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Abstract

This study examined the role of religious socialization in Asian American families between parental characteristics and children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. Parental variables included parental involvement with school, parental involvement with child, parental expectation, and parental education level. Data in this study was drawn from ECLS-K fifth grade Longitudinal Study. A theoretical model was generated and the fit of the model was tested for the full sample first, using path analysis.

The hypothesized model was found not to fit the full sample ($N=21,357$). However, the hypothesized model was found to fit the Asian American sample ($n=520$). The revised model for the full group was generated. The findings indicated that for the full sample, limited role of religious socialization was found. However, in the Asian American sample, religious socialization was found to mediate the parental variables to children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. Conceptual and methodological limitations were discussed. Implications and directions for future research were also suggested.

Keywords: religious socialization, Asian American family, academic competence, social competence.
Chapter I
Introduction

In this chapter, the background of this study on the role of religious socialization in Asian American families will be explored, as well as some of the rationale for the study, some definitions of important terms, and several research questions. A theoretical model to address the statement of the problem will be included. In particular, this study focuses on the role of religious socialization between parental characteristics and their children’s self-perceived academic and social performance. Approaches and studies in the literature regarding parental factors, children’s outcome variables, and religious socialization will be incorporated in Chapter Two in order to provide a theoretical underpinning for the present study.

Background of the study

Researchers have long endeavored to identify what causes underlying academic performance disparities in diverse ethnic subgroups, such as African Americans and Whites (e.g. Ogbu, 2002, Chatterji, 2006). Also, evidence has shown that children of Asian immigrants outperform not only children of other race/ethnic minorities, but even White counterparts, regardless of kinds of tests or measures, including test scores and GPAs (Kao
Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, to raise student achievement levels nationally, extensive efforts have been made to search for the particular factors which might affect achievement differences in diverse children (Chatterji, 2006). So far, researchers have acknowledged that there are individual, familial, peer-group, and ecological characteristics that all impact how well children perform academically and socially (Regnerus, 2000). Among the possible significant factors, parental influences are now considered to be the most pivotal for the development of children’s values, attitudes, and motivations toward educational and social achievement (Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988). As a result, the vast majority of research examined which family background factors, such as socioeconomic status, parental education level, and parental involvement, link with children’s positive functioning (Chao, 2001; Fuligni, 1997; Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, & Sameroff, 1999).

Interestingly, beyond parental participation in children’s academic attainment, religious influences typically have not been studied as factors that significantly contribute to models evaluating children’s educational and social functioning. Erikson (1992), in his review, stated that religion has a profound effect on children in various ways, including
through child-rearing practices, social experiences, and learning activities. In particular, many studies identified religion’s beneficial contribution to the development of minority youths (Bankston & Zhou, 1995; McBride, Mutch, & Chitwood, 1996; Fegley, Seaton, & Gaskins, 2002)

However, previous research on the connection between religion and the child’s educational attainment and social functioning, if any, has concentrated predominantly on how diverse religious principles and prohibitions are involved with specific kinds of education, and how this affects both the educational expectations and outcomes of children (Lenski, 1961; Darnell & Sherkat, 1997; Regnerus, 2000). Researchers have made efforts to identify and develop a clearer concept of the role of religious aspects in relation with family background factors and its effects on children’s academic and social achievement, However, few have been able to explain the processes and relations underlying these significant factors which might contribute to children’s positive educational and social functioning.

More importantly, little research exists on Asian American families, particularly, what factors including family background features and religious factors might contribute to the children’s academic and social functioning. This is unfortunate, considering the fact that Asian Americans are among the fastest growing of all major racial or ethnic groups in the
United States. Recent census data reveal that in 2003, 35% of immigrants to the United States were from Asian countries (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2004) and the population is anticipated to comprise over 10% of the population by the year 2050 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004).

It is hoped that the present study can fill the void in research and that the possible relations of key factors such as family background characteristics can be further explored in their effects of religious socialization on children’s academic and social functioning. This study has, in fact, examined whether there are differences in the effects of religious factors between general American families and Asian American families by testing a theoretical model.

*Factors in the family that might influence children’s educational and social performance*

Particularly, since success in the school milieu is valued by society and is seen as a principal determinant of adult success and independence, comprehending how parents socialize their children in the school setting promotes professional attention and research. In the literature, nevertheless, only limited attention has been given to academic socialization as a recognized construct, and, if any, the research has encompassed how
certain parenting behaviors encourage favorable school experiences for children and how other styles of parenting hamper the academic success of the children. Taylor, Clayton, and Rowley (2004) explained that academic socialization includes the assortment of parental beliefs and behaviors that contribute to children’s school-associated development.

Currently, a variety of interfamilial and extrafamilial influences is known to function in molding children’s development. Bronfenbrenner’s (1986, 1989) ecological model of development represents the interplay of these influences, stressing the significance of the relationships among settings, rather than a specific person or single setting. The significance of the dynamic interconnection of systems in shaping child development is likewise emphasized within the contextual systems model (Pianta & Walsh, 1996), which focuses on children’s academic functioning. According to this model, the child-family and school system act simultaneously to produce children’s academic outcomes and overall school experiences. Understanding and augmenting relationships inside and between systems fosters children’s school success.

**Parental background factors**

Much of the classic research focuses on links between “who parents are” and a variety of child outcomes (Taylor, Clayton, & Rowley, 2004). Among parental categorical
background factors are parental expectation and education.

*parental expectation.* Some researchers examined various components of parental involvement and found that parental expectations for their children’s educational attainment have the strongest relation to academic achievement compared to other types of parental involvement, such as parent-child communication and parent participation in school activities (Fan & Chen, 2001). Also, Halle, Kurtz-Costes, & Mahoney (1997) found in a sample of third and fourth graders that parental expectations predicted children’s achievement after controlling for earlier achievement.

Goldenberg, Gallimore, Reese, & Garnier (2001), on the other hand, found in a longitudinal study of kindergarten through sixth-grade children that children’s achievement was predicted by parental expectations, but that parental expectations had no significant effects on children’s achievement over time. Parental expectations appear to be different from other definitions of parental involvement in that parental expectations are beliefs, whereas other measures of parental involvement focus on actual behaviors, such as attending parent-teacher conferences or helping with homework. It is possible that parents’ beliefs influence their behaviors, but it is important to distinguish between these two types of constructs when considering their influences on academic achievement.
**parental education.** Regarding the educational level of the parents, however, Wilson and Sherkat (1994) caution that offspring from highly educated parents are less likely to resemble their parents. On the other hand, offspring from households with low education may possibly be more similar to their parents. One can speculate that well-educated parents may urge their offspring to be more autonomous and independent and may consider conformity not to be as important as individual development.

Evidence also suggests that parental education has been positively linked to social competence and negatively related to emotional and behavioral problems in young children (Ackerman, Kogos, Youngstrom, Schoff, & Izard, 1999). The study implies that poorly educated parents are more likely to be socially isolated, be less involved in the school system, and create fewer social opportunities for their children outside of the school environment. Another study indicates that low parental education can raise children’s contact to environmental stressors such as family disruptions, family and neighborhood poverty, and other unfavorable social circumstances (Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994).

**parental involvement.** Pertaining to parental involvement, another approach to research focuses on “what parents do” for their children. Such involvement in a child’s education is one of the principal mechanisms through which children are socialized for
academic success (Taylor, Clayton, & Rowley, 2004). The focus on parental involvement has its roots in research demonstrating a positive association between parental involvement and academic achievement. Parental involvement has been found to be an important predictor of children’s achievement in school. Parental involvement, both at home and at school, is moderately, but significantly related to children’s academic achievement (Izzo, Weissberg, Kasprow, & Fendrich, 1999; Miedel & Reynolds, 1999). Even though some researchers have found a relation between parental involvement and achievement, other researchers have reported mixed results (Deslandes, Royer, Turcotte, & Bertrand, 1997), even including negative relations between these two variables (Deslandes et al., 1997).

