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Abstract

The continuing population growth of Latino/a immigrants in the United States has led to an increase in the study of cultural identity and the adaptive processes that shape that identity. The negative effects of immigrant cultural adjustment on the behavior of Latino and Latina adolescents is an area that has received little research attention to date. Using self-report surveys gathered by a federally funded high risk youth project, this study examined the prediction of high risk behavior in a seventh and eighth grade sample of 131 Latino/a adolescents. A four dimensional cultural identity predictor was used in a multiple regression analysis to assess the relationship to the criterion variable, problem behavior syndrome namely alcohol abuse, sexual activity, and suicide attempts. Results from the multiple regression revealed that Acculturation and Family Loyalty were significantly related to problem behavior. High Acculturation increases risk of problem behavior whereas high Family Loyalty increases resiliency. There were no significant differences across gender and ethnic subgroups. The relevance of this data to prediction of high risk behavior in Latino/a adolescents and the implications for future research and prevention programs are discussed.
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Examining Cultural Identity in the Prediction of High Risk Behavior in Latino and Latina Adolescents.

Introduction

According to the US Bureau of the Census (1991), the Latino and Latina population totaled 21.4 million in 1990 and currently constitute 8.6% of the US population. This group is continuing to grow at a rate five times greater than all other minority groups. Immigration accounts for 50% of the growth compared to 21% of the growth in the non-Latino/Latina population (US Bureau of the Census, 1991). As a result of the changing demographics in the United States, an increasing amount of research and study has been dedicated to investigating Latinos (inclusive of both Latino and Latina populations) ability to adapt to a new culture. The term acculturation has been used by psychological researchers to describe this adaptation process.

Acculturation is defined as an adaptation process whereby the attitudes and/or behaviors of persons from one culture are modified or changed as a result of contact with a different culture (Moyerman, & Forman, 1992). However, usage of the term more commonly refers to a process of change by members of a minority group toward the adoption of the majority group’s culture (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). The interest and attention given to the process of acculturation have been primarily in two areas: 1) defining and measuring the
construct of acculturation and 2) examining its role as a contributor to a host of functional outcomes in the Latino and Latina population (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987, Keefe & Padilla, 1987).

Although there is a large body of empirical studies on the topic of acculturation, limited research is available on the effects of acculturation on Latino and Latina adolescents. Most research in this area has been extrapolated from adult findings without taking into account the different experiences of Latino and Latina adolescents. Additionally, the apparent lack of agreement among researchers on an operational definition and assessment device for acculturation has led to conflicting and inconclusive findings.

The objective of this study was to determine whether or not cultural identity aids in the prediction of high risk behaviors such as substance abuse, sexual behavior and suicide attempts among Latino and Latina adolescents. A multidimensional measure comprising both behavioral (i.e. language preference and usage) and attitudinal (i.e. ethnic loyalty and perceived discrimination) components was examined as a possible measure of cultural identity. The predictive power of demographic variables, such as gender, national origin and socioeconomic status (SES) were also examined. Measures used in this analysis include: the acculturation scale, the family loyalty scale, the ethnic pride/loyalty scale, and the perceived discrimination scale. Each of these scales has been found to account for large amounts of variance in factor analytic studies examining the
role of culture in the lives of Latino immigrants (Barea & Miller, 1994, Noris, Ford & Bova, 1996). Finally, in keeping with Jessor and Jessor’s (1977) problem behavior theory; drug abuse, sexual activity, and prevalence of suicide attempts were conceptualized as elements of one broad problem domain.

Defining and Measuring Acculturation

Acculturation is neither “good” nor “bad”, but an immensely complex psychosocial concept that requires a multidimensional research approach. However, most of the studies to date are limited by conceptual and methodological flaws. The majority of studies have conceptualized and operationalized acculturation as a unidimensional construct, assuming a “conflict replacement model” (Ramirez, 1984). The majority of unidimensional scales employed use primarily behavioral indicators such as language to measure acculturation. For example, a typical item (scored on a five-point scale) would ask whether the language spoken is Spanish only, mostly Spanish, about the same, mostly English or English only (Burnam, 1987). In this model, a highly acculturated Latino/a would demonstrate a high level of involvement in the American culture and a diminishing or low level of involvement in his or her Latino culture.

Padilla (1980) was one of the first researchers to offer a multidimensional approach, conceptualizing both behavioral and attitudinal components of the acculturation process. He defined behavioral correlates of the acculturation process and labeled them cultural awareness, comprised of such factors as cultural
heritage and language preference. He also defined an attitudinal component of acculturation that he termed ethnic loyalty. Ethnic loyalty consisted of attitudes related to ethnic pride and affiliation, and perceptions of discrimination. This multidimensional model assumes that people will be somewhere between the two cultures on each dimension. However, this model does not account for the person who may successfully acculturate to both cultures. From a multidimensional model of acculturation, researchers have moved to a bicultural or orthogonal model, allowing for competence in both origin culture and host culture (Oetting 1989). This conception posits that identification with one culture can be independent of identification with any other culture. Instead of being placed in opposition to each other, cultural identification dimensions are “at right angles”; they are uncorrelated. Failure to acknowledge those individuals that do not adapt well to either culture is a weakness in this model. With the emergence of new and more complex models of cultural change, new descriptors of the process need to be considered. In this study the descriptor “cultural identity” identified by Felix-Ortiz, Newcomb and Myers (1994) will be used to distinguish new conceptualizations of this process from older conceptualizations, which will be referred to as acculturation. This study recognizes cultural identity as a dynamic process of multicultural adaptation.
Acculturation Effects

A number of studies examining the effects acculturation has had on the mental health of the Latino and Latina population have shown that acculturation is not an easy process. In a review of the research relating acculturation to mental health problems, Rogler, Cortez, & Malgady (1991) concluded that most studies confirm a link between acculturation and mental health. Padilla, Olmedo, and Loya (1982), Oberg (1960), Guthrie (1975), Byrnes (1966), and Smalley (1963) have used such terms as “culture stress,” “culture shock,” “culture fatigue,” “role shock,” and “language shock” to describe the psychological impact of adaptation to a new culture. At first, the immigrant may feel relief at having arrived in the new home country, and hope for a better economic and political future. However, after this initial period, when faced with a multitude of stressors, the immigrant may come to question the decision to leave his or her homeland. It is important to note that the spectrum of reactions to a new culture also changes as a function of time. The literature is replete with reports of the many differences between the acculturation of recent immigrants and second and third generation immigrants. Each has to contend with quite different social and psychological stressors. For example, newly arriving immigrants have a defined cultural identity but are faced with the initial shock of leaving their homeland and arriving in a new and different environment. In contrast, second or third generation immigrants might be more aware of their environment, yet are beginning to question their cultural identity.
They no longer belong solely to one culture and are more aware of the discrimination against them for being “non-American”. It is important to note terms such as “American” and “non-American” portray a mythological culture that does not exist. The terms are used to express the “dominant culture’s” perspective of cultural identity.

