implement the same ethnic-racial socialization strategies? For example, Knight et al. (2011) suggested that fathers' socialization efforts may occur through more indirect methods other than talking, such as modeling or sanctioning, whereas mothers' socialization efforts may occur through direct verbal messages, given their culturally shaped gender role as the primary socializing agent in the family. Relatedly, how do fathers and mothers coparent in their ethnic-racial socialization efforts? Although the current study did not examine this question, the results are provocative in revealing that fathers and mothers may be divergent in their socialization goals and results. Future research examining the coparenting function in the ethnic-racial socialization process appears to be sorely needed so that coparenting can be conducted in a way that optimally benefits the children. Second, future research using qualitative or mixed methods would be valuable to gain a more in-depth understanding of how adolescent children might interpret the same ethnic-racial

socialization messages from fathers versus mothers, either differently or similarly. Third, the present results also beg the questions of "How?" and "Why?" Specifically, how do the ethnic-racial socialization practices of fathers and mothers, respectively, change the discrimination–depression association in their adolescent children? Future research should test potential mediating mechanisms that can explain how and why ethnic-racial socialization affects the link between discrimination and mental health. For example, Neblett, Rivas-Drake, and Umaña-Taylor (2012) suggested that ethnic-racial socialization may affect coping skills that enable youths to respond more effectively to racism and discrimination; thus, coping skills and other candidate mediators (e.g., cognitive appraisals; Neblett et al., 2012) may offer fruitful avenues for pursuing this line of inquiry in the future. Finally, among immigrant families in particular, future research that explores the intersection of acculturation and ethnic-racial socialization processes may yield valuable insights into how and why parents select or prioritize certain ethnic-racial socialization strategies. For example, as Latinx parents (and their children) become more acculturated, do immigrant fathers and mothers prioritize certain dimensions of ethnic-racial socialization? Or, as others have found (e.g., White et al., 2018), above and beyond parent characteristics, are there neighborhood/school and other broader social climate characteristics that are primarily driving ethnic-racial socialization? For example, White et al. (2018) found that neighborhood Latino ethnic concentration interacted with mothers' ethnic socialization practices for Mexico-born adolescents, such that mothers' ethnic socialization may compensate for living in neighborhoods with lower Latino ethnic concentration.

Regarding clinical implications, the present findings indicate the importance of carefully training fathers in parenting intervention/prevention programs, given that how fathers (vs. mothers) interact with and influence their children may differ. Moreover, clinicians need to be mindful in calibrating their recommendations for what "parents" (generically) do to protect their children from the adverse effects of discrimination by acknowledging caregiver gender and cultural differences. Finally, as clinicians await the results of future research on coparenting processes involved in ethnic-racial socialization (a line of inquiry recommended earlier), we caution against the danger of imposing a deficit model on fathers, given the present findings that their promotion of mistrust exacerbated the discrimination–depression association. At this time, we do not yet know enough of the richly textured content of fathers' ethnic-racial socialization messages to their adolescent children (e.g., what do fathers say, how do they transmit these messages?). To better understand fathers' ethnic-racial socialization processes and to provide the best advice to help fathers be more effective in their ethnic-racial socialization strategies, future research needs to address this oft-overlooked and understudied population.

Study Limitations

The present findings should be understood in light of the study's limitations. First, the present study employed an ethnic-homogeneous design focusing on a Mexican-origin sample; future research should investigate the roles of fathers and mothers, respectively, in the ethnic-racial socialization of youths from other racial/ethnic minority populations, as there will certainly be different cultural norms and family dynamics that influence how parents go about the ethnic-racial socialization process. It will be interesting to see how fathers and mothers are similar or different in their ethnic-racial socialization strategies across different cultural contexts. Moreover, it will be important to investigate how ethnic-racial socialization processes may vary for single-parent (vs. two-parent) households. Second, although we teased apart the differences between mothers and fathers in their ethnic-racial socialization efforts, the original scope of the study did not include a separate analysis of youth gender effects, but rather we statistically controlled for child gender in all analyses; therefore, the post hoc analysis of youth gender effects via three-way interaction terms may not have had sufficient power to detect significant effects. Future research should pursue this line of inquiry (i.e., examining whether parents' socialization strategies have differential effects for boys vs. girls) more systematically with a larger sample size. Third, the Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) for the mothers' Promotion of Mistrust subscale was relatively low; thus, reported results may be attenuated due to measurement errors (McDonald, 1999). Finally, the parent measures for the three types of ethnic-racial socialization were available only for Time 1; future studies can examine parent ethnic-racial socialization longitudinally to see how parents' strategies may change over time as they accommodate the changing needs and experiences of their growing adolescent children.