These discrepant results probably reflect, at least in part, varying definitions of parental involvement. Operational definitions of parental involvement used in research include communication between parents and teachers (Deslandes et al., 1997); parents’ communication with their children regarding school issues (Keith, Reimers, Fehrmann, Pottebaum, & Aubey, 1986); number of hours parents volunteer in their children’s schools; parental involvement in school activities, such as conferences (Okpala, Okpala, & Smith, 2001).

Both Izzo et al. (1999) and Sui-Chu and Willms (1996) found that parental
involvement at home, rather than at school, was associated with higher levels of academic achievement. Shumow and Miller (2001) found the opposite, however; parental involvement at home was negatively related to achievement, whereas parental involvement at school was positively related to achievement.

A great deal of attention has been focused on identifying predictors and correlates of parental involvement because there has been a consistent link between parental involvement and more positive school experiences and better academic outcomes for children (Christenson, Hurley, Sheridan, & Fenstermacher, 1997; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1997). Moreover, finding ways to promote parents’ involvement in the early educational experiences of their children may enhance parents’ perceptions of their own self-efficacy (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Patorelli, 1996). This may in return facilitate the establishment of relationships among parents, teachers, and schools and thus promote children’s long-term academic success. Results from several intervention programs suggest that increased levels of parental involvement in school are associated with children’s academic readiness and early academic achievement (Epstein & Dauber, 1991; Lopez & Cole, 1999). In a study about the role of parenting in the school success of Asian-American children, Chao (2000) found that the immigrant Chinese-American parents were
likely to show a higher structural involvement in school, whereas the Euro-American parents tended to demonstrate a higher managerial parental involvement in school.

Religious or cultural factors

According to Pedersen (1990), “culture” includes “ethnographic variables such as ethnicity, nationality, religion, and languages, as well as demographic variables such as age, gender, and place of residence, status variables such as social, economic, and educational factors, and affiliations” (p. 93). In almost every culture, beliefs and practices of a religious nature are prominent in providing support and guidance that can assist in the maintenance and enrichment of the overall functioning of an individual, as in the areas of educational achievement and social competence.

In large part, specific religious beliefs are preserved through cultural transmission, since they have continuum only through being passed on to future generations, the individual members of which must, in turn, embrace those transmitted beliefs and practices as their own. This process is called internalization. According to Ryan, Rigby, and King (1993), internalization refers to ‘the process through which an individual transforms a formerly externally prescribed regulation or value into an internal one’ (p.586). Internalization is most evident in the case of religious beliefs and practices. However,
religious beliefs can be rigidly and unreflectively adopted or they can, in contrast, be flexible, leaving one open to the consideration and assimilation of new ideas.

Research on transmission of values would naturally begin with an exact conception of what is being transmitted, which would range from religious values to common orientations about life. In the family, through a process of socialization, parents pass these down to their offspring. In order to illuminate this process that occurs in a familial context, Taylor, Clayton, and Rowley (2004) present a definition: socialization is the process by which parents shape a child’s behaviors, attitudes, and social skills so that the child will be able to function as a member of society. According to this definition, the socialization of children into a system of values and beliefs about self and society is primarily molded by parents. In association with value transmission, Glass, Bengtson and Dunham (1986) have concluded that the socialization acquired from the parents also encompasses “successful intergenerational transmission of class, race, religious affiliation, marital status, and other prominent social statuses that structure life experience and mold social attitudes.” These studies insinuate that these socialization processes affect a child’s formation of a world view, but more importantly, also funnel the child into broader communities which also help preserve the child’s religious beliefs and practices.
value transmission through socialization process. In regard to value socialization in the family, Whitbeck & Gecas (1988) found four factors or conditions to be particularly important to consider in assessing the transmission of values between parents and children: (a) the nature and kinds of values under consideration; (b) the perceptions and attributions formed by children regarding values of their parents; (c) the children’s age; and (d) the quality of interactions between parent and child. Value socialization in the bounds of parent-child relations may vary depending on these key components. For example, Furstenberg (1974) noticed that the perception of the parents’ values by the child is a significant factor in the transmission of values. He detailed that the more clearly children comprehended educational goals, the more probability there would be for the children to share them with their parents.

Another important point to take into account in value socialization would be the child’s age, because age is associated with cognitive development. During the formation of values, cognitive development operates both to set lower limits for expected internalization to occur and to discern which types of values can best be socialized at different development stages. Values also become more stable in the system of beliefs while the children mature. Furthermore, socialization outcomes depend on the quality of relations
between the parent and child, in other words, on what takes place between parent and child. To the degree that the child identifies with the parent, the chance of internalizing the parent’s values would be increased for the child (Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988).

*religious socialization.* Religious socialization entails the process by which a person learns and internalizes behaviors, attitudes, and values within the framework of a religious system of beliefs and practices (Brown & Gary, 1991). Regnerus (2000) also defines that religious socialization is a process that often operates apart from particular belief systems and organizational affiliations, and constitutes a form of social assimilation that has the effect of reinforcing values particularly beneficial to educational achievement and goal-setting. In order to illuminate his definition, he tested a multilevel model of involvement in church activities as providing integration and motivation toward schooling success among U.S. public high school sophomores in urban areas. He found out that respondents’ participation in church activities is related to heightened educational expectations, and that these more eagerly religious students score higher on standardized math and reading tests.

In this religious socialization process, research has focused on three agents: the family (Greeley & Rossi, 1966), the church, and peers (Cornwall, 1988). They found that
the family, more particularly, parents are the primary agents of religious socialization or transmission, while peers and the religious associations are secondary institutions.

According to Hart’s study (1990) on the impact of religious socialization in the family, compared with other contexts in which socialization occurs, the home context was the most influential milieu that contributed to the teenager’s religious socialization among the other contexts including the peer group, school, religious organization such as church, and mass media. In the study by Hunsberger and Brown (1984) which elucidated the effects of various sources of religious influence during childhood, participants in the study reported that their “home experience” has the strongest influence on their religious development. This study addressed the significance of the home environment, especially parental, more particularly, maternal influence, in affecting the later religious orientation (whether constructively or destructively), at least when their children become college students.

Little work has been done that considers whether or how different family factors that may influence religious socialization for white Christians will also be an important influence for nonwhite Christians and members of non-Christian religions. For instance, Asian-American religions include Christianity (both Protestantism and Catholicism), as well as an assortment of other

*religious socialization in the Asian American families.*
religions, including Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, and Smith, 2003; Lien and Carnes, 2004).

Similar to non-Asian families, Asian parents are often the first source of religious influence. However, in a study on religious transmission in Asian families, Park and Ecklund (2007) found that Asian parents not only provided the means by which children received religious training by transporting them to a religious center in the neighborhood, they also provided a representational resource for religious commitment by their roles as leaders in religious communities. Acting as models of religious practice, parents became religious teachers and moral instructors to their Asian American children. According to the study, despite differences in the content, beliefs and practices across religions, the participants, regardless of religion, usually described their experiences with their parents in a similar manner.

In an analysis of Chinese American educational process, Wang (2001) discussed the influence of Confucianism on the Chinese and the development of Chinese-American students’ cultural identities and academic achievement. Through the moral principles of conduct defined by Confucian teachings, the Chinese American tends to put more emphasis on the importance of educational achievement and hierarchically structured social relations.
In addition, Park and Kim (2006) explored the factors that influence academic achievement of Korean children and adolescents. They stated that in spite of recent structural change in Korean families, under the influence of Confucianism, the basic cultural elements of parental socialization that emphasize sacrifice, devotion and educational aspirations remain strong. Kim (2008) also supported that certain traditional values such as filial piety, family cohesion, and emphasis on education are still retained and reasserted by a considerable number of second-generation Korean Americans.