**Ethnic Identification**

Whether identification with their ethnicity reduces or increases psychological stress among ethnic minorities has been the object of numerous investigations (Castro, Sharp, Barrington, Walton, & Rawson, 1991; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987; Neff, Hoppe, & Perea, 1987; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). A robust ethnic identification seems especially useful for Latino/a individuals, whose culture is misunderstood by the “dominant culture” (Crawford, 1989, p. 57). Further more, development of a positive sense of belonging to one’s ethnic group may protect the individual from the potentially negative impact of prejudice and discrimination (Phinney, 1990).

Keefe and Padilla (1987) reported a decline in the cultural heritage and language preference of Mexican Americans from generation to generation, whereas ethnic pride remained relatively stable. Thus acculturation can have an observable effect on a behavioral perspective (e.g. language proficiency), whereas attitudes (e.g. ethnic pride or family loyalty) can be resilient to the acculturation
process. It would seem plausible that a weakening of ethnic pride or family loyalty would represent a major stressor in the life of a Latino/a individual.

**Family factors**

Perhaps the most significant acculturation stressor for Latino/a immigrants is the loss of social support in the form of family ties and close interpersonal relationships (Wodarski, 1992). The literature on the family ecology of Latinos indicates that the importance they give to the family is one of their most distinctive and enduring cultural characteristics as an ethnic group (Sabogal, 1987). Cortez (1995) described Latinos’ strong belief in the family unit as Familism, a belief system which refers to feelings of loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity toward members of the family, as well as the notion of the family as an extension of self. Brook, Whiteman, Balka, & Gursen (1997) Family Interactional theory posits that fundamental to the family domain is the parent-adolescent relationship. A strong mutual attachment between parents and children significantly affects the adolescents’ psychological functioning and thus insulates them from high risk behavior. Acculturation difficulties have been associated with difficulty in the parent-child attachment relationship, which in turn is related to the adolescent’s development of risk taking behavior traits (King, 1993). Thus, family factors can either offset adolescent risk factors or reduce protective factors leading to high risk behavior (e.g. drug use).
Prejudice and Discrimination

In time, as Latinos become more familiar with their new environment, they also become aware of the prejudice and discrimination that exist. According to Espin (1987),

“when a migrant comes from a country where she belongs to the racial majority, or where, as in Latin countries, racial mixtures are the norm, the experience of turning into a minority in the United States and encountering overt racial discrimination becomes a disorienting experience. (p. 493).”

Discrimination against Latinos is widespread in the United States (Furino, 1992). Ignorance, suspicion, myth, and misinformation still persist. In spite of the fact that all citizens are guaranteed equal rights under the U. S. Constitution, Latinos are likely to encounter unfair and prejudiced treatment in employment, education, housing, and other human services (Padilla, 1980). Viewing the larger community as an extension of the family, Latinos are faced with still another sense of loss of social support.

Berry (1997), further describes prejudice and racism as obstacles to “mutual accommodation”, which he feels is required for successful adaptation to be attained. This involves the acceptance by both groups to live as culturally different peoples.

Substance Abuse Patterns

Various studies have focused on substance abuse patterns among Latinos as a function of acculturation. The role of exposure to the “dominant culture” has been implicated in substance and alcohol consumption by different Latino/a
groups. This association has been sufficiently robust to occur under numerous conditions and under numerous definitions of acculturation. Farabee, Wallisch, and Maxwell (1995) found that prevalence rates among Mexican born immigrants increased as a function of US acculturation, with the most acculturated group’s rates of alcohol consumption more closely resembling non-Latino and non-Latina populations. Likewise, Pumariega, Swanson, Holzer, Linskey, and Quintero-Salinas (1992) found a significant cultural effect on adolescent substance abuse as measured across the US-Mexico border in the lower Rio Grande Valley region. Adolescent substance abuse was found to increase as a function of living in the US and being part of a generation further removed from Mexican culture. Overall, it appears that when examining substance abuse in Latino/a populations it is important to take into account cultural influences.

Sexual Behavior

By their 18th birthday, 14 percent of Latina adolescents will have had a child, compared to 7 percent of white teens (US Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1990). Self-report surveys reveal that Latino/a children engage in sexual activity at a much younger age than their white peers. Research examining the correlates and predictors of adolescent sexual activity has indicated domains such as SES, family relationships, and various behavioral and personality characteristics (Chilman, 1986, Hofferth, 1987). However, little is known about the relationship between acculturation and sexual behavior among Latino/a
adolescents. What is known about adolescents’ sexual behavior has been extrapolated from research done on Latino/a adults. For example, Sabogal, Perez-Stable, Otero-Sabogal and Hiatt (1995) examined acculturation, gender and ethnic differences in sexual behaviors of Latino/a adults and reported that highly acculturated Latina adults have a higher number of lifetime sexual partners and an increased prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) compared to less acculturated women. Additionally, the number of heterosexually acquired HIV infections reported in all Latinos is 10 times the rate for non-Latino/a whites (Centers for Disease Control, 1989). Other studies analyzing adult sexual behavior of the Latino/a population have reported that variables such as gender and acculturation play a key role in explaining traditional gender roles, which are important correlates with sexual attitudes and behaviors. Although very little is known about the relationship between culture and sexual behavior of Latino/a adolescents, there is clear evidence that Latino/a adolescents engage in sexual activity at a younger age and have the second highest pregnancy rate of any cultural group in the United States.

Suicide

According to a 1990 survey of 11,631 high school students, the US Centers for Disease Control (1991) found that 14.9 percent of Latina high school students in the United States had attempted suicide within a one year period, compared with 8.3 percent of all survey respondents. According to Hovey and
King (1996) a high level of acculturative stress may result in an increased risk for the development of psychological problems including depression and anxiety, feelings of marginality and alienation, heightened psychosomatic symptoms and identity confusion. Vega (1993), Razin (1991), and Becker (1990) found that increased rates of suicide in Latino and Latina immigrants were a function of acculturative stressors. Vega (1993) studied a multiethnic (Latino/a, White non-Latino/a, and African American) sample of 6,760 boys in Florida and found drug use and acculturation strains interacted as predictors of suicide attempts. The ethnic subgroups with greater proportions of highly acculturated immigrants showed the highest reported rates of suicide attempts.