Conclusion

The present study investigated the moderating effect of fathers' and mothers' ethnic-racial socialization on the link between adolescent discrimination and adolescent mental health. Of interest, we found significantly different moderating effects between fathers and mothers when the ethnic-racial socialization strategy was promotion of mistrust, with fathers' (but not mothers') promotion of mistrust *exacerbating* the adolescent discrimination–depression association. These results highlight the critical importance of not only including fathers in future studies of ethnic-racial socialization but also differentiating the effects of fathers versus mothers as they may exert quite different influences on their children's mental health in the context of racism and discrimination. Thus, future prevention/intervention efforts should also take note of these cultural and gendered caregiver differences.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the participating families and partnering community-based agencies. We also thank the research team for their assistance in this project: Rosemary Salinas; Misel Ramirez Vasoli; Amarilys Castillo; Jaqueline Martinez; Kristina Martinez; Margaret Schmid; Carlos Uzcategui; Kimberly Widawski; Gilberto Pérez, Jr., M.S. W., ACSW; and Jennifer Burke-Lefever, Ph.D.

FUNDING

This research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R21MH097675 (Irene Park, Principal Investigator). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed on the publisher's website.

REFERENCES

- Aldoney, D., & Cabrera, N. J. (2016). Raising American citizens: Socialization goals of low-income immigrant Latino mothers and fathers of young children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(12), 3607–3618. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0510-x
- Beck, A. T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Berkel, C., Knight, G. P., Zeiders, K. H., Tein, J., 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(4), 893–915. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00668.x
- Brown, T. L., Linver, M. R., Evans, M., & DeGennaro, D. (2009). African-American parents' racial and ethnic socialization and adolescent academic grades: Teasing out the role of gender. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(2), 214–227. doi:10.1007/s10964-008-9362-z
- Cabrera, N. J., & Bradley, R. H. (2012). Latino fathers and their children. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6(3), 232–238. doi:10.1111/cdep.2012.6.issue-3
- Caughy, M. O., Nettles, S. M., O'Campo, P. J., & Lohrnick, K. F. (2006). Neighborhood matters: Racial socialization of African American children. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1220–1236. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00930.x
- Córdova, D., & Cervantes, R. C. (2010). Intergroup and within-group perceived discrimination among U.S.-born and foreign-born Latino youth. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 32(2), 259–274. doi:10.1177/0739986310362371
- DeNavas-Walt, C., & Proctor, B. D. (2015). Income and poverty in the United States: 2014 (Current Population Reports, P60-252). Washington, DC: US Government Printing .