**Purpose of the study**

Given that religious activities in the family play a role in transmitting essential values or attitudes toward learning and social performance, limited research has been reported on the clear role of the religious socialization process by parents between parental background factors and their children’s overall functioning. In addition, despite the increase in diversity of families with multiple ethnic backgrounds in the U.S., little research has been performed concerning non-white families’ religious socialization process and its connection with parental characteristics and children’s academic and social success.

Specifically, Asian families are likely to value educational success based on their Confucian teachings. Kim (2008) addressed the issue, in her study of second-generation
Korean American families that certain traditional Korean family traits based on Confucian principles, such as filial piety, family cohesion, and stress on education, are preserved and upheld by a considerable number of young Korean Americans. Thus, Asian parents who advocate Confucian principles may converse about the importance of academic achievement with their children more often than those who believe in a religion that focuses less on academic success.

Considering that the religious and cultural factors might influence children’s performance, this current study focuses on the role of parents’ religious socialization in its effect on children’s academic and social competence. There has been little research on how religious socialization is achieved and what factors are operating, and the impact of socialization on children’s overall functioning, including academic and social functioning. Direct connections between certain familial factors and religious transmission or between religious socialization and children’s functioning have been explored. Evidently, however, the mediating effect of religious socialization has not been clarified between familial factors and children’s functioning. The direction of these influences has not been identified. In other words, in which way does religious socialization contribute to the relationship between particular parental characteristics and their offspring’s functioning.
This study investigates the relationship between the way in which religion manifests itself in shared activities of children and parents (For example, do parents talk with their children about matters of faith, religion, or worldview?) and in parental characteristics. In addition, differing from the existing research on the role of religious socialization, this study also allows for further knowledge about the Asian American family’s unique experience in transmitting their values. Given the growing presence of Asian Americans in the United States, it will be a valuable step toward understanding how religious socialization among Asian Americans resembles or differs from that among European American counterparts.

Research Questions

Based on the preceding information, the specific questions this study addressed are:

1. Does the religious socialization by American parents mediate the effects of parental characteristics on their children’s perceived academic and social competence?

2. Does the religious socialization by Asian-American parents mediate the effects of parental characteristics on their children’s perceived academic and social competence?

3. Is the relationship in Asian-American families’ greater for religious socialization
than in American families?

**Proposed model for this study**

The research and ideas discussed above imply that the family is generally considered a critical context for the development of children’s values. In intergenerational value transmission, values that are crucial to the parents, such as religious values, entailing the development of a purpose of life, a worldview, a sense of well-being, are more likely to be transferred by them to their offspring. These handed-down values influence on children’s internal and external behavior such as self-perception about their performance.

Literature suggests that these parental characteristics such as parental involvement, parental education and parental expectation have primary and secondary influences on religious socialization that occurred with the parents. Also, their children’s academic and social competence were directly and indirectly associated with religious socialization. However, findings complicate the interactive roles of religious socialization between the parental features and their children’s perceived educational and social performance and are seen to have been controversial. In addition, common arguments concerning religious transmission typically adopt white Protestant or Catholic experiences as reported in surveys.

Little research specifically examines the ways in which parental characteristics and
children’s self-reported functioning connect within the religious socialization context, especially for Asian American families in spite of its rapidly growing population in the United States. Based upon the preceding studies, the theoretical model was proposed as follows.

Figure 1. The hypothetical model showing relations among parental attributes, children’s self-perceived academic and social competence, and religious socialization by parents.
Chapter II
Review of the Literature

In this chapter, the literature including empirical research on how the religious socialization process is operating in familial contexts and its role in transmitting religious or cultural values that are upheld by parents will be reviewed. Theories of religious socialization and previous studies which were used for the theoretical framework for this study were examined. Specifically, the religious and cultural socialization process in Asian families and its impacts on children’s academic and social competence will be discussed.

Approaches of religious socialization

Religiosity can imply the degree to which one is religious (Garland, 1999). Cornwall (1988) explained that religiosity is a behavior that an individual learns from persons around him or her, including multiple dimensions such as beliefs and practices. Myers (1996) asserted that religiosity is inherited, like class. According to him, transmission of religiosity may also rely upon the accumulation of religious assets throughout childhood, by upholding family values, household participation (Iannaccone, 1990), and parent-child relations. This accumulation may be expedited in more devout, secure, and harmonious home settings in which parents spend more time socializing their
children. However, there is no single socialization theory. Diverse theoretical traditions in the social sciences have inspired the study of socialization processes, including psychoanalytic, social learning, cognitive-developmental, and deprivation theories. All of these have contributed to the understanding of socialization, although social learning theory has distinct pertinence to the speculation of the religious socialization process.

**social learning theory.** Religiosity addresses what extent religion plays in a person’s life. Social learning theory can be used to explain the formation of beliefs and practices, which characterize attitudes and behaviors. Social learning theory maintains that much of a child’s learning is formed by daily, moment by moment observation of attitudes and behavior carried out by significant others who function as role models. Cornwall (1988) described, in his framework concerning intergenerational learning, that, for an individual, religiosity is a learned behavior from other individuals surrounding him or her. In this context, children’s religious beliefs and practices are acquired at home and are expected to remain in continuum between parents and children.

Bandura and his colleagues (Bandura & Kupers, 1964; Bandura & McDonald, 1963) found that parental models are fundamental to the formation and development of children’s personalities. Children’s everyday association and interaction with parents
continually provides their children with opportunities for observing and imitating their parents in numerous day-to-day settings. This observational learning may result in the children sharing the values, attitudes, and behaviors of their parents. According to Grusec and Kuczynski (1997), parents are the key influence on children’s acquisition of values due to their distinctive place in their children’s lives. Childrearing places parents in the most powerful position to build constructive relationships with their offspring and to monitor and understand their children.

Social learning theory contends that the effectiveness of imitation and modeling processes varies depending on factors such as the characteristics of role models (Bandura, 1977). Learning theorists stress the value of parental warmth and acceptance in facilitating children’s imitative and modeling learning when parents’ beliefs and behavior are connected to affectionate, rewarding, and warm parenting practices, and gradually the parents’ behavioral characteristics assume a beneficial value for the child (Bandura, 1969). As a result, the child is motivated to learn and to reproduce these characteristics in his or her own behavior. To be specific, children who have positive interactions with the parental role model are likely to exhibit more imitative behavior than are children with whom the interaction with the adult model is less supportive (Bao, Whitbeck, Hoyt, & Conger, 1999).
Kochanska and Thompson (1997) proposed that responsive and sensitive parenting improves the chances for observational learning and for transmitting norms and expectations. Thus, a warm and supportive attachment between parents and children can lead children to both listen and respond to their parents (Smetana, 1997), pleasing them, rather than antagonizing them (Grusec, 1997).

Studying cultural transmission in Asian Indian families, Inman, Howard, Beaumont and Walker (2007) found that the parents utilize modeling as a strategy when transmitting ethnic identity to the children. In particular, the parents reported that they transmit their cultural values by modeling, upholding religious practices, and passing on cultural knowledge. In practice of modeling strategies, the parents showed the importance of family by displaying respect for the grandparents and by reporting that “children live what they see”. Also, to demonstrate the importance of religion and spirituality in daily life, mothers reported that they accompany their children to the temple, teach *stotras* (e.g., prayers and hymns), observe certain religious holidays, and participate in religious discussions with their children.

Based on social learning theory, the transmission model was suggested to explain religious socialization process. This model put a particular emphasis on what religious
behaviors are internalized and how children perceive that they are socialized to internalize their parents’ values and beliefs.

*Self-determination theory.* The transformation model of religious socialization was developed upon self-determination theory which highlights why religious behaviors are manifested. This model integrates the “how”, “what”, and “why” the behaviors are internalized. Deci and Ryan (1985, 1991) argued that the process of internalization reflects an individual’s intrinsic tendency to adapt and integrate external regulations into more self-determined ones and to withdraw from heteronomy toward autonomy.