**Problem Behavior Syndrome**

In this study, it is proposed that sexual activity, substance abuse and suicide attempts will be incorporated into an overall syndrome of problem behavior. In their problem behavior theory, Jessor and Jessor (1977) hypothesized a single factor of unconventionality that underlies adolescent problem behaviors, based on the strong positive correlations between adolescents’ involvement in drug use, sexual activity and delinquency. According to problem behavior theory, adolescent behaviors are defined according to age-specific societal norms and represent functionally similar social behaviors that share a common etiology (Tildesley, Hops, Ary, Andrews 1995). A number of studies have confirmed that the relationships among alcohol use, marijuana use, other illicit drug use, sexual
intercourse, and general deviant behavior could be explained by a single factor across high school, college and young adult samples (Donovan & Jessor, 1985, Farrell, Danish, & Howard 1992). In this study, suicide attempts will be included in this problem behavior syndrome. Previous research has uncovered strong associations between drug use and suicide attempts and drug use and early sexual activity among adolescents, but has neglected to examine all three behaviors under one dimension (Swanson 1992, McCauley, Ohannessian, & Crockett, 1993).

Demographics as Mediators of Acculturation Effects

The literature has consistently shown that when investigating acculturation as a possible predictor construct it is essential to take into account demographic variables such as age, gender, socioeconomic status (SES), and national origin.

Consideration of age is particularly important with Latinos since the median age in this population is 22 years, compared to 31.4 years in the overall population (Bureau of the Census, 1990). Since many Latinas are now entering their childbearing years, and because they tend to bear more children at younger ages than other ethnic groups, the Latino/a population on average will continue to be relatively younger than the rest of the population for some time (Comaz-Diaz, 1990). Despite these demographics, very few theoretical or empirical studies have addressed the acculturation process of adolescents and children (Szpapocznik & Hernandez, 1988: Vega, Gil, Warheit, Zimmerman, & Apospori, 1993).
Gender Role Differences

Gender role differences in the prevalence of all high risk behavior have been consistently reported with the Latino and Latina populations (Sabogal 1995). More importantly, acculturation has been found to play a key role in altering traditional gender roles, where male superiority and male dominance in the family remain pervasive and females are expected to fulfill the traditional role of compliant daughter, wife and mother. Research has found gender role differences are more prominent among less-acculturated Latinos, who are more likely to adhere to traditional gender roles (Vasquez-Nuttall, Romero-Garcia, & de Leon, 1987). Although stringent gender differences within the traditional Latino and Latina population have been reported as a possible explanation for gender role differences in high risk behavior (Pavich, 1986), other studies reveal that acculturation has a greater effect, gradually reducing the effects of these traditional gender roles over time (Pavich, 1986).

Socio-Economic Status

In several studies, SES has been found to correlate strongly with the acculturation level of Latino/a populations. Negy and Woods (1992) found a significant positive relationship between acculturation level and SES, suggesting that the more acculturated subjects come from backgrounds with higher levels of education and income. The acculturation process for Latinos was found to either be facilitated by a high SES or made more problematic with a low SES. These
results strongly suggest that acculturation and SES are intricately intertwined, making it essential to examine both constructs when working with Latino and Latina populations (Buriel & Saenz, 1980; Griffith & Villavicencio, 1985). The fact that the majority of Latinos are below poverty levels seem to increase their vulnerability both to difficulties with acculturation and a vulnerability to mental health problems.

National Origin

Another important demographic variable discussed in acculturation literature is the national origin of the Latino/a population. This is because the Latino/a population in the United States constitutes a diverse and heterogeneous community comprising groups with distinct historical, economical, political and racial differences. The Latino/a population in the United States consists of 63% Mexican Americans, 12% Puerto Rican, 6% Cuban, 14% Central and South American and 6% Other Latino/a (Bureau of the Census, 1990). Understandably, the majority of the research done in the area of acculturation has been with Mexican Americans. This study has the opportunity to examine more closely the unique Central and South American Latino/a populations of Rhode Island. This population has been neglected in the literature.

Research Purposes and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to shed new light on the role of cultural identity in predicting the high risk behaviors of substance abuse, sexual behavior
and suicide attempts among Latino and Latina adolescents. Important
demographic variables, such as gender, national origin and age were also
examined as possible aids in predicting these high risk behaviors. Another main
purpose of this study was to examine whether multidimensional measures
comprising both behavioral (i.e. language preference and usage) and attitudinal
(i.e. ethnic pride, family loyalty and perceived discrimination) components are
essential to understanding and measuring cultural identity. Finally, drug use,
sexual activity, and prevalence of suicide attempts were conceptualized and
analyzed as elements of one broad problem domain.

In this study, self-report survey information was gathered from high risk
Latino youth and analyzed to determine the predictive power of cultural identity
on high risk behavior. The following research hypotheses were proposed:
1) Each of four dimensions believed to represent an important component of
cultural identity; acculturation, ethnic pride, family loyalty and perceived
discrimination, will contribute uniquely to variance in problem behavior. Greater
acculturation to the US, lower ethnic loyalty, and greater perceived discrimination
would be correlated with more high risk behavior.
2) Sexual activity, substance abuse and suicide attempts would all form one factor
of high risk behavior to be described as a “problem behavior syndrome”.
3) Gender differences would exist in the predictive power of cultural identity, with
a stronger direct relationship among all four dimensions of cultural identity and
high risk behavior in female youth. It was predicted that male youth would demonstrate a weaker predictive relationship.

4) National origin would be a contributor to the prediction of high risk behavior in the Latino youth. Due to the ethnic diversity within the sample, the impact and predictive power of cultural identity within each of the distinct subculture groups would vary.

Method

Original data collection

Previously collected data, gathered as part of a federally funded high risk youth project, was utilized in this study. The “Hispanos Organizados en Prevencion y Educacion” (HOPE) project, which began in September 1, 1992, was a five year project funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP). Latino/a youth in Rhode Island were targeted as a high risk group due to their serious and growing problem with alcohol, tobacco and drugs (ATOD), low socioeconomic (SES) status, high school dropout rate, and high percentage of recent immigrant status. In order to obtain an independent evaluation of the HOPE project, the Rhode Island Department of Substance Abuse acquired the services of Community Research and Services Team (CRST) of Brown University, in collaboration with personnel from the University of Rhode Island.

The CRST administered the Youth Survey, one of five evaluation components, in order to examine the preventive services received by the youth.
participating in the Hope project. Two middle school sites in Rhode Island were selected for intervention because of their high concentration of Latino/a students and high proportion of recent Latino immigrants. One site had 54% and the other site had a 40%, Latino/a youth population. Latino/a seventh and eighth graders in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes were selected as youth particularly at risk for alcohol, tobacco, and other drug abuse problems. Data utilized in this study were obtained in the Fall of the third year of the project.