- Espinoza, G., Gonzales, N. A., & Fuligni, A. J. (2016). Parent discrimination predicts Mexican-American adolescent psychological adjustment 1 year later. *Child Development, 87*(4), 1079–1089. doi:10.1111/cdev.12521
- Finch, B. K., Kolody, B., & Vega, W. A. (2000). Perceived discrimination and depression among Mexican-origin adults in California. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41*(3), 295–313.
- French, S. E., & Coleman, B. R. (2013). The relation between parental racial socialization and African Americans' racial ideologies. *Journal of Black Psychology, 39*(4), 396–410. doi:10.1177/0095798412461805
- García Coll, C., Crnic, K., Lamberty, G., & Wasik, B. H. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development, 67*(5), 1891–1914. doi:10.2307/1131600
- Hernández, M. M., Conger, R. D., Robins, R. W., Bacher, K. B., & Widaman, K. F. (2014). Cultural socialization and ethnic pride among Mexican-origin adolescents during the transition to middle school. *Child Development, 85*(2), 695–708. doi:10.1111/cdev.12167
- Hooper, L. M., Mier-Chairez, J., Mugoya, G. C. T., & Arellano, B. (2016). Depressive symptoms, assessment, and treatment in Latino/a adolescents: A brief review. *Current Psychiatry Reviews, 12*(2), 150–162. doi:10.2174/1573400512666160602114446
- Hughes, D., & Chen, L. (1997). When and what parents tell children about race: An examination of race-related socialization among African American families. *Applied Developmental Science, 1*(4), 200–214. doi:10.1207/s1532480xads0104_4
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(4), 981–995. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00981.x
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(5), 747–770. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.747
- Huynh, V. W., & Fuligni, A. J. (2008). Ethnic socialization and the academic adjustment of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(4), 1202–1208. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.1202
- Jones, S. C. T., & Neblett, E. W. (2017). Future directions in research on racism-related stress and racial-ethnic protective factors for black youth. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 46*(5), 754–766. doi:10.1080/15374416.2016.1146991
- Kessler, R. C., Avenevoli, S., Costello, E. J., Georgiades, K., Green, J. G., Gruber, M. J., ... Merikangas, K. R. (2012). Prevalence, persistence, and sociodemographic correlates of DSM-IV disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication adolescent supplement. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 69*(4), 372–380. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.160
- 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*(5), 913–925. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00856.x
- Kornienko, O., & Santos, C. E. (2014). The effects of friendship network popularity on depressive symptoms during early adolescence: Moderation by fear of negative evaluation and gender. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(4), 541–553. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9979-4
- Kovacs, M. (2011). *Children's depression inventory 2nd edition (CDI 2) technical manual*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Liu, L. L., & Lau, A. S. (2013). Teaching about race/ethnicity and racism matters: An examination of how perceived ethnic racial socialization processes are associated with depression symptoms. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(4), 383–394. doi:10.1037/a0033447
- March, J. S., Parker, J. D. A., Sullivan, K., & Stallings, P. (1997). The multidimensional anxiety scale for children (MASC): Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 36*(4), 554–565. doi:10.1097/00004583-199704000-00019
- Martinez, C. R., McClure, H. H., Eddy, J. M., Ruth, B., & Hyers, M. J. (2012). Recruitment and retention of Latino immigrant families in prevention research. *Prevention Science, 13*(1), 15–26. doi:10.1007/s11121-011-0239-0
- Martinez, W., Polo, A. J., & Carter, J. S. (2012). Family orientation, language, and anxiety among low-income Latino youth. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 26*(4), 517–525. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2012.02.005
- McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., Kim, J., Burton, L. M., Davis, K. D., Dotterer, A. M., & Swanson, D. P. (2006). Mothers' and fathers' racial socialization in African American families: Implications for youth. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1387–1402. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00942.x
- McLaughlin, K. A., Hilt, L. M., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2007). Racial/ethnic differences in internalizing and externalizing symptoms in adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 35*(5), 801–816. doi:10.1007/s10802-007-9128-1
- McLoyd, V. C., Cauce, A. M., Takeuchi, D., & Wilson, L. (2000). Marital processes and parental socialization in families of color: A decade review of research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 1070–1093. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01070.x
- Molenaar, P. C. M., & Campbell, C. G. (2009). The new person-specific paradigm in psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*(2), 112–117. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01619.x
- Neblett, E. W., Jr., Rivas-Drake, D., & Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2012). The promise of racial and ethnic protective factors in promoting ethnic minority youth development. *Child Development Perspectives, 6*(3), 295–303. doi:10.1111/cdep.2012.6.issue-3
- Neblett, E. W., Jr., White, R. L., Ford, K. R., Philip, C. L., Nguyễn, H. X., & Sellers, R. M. (2008). Patterns of racial socialization and psychological adjustment: Can parental communications about race reduce the impact of racial discrimination? *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 18*(3), 477–515. doi:10.1111/jora.2008.18.issue-3
- Pachter, L. M., Szalacha, L. A., Bernstein, B. A., & García Coll, C. (2010). Perceptions of racism in children and youth (PRaCY): Properties of a self-report instrument for research on children's health and development. *Ethnicity & Health, 15*(1), 33–33-46. doi:10.1080/13557850903383196
- Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., ... Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one, 10*(9), e0138511. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138511
- Park, I. J. K., Du, H., Wang, L., Williams, D. R., & Alegria, M. (2018). Racial/ethnic discrimination and mental health in Mexican-origin youths and their parents: Testing the "linked lives" hypothesis. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 62*, 480–487. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.10.010
- Park, I. J. K., Wang, L., Williams, D. R., & Alegria, M. (2017). Does anger regulation mediate the discrimination-mental health link among Mexican-origin adolescents? A longitudinal mediation analysis using multilevel modeling. *Developmental Psychology, 53*, 340–352. doi:10.1037/dev0000235
- Park, I. J. K., Wang, L., Williams, D. R., & Alegria, M. (2018a). Coping with racism: Moderators of the discrimination—Adjustment link among Mexican-origin adolescents. *Child Development, 89*, e293–e310. doi:10.1111/cdev.12856
- Patten, E. (2016, April). *The Nation's Latino population is defined by its youth*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/04/20/the-nations-latino-population-is-defined-by-its-youth/>
- Pérez, D. J., Fortuna, L., & Alegria, M. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among U.S. Latinos. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(4), 421–421-433. doi:10.1002/jcop.20221

- Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(3), 271–281. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271
- Planalp, E. M., Du, H., Braungart-Rieker, J. M., & Wang, L. (2017). Growth curve modeling to studying change: A comparison of approaches using longitudinal dyadic data with distinguishable dyads. *Structural Equation Modeling, 24*(1), 129–147. doi:10.1080/10705511.2016.1224088
- Raffaelli, M., & Ontai, L. L. (2004). Gender socialization in Latino/a families: Results from two retrospective studies. *Sex Roles, 50*(5/6), 287–299. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000018886.58945.06
- Roosa, M. W., Liu, F. F., Torres, M., Gonzales, N. A., Knight, G. P., & Saenz, D. (2008). Sampling and recruitment in studies of cultural influences on adjustment: A case study with Mexican Americans. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(2), 293–302. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.2.293
- Tatum, B. D. (2017). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). *FACTS FOR FEATURES: Hispanic heritage month 2017*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2017/hispanic-heritage.html>
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Guimond, A. B. (2010). A longitudinal examination of parenting behaviors and perceived discrimination predicting Latino adolescents' ethnic identity. *Developmental Psychology, 46*(3), 636–650. doi:10.1037/a0019376
- Wang, L., & Maxwell, S. E. (2015). On disaggregating between-person and within-person effects with longitudinal data using multilevel models. *Psychological Methods, 20*(1), 63–83. doi:10.1037/met0000030
- White, R. M. B., Knight, G. P., Jensen, M., & Gonzales, N. A. (2018). Ethnic socialization in neighborhood contexts: Implications for ethnic attitude and identity development among Mexican-origin adolescents. *Child Development, 89*(3), 1004–1021.
- Zayas, L. H. (2011). *Latinas attempting suicide: When cultures, families, and daughters collide*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.