According to this model, the more fully internalized a regulation, the more one experiences behavior as unforced or self-determined. An external belief that has been assimilated to the self through the process of identification is therefore likely to be experienced as a personal value and as something one executes autonomously (Ryan, 1991). In other words, beliefs or regulations associated with identification are those that the individual perceives are personally chosen and valued (Ryan, Rigby, & King, 1993). In a study that further examined self-determination theory, Ryan and Connell (1989) found that more self-determined reasons for performing academic behavior predicted greater teacher-rated self-motivation on the part of the student, more constructive coping styles, better
sense of control over outcomes, and greater perceived competence in school.

*deprivation theory.* Other than social learning theory, another theory which tries to explain religious socialization process is deprivation theory. It argues that religion is a source of compensation for persons suffering from economic or social deprivation. The theory, often associated with the work of Glock and Stark (1966; Stark, 1972), suggests that religious commitment may compensate for other deprivations in life, and the impact of social class, education and occupation differs across religious groups (Cornwall, 1989).

**Empirical research about religious socialization**

Research had consistently shown that parental religiosity corresponds to their children’s religious beliefs and practices. The research has focused on the children in their adolescent period. For instance, religious socialization activities such as parental church attendance have a positive association with church attendance and religious beliefs by adolescents (Cox, 1967; Suziedelis & Potvin, 1981). In addition, parental religious practices are positively connected to every area of religious behavior in both early and late adolescence (Ozorak, 1989). Parker and Gaier (1980) stated that the parental involvement in religious activities explained more than 60% of the variance in the religious beliefs and practices for their children in high school. A study of agreement with religious values
between youth and parents reported that the religious values of youth’s were similar to those of their parents (Dudley & Dudley, 1986).

Among five factors which have been found to influence religious behavior (group involvement, belief-orthodoxy, religious commitment, religious socialization, and sociodemographic characteristics), according to Cornwall (1989), religious socialization factors influence behavior, but their effects are primarily indirect. Furthermore, for religious socialization, family context has been found to be most significant among U.S. and Dutch high school students (Myers, 1996; Hart, 1990). Milevsky, Szuchman, & Milevsky (2008) in their study on generational transmission of religious beliefs in a sample of college students, parents’ religious beliefs were significantly correlated to their children’s and the children who were the participants in the study were found to be fairly accurate reporters of their parents’ religious beliefs. Additionally, it was found that both explicit and implicit communication, and perception of parents’ beliefs predicted children’s beliefs.

Parental variables related religious socialization

Parents are regarded as the primary agents in the socialization of their children (Miller, 2005). The process by which parents form a child’s attitudes, behaviors, and social skills to enable the child to function within society is largely incorporated by the term,
socialization (Arnett, 1995). Further, scholars view the family as the central site of religious transmission (Acock and Bengtson, 1978; Thomas and Henry, 1985; Bao, Whitebeck, Hoyt, and Conger, 1999; Edgell, 2005).

Parents have both direct and indirect effects on the socialization of their offspring who may or may not be aware of their parents’ influence. Copious attempts were made to assess parental influences, such as conflicts in parents’ marriages or demographic characteristics by studying the intergenerational transmission of religiosity. For example, parental religiosity has a more powerful influence on children when there is less conflict in their parent’s marriage (Nelsen, 1981). Also, the experiences of family disruption in childhood impair the associations or bonds between the generations (Biblarz and Raftery, 1993) due to the existence of intergenerational stress and strain. In addition, it was found that parents’ immigration status is associated with the frequency of cultural socialization messages (Alba, 1990). The study revealed that recent immigrants are more likely to socialize their children regarding their ethnic origin, native language, and cultural traditions. However, parental socioeconomic status including income, education, and class was found to have no significant effects on the religiosity of their children (Myers, 1996).

*Parenting style.* Parenting style has been noted as one of the significant
factors of transmitting values in families. The important aspects of parenting style are found
to be parental support, control, and which of the two parents has the most influence on
value socialization. Even though both parents may hold the same religious preferences,
parents are not equally capable of transmitting values successfully (Wilson & Sherkat,
1994). Some researchers argue that mothers are more influential than fathers in transmitting
religious values to their offspring (Acock & Bengtson, 1978; Dudley & Dudley, 1986).
Others have reported that mothers are more likely to affect their children’s overall religious
orientation, and fathers are more likely to influence religious activities (Kieren & Munro,
1987; Clark, Worthington, & Danser, 1988). Little research has been done to investigate
what kinds of parental characteristics other than the factors above influence the formation
of children’s values, attitudes, and behavior. Among critical parental background variables
in the present study, parents’ education, involvement, and expectations were of major
interest.

parents’ education. Regarding the effects of parental education, research has
shown mixed results. Hammond & Hunter (1984) revealed that the level of parental
education is negatively associated with orthodoxy in children’s religious beliefs. Still other
research discovered that higher levels of parental education predict greater religious
participation among college students (Albrecht & Heaton, 1984). Myers (1996) found that parents’ education has both direct and interactive effects. Specifically, father’s education is positively related to offspring’s religiosity, while mother’s education is negatively associated. In other words, the effect of parental religiosity is enhanced by a higher level of father’s education and a lower level of mother’s education. However, a different study observed that parental education has no significant effect on the religiosity of offspring (Francis and Brown, 1991).

Religious socialization and children’s outcome

In the present study, the two variables, self-perceived academic and social success, were discussed in terms of the influences of religious socialization on children’s overall functioning.

Among the direct and indirect outcomes of religious socialization, educational attainment has gotten the most attention (Brown & Gary, 1991). Hansen and Ginsburg (1988) found that values, including religious values, have direct effects on school outcomes among high school students. Also, a more recent study supports the positive relation between religious socialization and academic success among urban U.S. public high school students (Regnerus, 2000). Brown and Gary (1991) reported, in their
study of African American participants, that as levels of religious socialization rise, there is a concurrent increase in educational achievement. They also found that the influence of religious socialization on educational attainment is greater than the effect of associating with any particular denomination or the impact of having a particular family structure during childhood.

Although there has been considerable research on the multitude of parental influences that shape the process of child development, less is known about the specific ways in which parents socialize their children in terms of school-related behaviors and outcomes. At any rate, the parents who consider themselves to be religious persons, or members of a church, appear not to be a sufficient influence. The success of religiously committed families in socializing their children is also affected by the impression of the children, for example, that religion is highly valued by their parents and that, accordingly, it takes a prominent place in the education of the children (Hart, 1990).

Holding the variables of age, sex, and social class constant makes it possible to test the hypothesis that religion is a significant factor in the social functioning of children. For example, it is possible that family religiousness is more generally linked to other group involvement (Putnam, 2000). Links have been found
between religion and prosocial behavior for adolescents. Adolescent’s social competence is associated with religious participation and a corresponding value orientation (Donahue & Benson, 1995; Regnerus, 2000). In the study of Donahue and Benson (1995), the adolescents were more prone to value helping others and volunteering than were less religious counterparts. For minority youths, religion was found to be positively associated with participation rates in abstinence programs. In addition, Hansen and Ginsburg (1988) found that values including religious values, have positive indirect effects on behavior outside of school among high school students.

Concerning the connections between family environment and children’s social functioning, the family plays prominent roles in socializing children prior to school entry in relation to their relationships with classmates, including the preservation of their friendships and support for contacts outside of school (Ackerman, Kogos, Youngstrom, Schoff, & Izard, 1999). Specifically, Bartkowski, Xu, and Levin (2008) found that familial religion is linked with children’s prosocial behavior, unless religion is used as a source of conflict among family members.