Subjects

The HOPE project administered surveys to a total of 175 seventh and eighth grade Latino youth from both project sites during the 1994-1995 academic year. Selection for inclusion in the project made use of a cluster sample of 100% of the ESL classrooms in both school sites. Participation in the evaluation was contingent on obtaining written informed consent by parents and written informed assent by the youth who would participate in the study. Sixty nine percent of the participating youth took the survey in Spanish, while 31% took the survey in English. Their ages ranged from 11 to 16 years old, with the majority of respondents (85%) falling within the range of 12 to 14 years old. Males and females were equally distributed in both sites. Forty-nine percent of the youth described themselves as Dominican, the largest subgroup in the sample, followed by Puerto Rican (21%), Guatemalan (11%), Colombian (9%), and Other Hispanic (8%).
The Parent Survey, another evaluation component of the project, surveyed the annual income of the parents of the children in the study. The range was from under $5,000 (30%) to over $10,000 (25%), with 46% of the parents earning between $5,000 and $10,000. This information supports the 1990 census information which classified the majority of Latinos in these two Rhode Island sites as existing below the ‘poverty’ level. This results in a relatively homogenous SES sample.

Instrument

The Hope Youth Survey for seventh and eighth grade Latino youth is a six page questionnaire available in both English and Spanish (see Appendix-A). It consists of 87 items including: five demographic items; a four item scale (alpha coefficient .74) measuring the level of Latino pride experienced by youth; a five item scale (alpha coefficient .62, (Montgomery, 1992)) measuring the level of acculturation; a three item family loyalty scale (alpha coefficient .72, (Vega, 1992)) determining the strength of family relationships; 11 30-day prevalence of use items; five intensity of use items; four items relating to peer disapproval of various AOD behaviors; four perceived risk associated with use items; a three item scale (alpha coefficient .65, (Newcomb & Harlow, 1986)) measuring youth perceptions of the purpose in life; 11 items relating to career aspirations and expectations; six items used to determine youth support network and protective factors; 11 items relating to risk factors in HOPE youth, a two item scale (alpha
coefficient .69) measuring the level of school satisfaction; seven items determining
the level of program participation and perception of its value, and a proposed two
item scale measuring the level of perceived discrimination. All items had response
sets ranging from two to eight choices (see Appendix-C).

For the purposes of this study, four of these scales were included:
the level of acculturation scale, the family loyalty scale, the Latino /ethnic pride
scale, and the perceived discrimination scale (see Appendix-A).

Results

This study analyzed the data using a multi-step process. Prior to beginning
the analysis, an extensive data cleanup was performed. Scale scores were treated
as missing if more than one individual item was missing. In addition, if more than
two scale scores in any given set were missing, then that individual’s score was
eliminated. As a result, 44 cases from the original 175 were eliminated leaving
131 in the sample for analyses reported here. After eliminating the outliers and
missing data, all variables were converted to z-scores in order to minimize
skewness and kurtosis. Assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity
were met through examination of the standardized residual histogram and normal
probability plot of residuals. No outliers were identified through the listing of
standardized residual z-scores and standardized residual histogram.

In the first step of the analysis, relationships were determined among the
five demographic variables, eliminating any redundant variables. As a result none
of the demographic variables were eliminated. A Pearson correlation and Cronbach’s Alpha were then run on all dependent and independent variables with the exception of the two perceived discrimination items. A correlation determined that the two items #26 (My teachers care about me) and #43 (Do you believe that being Hispanic/Latino makes it harder or easier to accomplish your education and career goals?) were uncorrelated. As a result, it was determined that item #43 stood better on its own, both theoretically and statistically. Mean scores, standard deviations and Cronbach alphas for all scales are represented in Table I.

| Insert Table I about here |

Cross-sectional correlations of all dependent and independent variables are presented in Table II. As seen in this table, problem behavior was strongly correlated with Acculturation and negatively correlated to Family Loyalty, Ethnic Pride and National origin. In addition to Problem Behavior, Acculturation was negatively correlated with Family Loyalty and Age. Ethnic Pride and Family Loyalty were highly correlated and Perceived Discrimination did not significantly correlate with any of the variables.

| Insert Table II about here |
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In the second step, principal component analyses (PCA) were conducted on all sets of predictor variables and dependent variables in order to establish if the hypothesized underlying factors would hold together (except for the perceived discrimination item). Minimum acceptable loading was set at .30, and item loadings were examined.

PCAs were first run on all of the items in the relevant predictor subscales (acculturation, family loyalty, ethnic pride, and perceived discrimination), in order to ascertain a four dimensional cultural identity construct. The acculturation items resulted in two factors with all the items loading on the first factor except for item #23 (my friends listen to Hispanic music), which was theoretically and statistically a weak item. After this item was removed, one factor resulted in an increase in the alpha. The family loyalty items and ethnic pride/loyalty items each formed one unitary factor.

The second set of PCAs run on the problem behavior items, formed five unclear factors (no clear theoretical explanation) and the removal of five complex items was warranted. They were: #47 I drink hard liquor, #75 Felt I had serious psychological problem, #76 Hard for family to obtain necessities, #78 Is there adult home after school, and #79 I have a home to go to. When these complex items were eliminated, three factors were extracted, with all remaining 12 items significantly loading on the first factor. Conceptually it appeared that factor one represented the general profile for problem behavior and the second and third
factors represented a male and female profile for problem behavior (see Appendix-B). For example, factor two (proposed male profile of problem behavior) had significant loadings of items addressing: beer drinking, getting into serious trouble, considering dropping out, sexual activity, and attendance problems. All these behaviors have been reported to have a higher male representation (Farabee & Wallisch, 1995, Sabogal & Perez-Stable 1995). Factor three (proposed female profile of problem behavior) had significant loadings of items addressing: wine drinking, wine cooler drinking, attempted suicide, and cigarette smoking. All these behaviors have been reported to be more representative of female problem behaviors (Braverman, 1993, Marttunen & Markus, 1994, Sabogal & Perez-Stable, 1995). A summary of the factor loadings and the variance each scale accounted for is represented in Table III.

Insert Table III about here

Based upon the results of the principal component analyses and other conceptual considerations, the resulting independent/predictor variables (cultural identity measure) and dependent/criterion variable (problem behavior syndrome) were run through a stepwise hierarchical multiple regression. For each of the three multiple regressions, independent variables were entered in the same specified order and assessed in terms of what each one added to the variance accounted for.
at a particular point of entry. Order of entry of variables was determined through theoretical and empirical considerations. The order was: demographic items in step one, the acculturation scale in step two, the family loyalty scale in step three, the ethnic pride scale in step four, and the perceived discrimination item in step five.

In the first MRA testing factor 1, three of the independent variables were found to contribute unique variance to the prediction equation. Demographic variables forced in at step one did not prove to be significant at the .05 level, and thus, they did not enter the equation. Acculturation (R=.21, R-squared = .05), entered in step two, was significant at the .05 level. Family Loyalty (R=.28, R-squared = .08) was borderline significant, at the .06 level. Both the Acculturation and Family scales were retained. Finally, the Ethnic Pride and Perceived Discrimination scales entered in steps four and five and were both found nonsignificant at the .05 level. Subsequent MRAs testing factors two (male profile of problem behavior) and three (female profile of problem behavior) of the dependent variable construct rendered nonsignificant results. In addition, the separate MRAs sorting out males and females also yielded nonsignificant results. Results of the multiple regression analysis at each step of data analysis are reported in Table IV.
Discussion

This study confirms that factors relating to cultural identity are multidimensional and indicates that some of these dimensions are associated with high risk behaviors in Latino/a adolescents. Figure 1 represents schematically how each dimension is linked to the problem behavior construct and interrelated with each other.