*Religious and cultural characteristics of Asian families in America*

America’s changing racial, ethnic, and religious demographics may challenge our
knowledge about the role of family as a means of passing on religious and spiritual identities and practices. The American racial and ethnic landscape has been broadened since the 1960s through immigration, which brought large numbers of immigrants from non-European parts of the world such as Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia. Accordingly, these new nonwhite immigrants are both increasing religious diversity and radically changing the ethnic and racial composition of the American religious spectrum (Warner & Wittner, 1998). This new immigration pattern also signals a change in American family demography. According to recent census reports, those under the age of 18 that are either foreign born or born to at least one nonnative parent now constitute almost 20 percent of all U.S. children (Fields, 2003).

Asian Americans are known to be a highly diverse group of people who come from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Southeast Asia, Asian India, and the Pacific Islands (Tan & Dong, 2000). More than 50 groups who speak any of more than 30 different languages are included among these people. Of the Asian American population, Chinese comprises 23%, Pilipino 19%, Japanese 12%, Asian Indian 11%, Korean 11%, and Vietnamese 9%. Also, many Asian Americans are reported to exhibit immigration challenges, oppression, war trauma, and refugee status (Lee, 1996). Consequentially,
traditional social values, acculturation, and religious beliefs and practices are tightly
interwoven in Asian Americans, making it hard to distinguish clearly between them (Tan &
Dong, 2000).

\textit{influence of Confucianism.} While stating that cultural factors are deeply
involved in an individual’s psychological functioning, Huaibin (2007) asserted that
Confucianism has been the backbone of Chinese culture and has enormously influenced
Chinese society. According to Confucian teachings, everyone has the potential to become as
virtuous as someone at the most advanced level of “stage” which is predominantly different
from adherence to Christianity by Western societies. Confucianism emphasizes self-
regulation and self-learning using introspection, self-examination, and meditation. Also,
Huaibin explained that Confucianism teaches an individual to fully consider the interests of
all the parties involved and come to a solution that is accepted by all, which could prevent
the individual from being more assertive and independent. On top of that, hierarchy and
status organize most social relationships among Asian Americans. Predetermined roles,
codes of behavior, and language usage indicate one’s status in the family or society. In
extra-familial relationships, the same hierarchical pattern remains (Frame, 2003). In
addition to the influence of Confucianism, many Eastern religions such as Buddhism,
Hinduism, Taoism, and shamanism treasure the virtues of silence, nonconfrontation, modesty, humility, simplicity, patience, and perseverance (Sodowsky, Kwan, & Pannu, 1995).

Collectivism. 

It is well known that collectivistic orientation is prominent in most of Asian cultures. Collectivist cultures are those cultures in which the goals of the in-group are more important than the goals of the individual. In these cultures, an individual defends hierarchical relationships and conformity to in-group norms. Individuals growing up in a collectivist culture are believed to build up a strong psychological sense of collectivism, which has been labeled interdependence (Hynie, Lalonde, & Lee, 2006). That is, while independent individuals aim for self-reliance and autonomy, interdependent selves have a tendency to find ways to fit in with significant others. In particular, maintaining the reputation and honor of the family is a core concern, as is obedience to parental expectations regardless of the age of the child. A specific way in which members of collectivistic cultures make evident their resilient interconnectedness with others is through coping. In their study about coping strategies in a collective culture, Yeh, Inman, Kim, and Okubo (2006) discussed two most frequently adopted coping strategies among Korean Americans: social support and avoidance. They argued that these coping styles may be used
to maintain interpersonal harmony by altering one’s responses to a problem rather than actively changing the setting. Also, Min (1991) stated that cultural homogeneity is one of the most indispensable factors behind Korean American parents’ enduring ethnic affiliation as compared with other Asian American ethnic groups. Min (1991) also noted that parents may feel betrayed and upset that their children are not making choices that are consistent with their cultural norms.

*religious plurality of new Asian immigrants.* Since the 1960s (after the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act), a new wave of immigration has brought a new religious diversity to the United States. As the presence of Asian Americans grows in the United States, American religion is becoming less Euro-Protestant, with many Asian communities comprising non-Western variations of Christianity (e.g., Confucian-influenced Protestantism among Protestant Chinese and Korean Americans, and Syrian Christianity among Indian Christians), and non-Christian religions (e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam) (Smith & Kim, 2005). This diversity in belief embraces more than 800 Chinese Protestant churches in the United States in 2000, and more than 250 Korean churches in the New York city area alone (Yang, 2002). An interesting example that shows a recent diverse combination of religious participation is that although Korean culture is known to have a
strong Confucian influence, there is a very high degree of conversion to Christianity among Koreans after immigration. And approximately seventy percent of first-generation Koreans in Los Angeles area reported affiliation with Korean ethnic churches in the United States (Hurh and Kim, 1984)

psychological issues of Asian American parents and children. A most recent qualitative study (Yeh, Kim, Pituc, & Atkins, 2008) examined how Chinese immigrant youth negotiate competing cultural values and norms across various social systems, including family, peers, and schools. The findings revealed six key topics which reported the following to be held in common by Chinese youth, their parents, teachers, and counseling personnel: socioeconomic changes due to immigrant status, English proficiency as a barrier to adjustment, changes in family structure and dynamics, racism and invisibility, challenges to social support systems, and interdependent strategies for navigating in the United States. The participants narrated losses linked to socioeconomic status, family roles, a loss of security in everyday interactions, and a loss of language and culture. These challenges were found to contribute to daily struggles including feelings of insecurity, alienation, loneliness, and fear.

Due to a recent immigration history, Korean American parents and children have
different adaptation processes, which result in an increase in cultural conflicts between children and parents (Kim, Hurh, & Kim, 1993). These conflicts were found to be related to emotional distance between parents and children, interpersonal problems, lack of self-confidence and assertiveness, and anxiety and depression (Lee, Choe, Kim, & Ngo, 2000; Lowinger & Kwok, 2001). Particularly, for Korean American college students, conflicts may include educational choice, career choice, dating and marriage, and family expectations (Chung, 2001).

Besides, Chao and Aque (2009) explained that control and discipline are regarded as important parental responsibilities in many Asian societies, according to Confucian beliefs. In particular, when the parents may have lower English proficiency and feel embarrassed in terms of how to deal with their children, some parents react by becoming more rigid about discipline and parental control which result in conflicts between parents and their children (Salvador, Omizo, & Kim, 1997). Also, in light of academic expectations, although Asian American students had the highest levels of academic achievement, they also had the greatest fear of academic failure compared to their Caucasian counterparts (Eaton & Dembo, 1997).

Despite strong evidence of a range of psychological symptoms, Asian Americans
are described as underusing mental health services due to shame and stigma attached to mental health problems, misunderstanding about counseling, linguistic barriers, confidence on family for help, use of alternative resources to traditional healing or counseling, and a lack of culturally responsive personnel (Loo, Tong, & True, 1989; Tsai, Teng, & Sue, 1980).

Yet, little research specifically sheds light on the ways in which family and religion connect within this new ethnic and religious composition, particularly for members of non-Christian religious traditions or for nonwhite members of Christian religions (Boyatzis, 2003).
Chapter III
Research Methodology

To investigate the research questions, two studies were conducted. The first study was to examine whether the hypothesized model fits with the universal sample and also to develop the refined model. The second study tested the observed model developed in the first study with the Asian sample to see if the religious socialization has the same role in the sample. In this chapter, the results of two studies are presented according to the research questions.

Description of the data source

The data used in this study was collected by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS). The initial data was collected in the 1998-1999 school year, one round in the fall and the other round in the spring, when the children were in kindergarten. The ECLS study is trailing a nationally representative cohort of children from kindergarten to high school. Altogether, throughout the U.S., 21,260 kindergartners participated in the study. In the following fall and spring of the 1999-2000 school year, two more sets of data were gathered when most of the base year children attended first grade. Between the first data
collection in 1998 and the spring of 2004, data was collected in six waves from principals, teachers, student records, parents, and children (see Table 3-1). The ECLS study was designed to provide a wealth of information that enables researchers 1) to explore how family, school community, and individual variables affect children’s early achievement in school, 2) to look into school readiness and the connection between the kindergarten experience and later elementary school functioning, 3) and to trace children’s educational improvement as they progress through secondary school (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

Table 3-1. ECLS-K points of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Year of Collection</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall-kindergarten</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>Full sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-kindergarten</td>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
<td>Full sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall-first grade</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>30 percent subsample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-first grade</td>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
<td>Full sample plus refreshing(^1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-third grade</td>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>Full sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring-fifth grade</td>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>Full sample</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Children who were not in kindergarten in the United States during the 1998-
1999 school year, and therefore did not have a chance to be selected to participate in the base year of the ECLS-K, were added to the spring-first grade sample. The addition was referred to as ‘freshening’ the sample.

The design of the ECLS-K has been guided by research in child development and education recognizing the interconnection of individual and ecological factors such as socio-economic status and family situation, the interaction of family and school, and the community. The ECLS-K has included particular attention to the role of family in helping children adjust to school and in supporting education through the elementary years.

The ECLS-K fifth grade longitudinal data collection

The K-5 longitudinal dataset combines data from the base year (kindergarten), first-grade, third-grade, and fifth-grade years. It was generated so that researchers can easily examine children’s development and growth from kindergarten to fifth grade without having to go through the process of merging several different data files. The K-5 longitudinal data file encompasses all data collected from children, parents, teachers, or schools in the base year (fall and spring), first grade (fall and spring), spring-third grade, and spring-fifth grade (Tourangeau, Nord, Le, Pollack, Atkins-Burnett, Hausken, 2006).
Data for the current study

Data for this study was extracted from the original sample of the ECLS-K fifth-grade longitudinal data. It required the combination of information from several rounds of data collection of child and parent interview data. Also, because of the nature of cross-year analyses, the data file contains appropriate longitudinal weights applied to the data to obtain the proper standard errors for generalizing to the U.S. population of children who were of kindergarten age in 1998-1999. The weights used for this study are presented in Table 3-2.

Sample characteristics

The total of participants for this study was 21,357 (51.7% male, 48.3% female). The means and standard deviation in age for mothers and fathers were 39.25 (SD=6.82), and 41.99 (SD=7.10). Of the participating children, White (non-Hispanic) made up 57.2% of the sample and Hispanic represented 19.1%. And 16.2% were African American (non-Hispanic), 2.8% were Asian, 1.7% were American Indian or Alaska native, 0.7% were Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 2.2% were more than one race (non-Hispanic). With respect to the father’s (and mother’s) education levels, 13.8% (12.3%) had less than high school education, 27.7% (27%) had a high school diploma, 5.7% (5.5%) finished vocational or technical program, 23% (30.3%) reported some college
education, 16.8% (15.8%) had a bachelor’s degree, 2.3% (2.2%) completed graduate or professional school (No degree), 6.4% (5.3%) had a master’s degree, and 4.4% (1.6%) had a doctorate or professional degree. As for socioeconomic status of the families, 19.9% of participants were located in the first quintile, 19.7% in the second quintile, 19.6% in the third, 20.6% in the fourth, and 20.2% in the fifth.

The Asian sample consisted of 520 (48.9% male, 51.1% female). Age of fathers and mothers ranged from 30 to 70 (28 to 56 for mothers), with a mean age of 45.12 ($SD=5.88$) and 41.54 ($SD=5.63$) respectively. As for father’s (and mother’s) education level, 13.8% (12.3%) had less than high school education, 27.7% (27%) had a high school diploma, 5.7% (5.5%) finished vocational or technical program, 23% (30.3%) reported some college education, 16.8% (15.8%) had a bachelor’s degree, 2.3% (2.2%) completed graduate or professional school (No degree), 6.4% (5.3%) had a master’s degree, and 4.4% (1.6%) had a doctorate or professional degree. As for socioeconomic status of the families, 11.3% of participants were located in the first quintile, 17.8% in the second quintile, 15.0% in the third, 22.2% in the fourth, and 33.8% in the fifth. The comparison of sociodemographic features between the entire sample and Asian sample was presented in Table 4-6.
### Table 3-2. Summary of sociodemographic information of the full sample and Asian sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>full sample</th>
<th>Asian sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean and SD in age of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>41.99 (7.05)</td>
<td>45.12 (5.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>39.25 (6.82)</td>
<td>41.54 (5.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level of fathers (mothers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or below</td>
<td>4.6% (4.2%)</td>
<td>5.1% (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th – 12th grade</td>
<td>9.2% (8.1%)</td>
<td>3.1% (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/equivalent</td>
<td>27.7% (27.0%)</td>
<td>16.4% (20.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc/Tech program</td>
<td>5.7% (5.5%)</td>
<td>3.5% (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>23.0% (30.3%)</td>
<td>21.7% (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>16.8% (15.8%)</td>
<td>23.6% (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional school (no degree)</td>
<td>2.3% (2.2%)</td>
<td>4.2% (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>6.4% (5.3%)</td>
<td>13.1% (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or professional degree</td>
<td>4.4% (1.6%)</td>
<td>9.4% (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2. Summary of sociodemographic information of the full sample and Asian sample

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th>full sample</th>
<th>Asian sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; quintile</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; quintile</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; quintile</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; quintile</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; quintile</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

This study utilized three sets of measures from the parent and child surveys; (a) parents’ characteristics including parental involvement with school and child, parental expectations, and parents’ level of education, (b) religious socialization which was assessed by several items regarding, for example, conversation about religion in the family, and (c) academic and social competence as perceived by children. The first two measures were collected when children were first graders and self-reported academic and social
competence was assessed in their fifth grade.

*parents' characteristics.* Fathers’ and mothers’ educational levels were assessed using the highest grade of school they had completed. Also, parents’ involvement with school was measured by nine items including “During this school year, have you or another adult in your household taken it upon yourself to contact child’s teacher or school for any reason having to do with child?” and “Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household attended school events, or meetings, or participated in volunteering?” In addition, parental involvement with child was assessed using 12 items. The items include “Have you ever talked to your children about day at school?” and “Have you met your child’s teacher?” Coefficient alphas for parental involvement with school and child are .742 and .949 respectively. Parental expectation about their children’s schooling success was measured using the question “How far in school do you expect your child to go?” Parents were asked to respond on a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from “to receive less than a high school diploma” to “To finish a Ph.D., MD or other advanced degree”. These variables were collected in the spring of each survey year.

*religious socialization.* To measure this domain, six questions were adopted including “How often does someone in your family talk with child about your family’s
religious beliefs or traditions?”, “How often does someone in your family participate in special cultural events or traditions connected with your racial or ethnic background?”, and “Do you and your current partner often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never have arguments about religion?” On the first two questions, responses were given using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from never to several times a week or more. The coefficient alpha for the variable is .596. Information on religious socialization activities was reported by parents at the second and fourth round.

*children’s perception of their social and academic competence.*

To assess children’s socioemotional development, the ECLS-K assessors administered the Self-Description Questionnaire (SDQ). This is given to find out how children think and feel about themselves socially and academically. The SDQ is composed of 42 statements. Children rated their perceptions of their competence and interest in reading, mathematics, and “all school subjects”. In addition, they were asked to rate their perceptions of competence and popularity with their peers and report about problem behaviors with which they might be struggling.

In detail, each behavior was evaluated in relation to their self-perception on a response scale of one to four scores: “not at all true,” “a little bit true,” “mostly true,” or
“very true.” The 42 items factored into six scales: Reading, Mathematics, School, Peer, Anger/Distractibility, Sad/Lonely/Anxious. In this study, the total scores of the third scale (School) and fourth scale (Peer) were used to assess children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. The School scale contains six items on their level of success in “all school subjects” and their pleasure in “all school subjects.” The Peer scale includes six items on how easily they befriend others and socialize with children as well as their perception regarding their popularity. The items on the first four scales (Reading, Mathematics, School, and Peer) were adapted to fit the ECLS-K study with permission from the Self-Description Questionnaire I (Marsh, 1992). The items in the last two problem behavior scales (Anger/Distractibility, Sad/Lonely/Anxious) were specifically designed for the ECLS-K study.