The first hypothesis was partially supported, revealing Acculturation and Family Loyalty contributed uniquely to variance in problem behavior. However, the expectation that Ethnic Pride and Perceived Discrimination would also be predictive did not hold up, though results did show that Ethnic Pride was negatively correlated with problem behavior. As expected, Acculturation has a positive relationship with problem behavior which indicates that when Latino/a adolescents become more acculturated to the majority culture, they pull away from their origin culture, which can result in problem behavior. Conversely, Family Loyalty’s negative relationship with problem behavior indicates that Latino/a adolescents who remain loyal to their families will be less prone to high risk behavior. This supports existing research which identifies Family Loyalty as a possible protective factor (Brook, Whiteman, Balka, & Gursen 1997; Cortez,
1995). Also, as expected, a positive correlation was found between Ethnic Pride and Family Loyalty. This demonstrates that Ethnic Pride plays a positive role in defining one’s cultural identity, but does not have the strength independently to aid in the prediction of problem behavior. Its positive correlation with Family Loyalty is apparently the source of its relationship to Problem Behavior. Understandably, the nonsignificant findings of the one item Perceived Discrimination variable, could be indicative of its lack of measurement reliability. Furthermore, the significant intercorrelations between Family Loyalty, Ethnic Pride, and Acculturation indicate that a relationship exists between them. This study therefore provides some preliminary empirical evidence connecting the three cultural identity dimensions.

The principal components analyses do appear to indicate that the major problem behavior variables did form a factor including: sexual activity, suicide risk, and substance abuse. These findings support the second hypothesis along with Jessor and Jessor’s (1987) Problem Behavior Theory, which posits unconventionality as the unifying force for these behaviors. Thus, Problem Behavior holds up as a fairly reliable factor for Latino/a youth, allowing researchers to assess aspects of problem behavior with a relatively simple and straightforward measure.

The third hypothesis regarding gender differences contributing to the predictive power of problem behavior was not supported. One reason why the
gender separated MRAs did not produce significant results could be small sample limitations. After sorting out males and females, each multiple regression was relying on a less than 60 subject sample to examine the role of six different predictor variables.

Similarly, hypothesis four, examining the predictive contribution of the remaining demographic variables (national origin and age) was not supported by the results of the multiple regression presented above. No demographic variables were entered into the regression equation. Additionally, intercorrelations also revealed nonsignificant correlations between demographics and the cultural identity variables or criterion variable. There may be a number of reasons why the demographic information proved to be nonsignificant. Two possible explanations will be discussed. Firstly, the representation of each ethnic subgroup was greatly uneven: 49% Dominican, 21% Puerto Rican, 9% Guatemalen and 8% Other. Similarly, their ages ranged from 11 to 16 years old, with the majority of respondents (85%) falling within the range of 12 to 14 years old. The inclusion of demographics may be more viable and provide more stable results if examined with equal representation of subgroups and with a larger sample size. A second possible explanation for the nonsignificant results might be that risk of problem behavior remains consistent across age and ethnic subgroups. This possibility seems less likely, due to the extensive literature that identifies demographic
variables (e.g. national origin, age) as important predictors of problem behavior (Comaz-Diaz, 1990, Vasquez-Nuttall, Romero-Garcia, & de Leon, 1987).

Limitations

This study’s primary challenge was the limitation imposed by secondary analysis. Theory-based hypotheses were constrained by the available items. Another possible disadvantage in this study is the use of a self-report measure, particularly when working with adolescents. The self-report questionnaire contains inquiries about highly personal behaviors and is subject to both underreporting and overreporting. For example, young Latinos may have a tendency to over report, while young Latinas may under report, their sexual experiences. A further concern is whether or not questions were clearly understood and or translated accurately. For example, in response to an item which inquired if an individual has had sexual intercourse, five percent of the respondents chose, “I don’t know” as a response. This raises the question of the validity of the translations.

Another challenge in this study was the complicated theoretical and statistical considerations necessary to undertake the examination of predictor and criterion variables. Cultural variables are inherently dynamic demanding continuous redefining and clarification. The conceptual controversy in defining the predictor constructs of cultural identity and acculturation make it difficult to find an acceptable measure of these constructs. Without such clarity it is
understandably difficult to create a cohesive, multidimensional measure of cultural identity. Furthermore, several of these variables raise socially sensitive and provocative questions. For example, perceived discrimination touches upon philosophical issues that historically have been known to be difficult to examine empirically.

The criterion variable, problem behavior syndrome, is also theoretically complicated. Jessor and Jessor’s theory citing “unconventionality” as the underlying premise that links all of these high risk behaviors is unlikely to be the only way to construe the pattern of problem behavior. Although there may be some shared global “riskiness”, individual problems may also have unique contributing risk factors. For example, the motivational factors involved in suicidal behavior might include psychological predispositions (e.g. depression) in addition to tolerance of deviance/risk taking behavior. Studies that focus on the broadly defined Problem Behavior Syndrome may miss theoretically and practically important contributions to more specific problem behaviors.

A final limitation involves the analyses performed, specifically the multiple regressions. To meet the criteria of Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989, data from 140 subjects, compared to the 131 subjects in this study would have been analyzed (e.g. 20 subjects for each of the seven predictor variables). It will be important to replicate these intriguing findings with improved measures of the constructs and larger samples.
Future Directions for Research

In Padilla's (1980) theory of cultural identity, several measurement components were identified. The result was a comprehensive, multidimensional measure of cultural identity that improved upon the already existing unidimensional language measures. This study was able identify some of these measurement components but was limited by the constraints of secondary analysis. Although attitudinal measures were used in the present study to represent a multidimensional approach to the cultural identity construct, the acculturation scale used measured acculturation as a unidimensional process. Individuals are seen to move from the loss of their origin culture towards assimilation to the majority culture, not taking into account “self-efficacy” measures for successful functioning in both cultural worlds. Future research needs to incorporate bicultural measures that use dimensional scoring to measure acculturation (Magina & Rocha, 1996). Incorporation of bicultural measures allows for an individual to become proficient in both his/her native and host cultures. Several investigators have suggested the importance of measuring biculturalism since it appears to present a highly effective form of adaptation to the demands faced by most Latino individuals living in the United States (Burnam, Telles, Karno, Hough, & Escobar, 1989). Marin (1993) has articulated that to measure biculturalism meaningfully it is necessary to abandon “a unidimensional ordinal answer scale” (used in questionnaires) and employ bidimensional scoring scales. He is referring to using
a separate assessment for both cultures by counting the number of responses in a given direction to create multiple scales.