Data analysis and procedure

Since the data was collected from different time points, three weights were applied for the statistical analyses as recommended by the NCES. The manual describes how to merge different data files for the longitudinal analyses (U.S. Department of Education, 2004a). If an analyst is primarily interested in using data from two or three of the rounds of data collection, he or she may want to create their own file using appropriate weights which
were already provided in the ECLS-K fifth data file (U.S. Department of Education, 2004b).

In this current study, the variables that were used to generate the constructs such as parental involvement with school and child, parental expectations, and children’s self-perceived academic and social competence were collected at the sixth round which means that the children were in the fifth grade. On the other hand, the variables that were comprised of religious socialization were collected from the second and fourth rounds. Information on parental education was gathered at the fifth round. Table 3-2 provides the weights utilized.

All the analyses except for the path analysis were conducted using SPSS ver.15.

To test the hypothesized model, a causal modeling technique was utilized, which investigates whether a pattern of intercorrelations among variables “fits” the researcher’s inferential theory of which variables are causing other variables. There are two types of causal modeling techniques: path analysis and structural equation modeling (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Path analysis begins with the researcher developing a diagram with arrows connecting variables and depicting the causal flow, or the direction of cause-and-effect. In this study, path analysis was used to test the hypothesized model. The procedure of data analyses are as follows:

- First, the basic demographic features of the sample were obtained through
descriptive analyses.

- Second, correlations between the variables were estimated by correlation analysis to achieve the observed correlations.

- Third, multiple regression analysis was conducted to obtain the path coefficients. Multiple regression analysis provides the values for the unbiased estimates of the path coefficients. Coefficients were then used to calculate the reproduced correlations through the development and application of path decompositions. This process of regression analysis will be conducted for each endogenous variable within the initial model. For the initial model in this study, the following three analyses were conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Endogenous variable</th>
<th>Exogenous variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Religious Socialization</td>
<td>PIWS, PIWC, PEXP, PEDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academic Competence</td>
<td>PIWS, PIWC, PEXP, PEDU, RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Competence</td>
<td>PIWS, PIWC, PEXP, PEDU, RS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIWS: parental involvement with school; PIWC: parental involvement with child; PEDU: parental educational level; PEXP: parental expectation; RS: religious socialization; ACOM: self-perceived academic competence; SCOMP: self-perceived social competence.
• In the specific terminology of causal modeling, the variable that is being explained by the model (i.e., the effect, the dependent variable) is referred to as the endogenous variable, while all variables not explained by the model (i.e., the causes, the independent variables) are referred to as exogenous variables (Tate, 1992). Endogenous variables are assumed to have their variance explained by the exogenous variables included in the model; whereas, the variability of exogenous variables is assumed to be determined by other variables outside the causal model under study.

• Fourth, to assess the model fit, so to speak, to determine whether or not the hypothesized model is consistent with the observed, empirical correlations (actual data) among the variables, the reproduced correlations were obtained. And the reproduced correlations were compared to the empirically derived correlations from the second step of the procedure. The reproduced correlations are the bivariate correlations that would be produced if the causal model were correctly specified. If the observed and the reproduced correlations are reasonably close (within roughly .05 of each other), it can be assumed that the model is consistent with the empirical data (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Larger discrepancies indicate
that the model is not consistent with the data and model revisions should be considered. These reproduced correlations and subsequent comparisons to observed correlations were computed manually since no computer analysis can yield the calculations.

- Fifth, the final revised model was compared to the Asian sample to see whether the model can be explained by and generalized to the Asian sample.

**Table 3-3. Weights used for the analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>C24PWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement with school and child</td>
<td>C6PWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of the total variables</td>
<td>C56PWO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4
Results

In this chapter, the results of the analyses are presented. The findings for the whole group of participants are presented first, and then the outcomes for the Asian group are provided. In each of the two sets of presentations (i.e., for the total group and the Asian American group) basic descriptive statistics are used to summarize the data. Then the relationships between parental involvement with the school (PIWS), parental involvement with the child (PIWC), parents’ educational level (PEDU), parental expectations (PEXP), and religious socialization (RS).

*The hypothesized model fit with the full group*

The Means ($M$) and standard deviations ($SD$) of all predictor and criterion variables are shown in Table 4-1. To test the overall fit of the hypothesized model to the data, first, the observed correlations and reproduced correlations were obtained by employing correlation and multiple regression analyses in the manner described by Mertler and Vannatta (2005). The estimates are presented in Table 4-2.
Table 4-1. Means and standard deviations of analyzed variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PIWS: parental involvement with school; PIWC: parental involvement with child; PEDU: parental educational level; PEXP: parental expectation; RS: religious socialization; ACOM: self-perceived academic competence; SCOMP: self-perceived social competence.

The results indicate that the initial model (see Figure 4-1) is not consistent with the observed correlations because most of the reproduced correlations show larger discrepancies than .05 from the observed correlations. The non-significant paths according to evaluation of the path coefficients and individual levels of significance were excluded from the model at each revision attempt. After six revisions, the total of six paths of PIWS on RS, PIWC on ACOM, PIWC on RS, PEDU on ACOMP, PEXP on SCOM, and RS on ACOM were removed. Hence, a final revised model with respective path coefficients was created and is displayed in Figure 4-2. All path coefficients were significant at the .05 level.

Recalculation of reproduced correlations for the revised model suggested better consistency with the empirical correlations as only six reproduced correlations exceeded a
difference of .05 (see Table 4-3). Tests of any other possible paths in the initial model revealed no further improvement in the model. Thus, the revised model is the concluding model that shows the relatively best consistency with empirical data. Since a consistent model was developed, the specific causal effects for each endogenous variable were uncovered with respect to direct, indirect, and total effects. The total effect is determined by summing the direct and indirect effects for each path. The direct, indirect, and total causal effects of the revised model are presented in Table 4-4.

The first outcome of primary interest was the children’s self-perceived academic competence. The determinant with the largest total causal effect was the parental expectations (.159). The remaining determinant of self-perceived academic competence, as indicated by total causal effect, was the parental involvement with school (.110). This model explained approximately 7% of the variance in the children’s self-perceived academic competence. However, parental education, parental involvement with child, and religious socialization do not have any significant effects on the children’s self-perceived competence.

The second outcome of major interest was the children’s self-perceived social competence. The determinant with the largest total causal effect on this variable was
religious socialization (.116). The remaining determinants of social competence were
parental involvement with school (.086), parental involvement with child (.040), parental
education (.030), and parental expectations (.016). This model explained approximately 2%
of the variance in self-perceived social competence. The primary determinant of religious
socialization was parental education followed by parental expectations (.142).
Approximately 10% of the variance in religious socialization was explained by the model.
Parental involvement with school and child were found to show no effects on religious
socialization.