Only after the proper measurement components are used can cultural identity be examined as possible predictor of other behavior. There would also be great value in replicating the role of “protective factors” (e.g. family loyalty) identified in this study. Further supporting the findings of this study, Brook and colleagues (1997) found that the family protective factors in Latino families offset risk factors, leading to less drug use in Mexican American adolescents.

Overall, this study has contributed to the growing knowledge of the complex multi-dimensional role of cultural identity in both risk and protective factors for Latino/a adolescents. Greater recognition of the possible protective effects of cultural constructs should provide a strong stimulus for more sophisticated theorizing and, equally important, for the development of prevention and intervention efforts targeted at enhancing protection as well as at reducing risk for problem behavior. For example, Brook and colleagues (1997) further examined protective cultural factors (e.g. family cohesiveness and ethnic identity) in a African American and Latino Adolescent population, and found them to support additional protective factors (e.g. achievement), which lead to less drug use.

A further benefit of this line of research is that of informing the development of services that may assist immigrant populations in understanding
and coping with the demands of transitioning into the mainstream culture and choosing a style of acculturation that will maximize success and life satisfaction.
### Table I.
**Means and Standard Deviations and Cronbach Alphas of Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Std Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Behavior Scale</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>5.784</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Loyalty Scale</td>
<td>13.023</td>
<td>2.032</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Pride Scale</td>
<td>18.226</td>
<td>1.979</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation Scale</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.032</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination Item</td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43  Being Hispanic makes it hard</td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Problem Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acculturation</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Loyalty</td>
<td>-.22*-.26**.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ethnic Pride</td>
<td>-.19*-.16.03</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>.03 -.05-.13</td>
<td>.05 -.003-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.06 -.02-.11</td>
<td>.06 .07 .03-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05      ** p < .01
Table III: Principal Components of the Dimensions of Cultural Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCT</th>
<th>FACTOR LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Problem Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V54 Cigarette smoking</td>
<td>0.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73 Tried to take own life?</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V46 Drink Wine Coolers?</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74 Been in serious trouble?</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71 How do you spend free time?</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V45 Drink Wine?</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V69 Sexually Active?</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10 School Attendance</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72 Consider dropping out?</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V70 Pregnant or made pregnant?</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V77 Have physical health problems</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Accounted For I</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Family loyalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21 Family members are close</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19 Spend free time with family</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24 Family togetherness important</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Accounted For II</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Ethnic Pride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15 Proud to be Hispanic</td>
<td>0.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22 Being Hispanic is important</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28 Cultural background important</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20 Being Hispanic gives meaning</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Accounted For III</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12 Length of time in U.S.</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13 Length of time in R.I.</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3 Language chosen for survey</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V25 Prefer friends to be Hispanic</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31 Language spoken with friends</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Accounted For IV</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step/predictor measures</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acculturation</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Loyalty</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethnic Pride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Beta values are standardized partial regression coefficients at final step.
Figure 1.

Cultural Factors Involved in the Prediction of Problem Behavior

Cultural Identity

Acculturation

Family Loyalty

Ethnic Pride

Problem Behavior
- Substance abuse
- Sexual Activity
- Suicide Attempts
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C. between 1 and 2 years
D. between 2 and 5 years
E. more than 5 years
F. I was born here

23. When I listen to music, I usually listen to Hispanic/Latino music.
   A. strongly agree
   B. agree
   C. neither agree nor disagree
   D. disagree
   E. strongly disagree

25. I prefer most of my friends to be Hispanic/Latino.
   A. strongly agree
   B. agree
   C. neither agree nor disagree
   D. disagree
   E. strongly disagree

31. When I am with my friends, I prefer to speak:
   A. Spanish
   B. English
   C. Both
   D. Other

3. What language was the test taken in?
   A. Spanish
   B. English

**Ethnic Pride:**

15. I am proud to be Hispanic/Latino.
   A. strongly agree
   B. agree
   C. neither agree nor disagree
   D. disagree
   E. strongly disagree
   F. I am not Hispanic

20. Being Hispanic gives my life meaning.
   A. strongly agree
   B. agree
   C. neither agree nor disagree
   D. disagree
   E. strongly disagree

22. When I think about who I am, being Hispanic/Latino is very important to me.
   A. strongly agree
   B. agree
C. neither agree nor disagree  
D. disagree  
E. strongly disagree  

28. My cultural background is very important to me.  
A. strongly agree  
B. agree  
C. neither agree nor disagree  
D. disagree  
E. strongly disagree  

Family Loyalty Scale:  
19. Members of my family like to spend free time with each other.  
A. strongly agree  
B. agree  
C. neither agree nor disagree  
D. disagree  
E. strongly disagree  

21. Members of my family feel very close to each other.  
A. strongly agree  
B. agree  
C. neither agree nor disagree  
D. disagree  
E. strongly disagree  

24. Family togetherness is very important to me.  
A. strongly agree  
B. agree  
C. neither agree nor disagree  
D. disagree  
E. strongly disagree  

Problem Behavior Syndrome Scale:  

10. During the last month, how many days of school have you missed?  
A. not in school during the last month  
B. none  
C. 1-2 days  
D. 3-5 days  
E. 6-10 days  
F. 11-15 days  
G. more than 15 days  

44. During the last month, did you drink beer?  
A. yes  
B. no  
C. don't drink  

45. During the last month, did you drink wine?  
A. yes
46. During the last month, did you drink wine coolers?
   A. yes
   B. no
   C. don't drink

54. Have you ever smoked cigarettes?
   A. never smoked
   B. smoked, but less than 100 cigarettes in my life
   C. smoked more than 100 cigarettes in my life, but quit no longer smoke
   D. smoked more than 100 cigarettes in my life and still smoke

69. Have you had sex (made love, etc.)?
   A. yes
   B. no

70. Have you ever been pregnant or made someone pregnant?
   A. yes
   B. no
   C. not sure

71. How do you spend most of your free time?
   A. alone, happily
   B. alone, unhappily
   C. with others, happily
   D. with others, unhappily

72. Do you think about dropping out of school?
   A. no
   B. sometimes
   C. often

73. Have you ever tried to kill yourself?
   A. yes
   B. no

74. Have you ever done things you could get into serious trouble for
   (like stealing, or hurting someone badly in a fight)?
   A. yes
   B. no

77. Do you have any physical health problems that make it hard for you to do
   things your friends do (such as poor eyesight, asthma, etc.)?
   A. yes
   B. no
Appendix-B

Summary of the Three Problem Behavior Factors:
General Factor, Male Factor and Female Factor

**General Problem Behavior Factor:** (12 items)
- #10 School Attendance
- #44 Drink Beer?
- #45 Drink Wine?
- #46 Drink Wine Coolers?
- #69 Sexually Active?
- #70 Pregnant or made someone pregnant?
- #71 How do you spend your free time?
- #72 Consider dropping out?
- #74 Have been in serious trouble?
- #77 Have physical health problems

**Male Factor:** (8 items)
- #10 School Attendance
- #44 Drink Beer?
- #69 Sexually Active
- #70 Pregnant or made someone pregnant
- #71 How do you spend your free time?
- #72 Consider dropping out?
- #74 Have been in serious trouble?
- #77 Have physical health problems

**Female Factor:** (5 items)
- #45 Drink Wine?
- #46 Drink Wine Coolers?
- #72 Think about dropping out of school
- #73 Tried to take own life
- #54 Cigarette smoking
Appendix C:

Hope Youth Survey: Complete Questionnaire
HOPE YOUTH SURVEY

CIRCLE THE LETTER THAT GOES WITH YOUR ANSWERS. CHOOSE ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION.

BE CAREFUL NOT TO SKIP QUESTIONS BY MISTAKE.

1. In what city do you go to school?
   [A] Central Falls
   [B] Providence
   [C] other ____________

2. What grade are you in now?
   [A] 7th grade
   [B] 8th grade
   [C] 9th grade
   [D] other: ____________

3. Your age is:
   [A] 11
   [B] 12
   [C] 13
   [D] 14
   [E] 15
   [F] 16
   [G] 17
   [H] 18

4. Are you: [A] male (boy)
   [B] female (girl)

5. Are you learning English as a second language?
   [A] yes
   [B] no

6. What grades do you get most of the time in subjects like English, math, history, etc. . . . ?
   [A] mostly A's
   [B] mostly B's
   [C] mostly C's
   [D] mostly D's
   [E] mostly E's or F's
   [F] I am not Hispanic

7. During the last month, how many days of school have you missed?
   [A] not in school during the last month
   [B] none
   [C] 1-2 days
   [D] 3-5 days
   [E] 6-10 days
   [F] 11-15 days
   [G] more than 15 days

8. What is your ethnic group?
   Hispanic/Latino (Please specify):
   [A] Colombian
   [B] Puerto Rican
   [C] Dominican
   [D] Guatemalan
   [E] Other Hispanic ____________
   [F] White (not Hispanic)
   [G] African-American (not Hispanic)
   [H] Other: ____________

9. How long have you been in the United States (since your most recent arrival)?
   [A] less than 6 months
   [B] between 6 months and 1 year
   [C] between 1 and 2 years
   [D] between 2 and 5 years
   [E] more than 5 years
   [F] I was born here

10. How long have you been in Rhode Island?
    [A] less than 6 months
    [B] between 6 months and 1 year
    [C] between 1 and 2 years
    [D] between 2 and 5 years
    [E] more than 5 years
    [F] I was born here

THE NEXT 17 QUESTIONS ASK HOW MUCH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT YOURSELF

11. I have a hard time making decisions about my life.
    [A] strongly agree
    [B] agree
    [C] neither agree nor disagree
    [D] disagree
    [E] strongly disagree

12. I am proud to be Hispanic/Latino.
    [A] strongly agree
    [B] agree
    [C] neither agree nor disagree
    [D] disagree
    [E] strongly disagree
    [F] I am not Hispanic
13. I have difficulty deciding what to do in the future.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

14. I have a good relationship with my family.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

15. I have a hard time knowing what to do when I have a problem.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

16. Members of my family like to spend free time with each other.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

17. Being Hispanic gives my life meaning.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

18. Members of my family feel very close to each other.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

19. When I think about who I am, being Hispanic/Latino is very important to me.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

20. When I listen to music, I usually listen to Hispanic/Latino music.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

21. Family togetherness is very important to me.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

22. I prefer most of my friends to be Hispanic/Latino.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

23. I feel comfortable talking to my family about my problems.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

24. I respect my family's Hispanic traditions.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

   [F] I am not Hispanic
25. My cultural background is very important to me.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

26. My teachers care about me.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

27. My school is giving me a good education.
   [A] strongly agree
   [B] agree
   [C] neither agree nor disagree
   [D] disagree
   [E] strongly disagree

28. When I am with my friends, I prefer to speak:
   [A] Spanish
   [B] English
   [C] Both
   [D] Other

29. Do you think you will be able to graduate from high school
   [A] not at all likely
   [B] a little likely
   [C] very likely
   [D] I don't know

30. Do you think you will be able to get a full-time job if you look for one after leaving high school
   [A] not at all likely
   [B] a little likely
   [C] very likely
   [D] I don't know

31. Do you think you will be able to go on to college or to a vocational program after high school
   [A] not at all likely
   [B] a little likely
   [C] very likely
   [D] I don't know

32. Do you think you will be able to eventually get a job you are happy with
   [A] not at all likely
   [B] a little likely
   [C] very likely
   [D] I don't know

33. Do you think you will be able to eventually get a job that pays very well
   [A] not at all likely
   [B] a little likely
   [C] very likely
   [D] I don't know

34. How much would you like to graduate from high school
   [A] not at all
   [B] a little
   [C] a lot
   [D] I don't know

35. How much would you like to get a full-time job if you look for one after leaving high school
   [A] not at all
   [B] a little
   [C] a lot
   [D] I don't know

36. How much would you like to go on to college or to a vocational program after high school
   [A] not at all
   [B] a little
   [C] a lot
   [D] I don't know
37. How much would you like to eventually get a job you are happy with?
   [A] not at all  
   [B] a little  
   [C] a lot  
   [D] I don’t know

38. How much would you like to eventually get a job that pays very well?
   [A] not at all  
   [B] a little  
   [C] a lot  
   [D] I don’t know

39. Do you believe that being Hispanic/Latino makes it harder or easier to accomplish your educational and career goals?
   [A] much harder  
   [B] a little harder  
   [C] no difference  
   [D] a little easier  
   [E] much easier

40. During the last month, did you drink beer?
   [A] yes  
   [B] no  
   [C] don’t drink

41. During the last month, did you drink wine?
   [A] yes  
   [B] no  
   [C] don’t drink

42. During the last month, did you drink wine coolers?
   [A] yes  
   [B] no  
   [C] don’t drink

43. During the last month, did you drink hard liquor/mixed drinks (rum, whiskey, aguardiente, etc.)?
   [A] yes  
   [B] no  
   [C] don’t drink

44. On how many days during the last two weeks did you have an alcoholic beverage?
   [A] I don’t drink  
   [B] I didn’t drink in the last 2 weeks  
   [C] 1 to 2 days  
   [D] 3 to 7 days  
   [E] 8 to 13 days  
   [F] every day

45. How much do you usually have each day that you drink?
   [A] I don’t drink  
   [B] 1 or 2 drinks each day  
   [C] 3 to 5 drinks each day  
   [D] 6 to 10 drinks each day  
   [E] 11 or more drinks each day

46. Do you think that your drinking causes any problems?
   [A] I don’t drink  
   [B] no  
   [C] yes  
   [D] I’m not sure

47. Did you get drunk during the last month?
   [A] no  
   [B] yes, 1 time  
   [C] yes, 2-4 times  
   [D] yes, 5 or more times

48. If you use marijuana (grass, pot), on how many days did you use it during the past month?
   [A] I have never used it  
   [B] I haven’t used it in the last month  
   [C] 1 to 2 days  
   [D] 3 to 15 days  
   [E] 16 to 29 days  
   [F] every day

49. If you have used cocaine or crack, on how many days did you use it during the last month?
   [A] I have never used it  
   [B] I haven’t used it in the last month  
   [C] 1 to 2 days  
   [D] 3 to 15 days  
   [E] 16 to 29 days  
   [F] every day

50. Have you ever smoked cigarettes?
   [A] never smoked  
   [B] smoked, but less than 100 cigarettes in my life  
   [C] smoked more than 100 cigarettes in my life, but quit and no longer smoke  
   [D] smoked more than 100 cigarettes in my life and still smoke
51. Do you think your drug use causes any problems?
[A] yes  [B] no  [C] not sure  [D] don’t use drugs

52. Do you ever use alcoholic drinks with other drugs?
[A] no, never  [B] yes, seldom  [C] yes, often

53. If you had problems related to alcohol or drugs, to whom would you go for help? (Check only one)
[A] I’d solve the problem myself  [B] parent(s)  [C] friend, brother, or sister  [D] Student Relations Specialist  [E] alcohol/drug counselor not in school  [F] guidance counselor, teacher or school nurse  [G] other

54. If you had problems related to alcohol or drugs, how important would it be to talk to someone who belongs to the same culture?
(A) not important  (B) a little important  (C) very important

55. If your parents drink or use drugs, does your parents’ drinking or drug use cause difficulties?
[A] no, they don’t drink or use drugs  [B] no, neither parent’s drinking or drug use causes difficulties  [C] yes, one parent’s use causes difficulties  [D] yes, both parents’ use causes difficulties  [E] I’m not sure

56. Do you have friends or relatives whom you can turn to, if something is troubling you?
[A] no, never  [B] yes, sometimes  [C] yes, usually

57. How would your close friends feel about you smoking marijuana regularly?
[A] approve  [B] disapprove  [C] wouldn’t care  [D] don’t know

58. How would your close friends feel about you trying cocaine or crack occasionally?
[A] approve  [B] disapprove  [C] wouldn’t care  [D] don’t know

59. How would your close friends feel about you having four or five drinks once or twice each weekend?
[A] approve  [B] disapprove  [C] wouldn’t care  [D] don’t know

60. How would your close friends feel about you driving after having 5 or more drinks?
[A] approve  [B] disapprove  [C] wouldn’t care  [D] don’t know

61. How much do you think people harm themselves (physically or in other ways) by smoking marijuana regularly?
62. How much do you think people harm themselves (physically or in other ways) by trying cocaine or crack once or twice
[A] no risk
[B] some risk
[C] great risk
[D] can't say

63. How much do you think people harm themselves (physically or in other ways) by having four or five drinks once or twice each weekend
[A] no risk
[B] some risk
[C] great risk
[D] can't say

64. How much do you think people harm themselves (physically or in other ways) by driving after having 5 or more drinks
[A] no risk
[B] some risk
[C] great risk
[D] can't say

65. Have you had sex (made love, etc.)?
[A] yes  [B] no

66. Have you ever been pregnant or made someone pregnant?
[A] yes  [B] no  [C] not sure

67. How do you spend most of your free time?
[A] alone, happily
[B] alone, unhappily
[C] with others, happily
[D] with others, unhappily

68. Do you think about dropping out of school?
[A] no
[B] sometimes
[C] often

69. Have you ever tried to kill yourself?
[A] yes  [B] no

70. Have you ever done things you could get into serious trouble for (like stealing, or hurting someone badly in a fight)?
[A] yes  [B] no

71. Have you ever felt you had a serious psychological/mental or emotional problem (one that made it hard for you to be happy or get along with others)?
[A] yes  [B] no

72. Is it hard for your family to obtain enough money for basic necessities of life (food, clothing, housing)?
[A] yes  [B] no

73. Do you have any physical health problems that make it hard for you to do things your friends do (such as a poor eyesight, asthma, etc.)?
[A] yes  [B] no

74. Is there usually an adult at home when you get home from school?
[A] yes  [B] no

75. For the past month, have you had a home to go to each day (have you been homeless in the past month)?
[A] yes  [B] no

76. How often do you attend church, religious meetings and activities?
[A] almost every day
[B] at least 1-2 times a week
[C] at least 1-2 times a month
[D] a few times a year
[E] never

77. How important is religion in your life?
[A] not important
[B] a little important
[C] very important
78. In the last three months, have you attended any of the following activities outside of school? (circle all that apply)

[A] sports programs  
[B] job-training classes  
[C] clubs or projects  
[D] paid work  
[E] volunteer work  
[F] other  
[G] none of the above

79. How many times per week do you go to HOPE after-school activities (such as those at Proyecto Esperanza, Progreso Latino, etc.)?

[A] I have never gone to one.  
[B] I have gone once or twice  
[C] Once a week  
[D] Twice a week

80. How often have you gone to see the Hispanic counselor (Luis or Henri) in your school?

[A] I have never gone.  
[B] 1 time  
[C] 2-5 times  
[D] 5-10 times  
[E] more than 10 times

81. How often have you attended the HOPE in-school workshops run by Michelle and Ana?

[A] I have never gone to one.  
[B] 1-2 times  
[C] 3-4 times  
[D] 5-6 times  
[E] 7-8 times  
[F] I finished all nine workshops.

82. How many HOPE Program activities have you participated in (after-school tutoring, summer tutoring, etc.)?

[A] I have never gone to one.  
[B] one  
[C] two  
[D] more than two

83. How often do you participate in the weekend activities of the HOPE program (camping, weekend trips, etc.)?

[A] never  
[B] less than once a month  
[C] once a month or more often  
[D] every weekend  
[E] there are no weekend activities in this program.

84. I would tell others to come to the HOPE program

[A] strongly agree  
[B] agree  
[C] neither agree nor disagree  
[D] disagree  
[E] strongly disagree

85. The HOPE program is very important to me

[A] strongly agree  
[B] agree  
[C] neither agree nor disagree  
[D] disagree  
[E] strongly disagree

86. Did you take this survey last year?

[A] yes  
[B] no

Thank you for your help.
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