Figure 4-1. Path diagram for the initial model
Table 4-2. Observed correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-3. Reproduced correlations for the initial model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.011*</td>
<td>.080*</td>
<td>.265*</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>.133*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.040*</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>.028*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between reproduced and observed correlations is greater than 0.05.
Table 4-4. Reproduced correlations for the revised model (Final)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.304*</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.017*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between reproduced and observed correlations is greater than 0.05.
Table 4-5. Summary of causal effects for revised model shown in Figure 4-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Causal Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic competence</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social competence</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The revised model (shown in Figure 4-1) illustrates the indirect and direct effects of religious socialization between the parental characteristics and the children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. First, concerning academic self-perceived competence, it was hypothesized that parental involvement with school and child had both an indirect and a direct relationship with the children’s self-perceived academic competence. However, parental involvement with school was found to have only a direct relationship with the perceived academic competence. Religious socialization was not mediating between the two variables. Parental involvement with child was neither directly nor indirectly associated with the perceived academic competence. Parental expectations and parent education only showed a direct relationship with religious socialization, while religious socialization was not related with the perceived academic competence. The parental expectation variable was found to be directly associated with academic competence. In conclusion, religious socialization did not play a mediating role between parental characteristic variables and children’s self-perceived academic competence.
As for the perceived social competence, the hypotheses include that three of the parental variables such as parental involvement with school, with the child and the parental expectations are directly and indirectly linked with children’s self-perceived social competence. Parent education was hypothesized to be related only indirectly with the perceived social competence. According to the revised model, parental involvement with school and child showed only a direct relationship with the perceived social competence. However, the hypothesized mediating role of religious socialization between parental expectations and parental education and perceived social competence was supported.
Revised model fit with the Asian American sample

The model developed in the first study with the full population was again tested with only Asian American respondents to determine if the role of religious socialization has the same effect between parental characteristics and children’s self-perceived competence. The means and standard deviations of the variables were presented in Table 4-5. To restrict the analysis only to children from Asian backgrounds, Children were excluded from analysis who were identified as having a multiracial or other racial-ethnic identity and had either of their parent who identified themselves as multiracial or other ethnic group.

Table 4-6. Means and standard deviations of constructs in Asian sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PIWS: parental involvement with school; PIWC: parental involvement with child; PEDU: parental educational level; PEXP: parental expectation; RS: religious socialization; ACOMP: self-perceived academic competence; SCOMP: self-perceived social competence.
Table 4-8. Observed correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-9. Reproduced correlations for the final model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
<th>SCOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.019*</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>-.071*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.047*</td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between reproduced and observed correlations is greater than 0.05.
According to the results, eight of the reproduced correlations exceeded a difference of .05, which indicates that the revised model is not generally consistent with the observed correlations. Therefore, it was concluded that the final model for the whole group did not show the best fit with the Asian sample. That is, the final model for the whole group cannot provide the best explanation for the Asian sample about the relations of the variables under consideration. To elucidate the relationships between variables and to determine the best fit model to the Asian American families, further study was required.
The hypothesized model fit to the Asian American sample

The same procedure to test the hypothesized model against the Asian American sample was taken; the observed correlations and reproduced correlations were obtained by employing correlation and multiple regression analysis. Nine of the reproduced correlations exceeded a difference of .05 from the observed correlations. Therefore, the revision of the hypothesized model continued until further revisions did not improve the fit of the model.
Table 4-10. Empirical and reproduced correlations for the hypothesized model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIWS</th>
<th>PIWC</th>
<th>PEDU</th>
<th>PEXP</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>ACOMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observed Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td></td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Reproduced Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIWC</td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDU</td>
<td></td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEXP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>-.061*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.080*</td>
<td>.076*</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.098*</td>
<td>.081*</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.034*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference between reproduced and observed correlations is greater than 0.05.
However, further multiple revisions of the hypothesized model did not produce any advancement in terms of the number of reproduced correlations that exceeded a difference of .05. Tests of any other possible paths in the hypothesized model did not offer any better consistency with the empirical correlations. Therefore, it was concluded that the hypothesized model was the final model for the Asian American sample. The final model with respective path coefficients is displayed in Figure 4-4. The direct, indirect, and total causal effects of the hypothesized model are presented in Table 4-11.

* Significant at the .05 level

Figure 4-4. Final path diagram for the Asian American sample with path coefficients
Table 4-11. Summary of causal effects for the hypothesized model for the Asian sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Causal Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious socialization</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Parental involvement with school</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental involvement with child</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental expectations</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to children’s self-perceived academic competence, the determinant with the largest total causal effect was parental involvement with school (.182). The remaining determinants of self-perceived academic competence, as indicated by total causal effect, were parental expectations (.036), parental involvement with child (.027), religious socialization (-.010), and parental education (-.007) in order. This model explained approximately 4% of variance in children’s self-perceived academic competence.

In regards to children’s self-perceived social competence, the determinant with the largest total causal effect was parental involvement with school (.217). The remaining determinants of social competence according to their total effect size were religious socialization (-.052), parental involvement with child (.038), parental education (-.008), and parental expectations (.006) respectively. This model explained approximately 7% of variance in self-perceived social competence.

The key determinant of religious socialization was parental education (.149). The remaining determinants were parental involvement with child (.132), parental expectations (-.115), and parental involvement with school (-.001). Approximately 4% of variance in religious socialization was explained by the model.
Chapter 5
Discussion

This chapter discusses the key findings of the study in terms of its implications for enhancing the understanding of the role of religious socialization in Asian American families on the children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. Limitations of the study and future directions for further research are also addressed.

Research questions for this study

The purpose of the study was to explore the role of religious socialization in Asian American families and its effects between parental characteristics and children’s self-perceived academic and social competence. Parental characteristics include parental involvement with school and child, parental expectations, and parental education level. As indicated by the literature review, religious socialization has played a well-known role in children’s educational and social achievement. Through the process or activities of religious socialization by parents, certain values are embedded in children’s academic and social development and performance. More specifically, Asian Americans are likely to uphold Confucian views, beliefs, and values. It is also known that the emphasis of Confucian practice has been on educational accomplishment and on avoidance of social conflicts by
self-control and self-discipline (Frame, 2003). Although, to date, many studies and data have shown that Asian American children exhibit significantly different academic performance than non-Hispanic White counterparts (Han, 2008), few researchers have reached the conclusion that those Confucian practices have made a specific positive contribution to children’s academic and social performance. However, in the case of recently immigrated Asian families, children might interpret their parents’ excessive focus on academic success as a way of securing financial status in the United States, rather than just a cultural practice by parents (Yeh, Kim, Pituc, & Atkins, 2008). This might lead to children’s feelings of insecurity, and as a result, children might become academically at risk and socially restricted. However, little research has addressed the relationships of these variables.

In addition, while family background factors (e.g., socioeconomic status) have been found to be connected with shaping the academic performance of children with an Asian culture and upbringing, other factors that might account for this population’s diverging trajectory, such as religious or cultural socialization, have not been clearly determined. However, there is little research examining specific relationships between this socialization activity among parental attributes and children’s academic and social
performance variables. For this reason, the present study investigated effects of religious socialization in Asian American families. Accordingly, to explore any direct and indirect effects of religious socialization, the hypothesized model was established based on the supposition that religious socialization has a mediating role between parental factors and children’s self-perceived academic and social competence.

Key Findings

The results of this study suggest that there are different working models for the entire group and for the Asian American sample. For the entire group, the hypothesized contribution of religious socialization was not supported. In the larger group of American families, parental characteristics are more likely to link directly with children’s academic competence. It was found that in most American families, such parental characteristics as parental involvement with school and parental expectations were directly related to children’s self-perceived academic competence. The other parental factors such as parental involvement with child and parental education did not show any association with their children’s self-perceived academic competence. In addition, the hypothesized mediating effects of religious socialization between parental background factors and the children’s academic outcome variable were not supported.
However, in the broader group of American families, the mediating role of religious socialization was partially identified in the relation between parental characteristics and children’s self-perceived social competence. Specifically, parental involvement with school and child was not mediated by religious socialization to social competence. The parental variables related positively to social competence. On the other hand, parental expectations and parent education were found to be related to social competence only through religious socialization. Those two parental variables had merely indirect relations to children’s social competence.

Secondly, for the Asian American sample, it was found that the final model for the entire group did not show the best fit for the Asian American sample. That is, the role of religious socialization in Asian families was not represented by the same model as the one for the entire sample that embraced all ethnic groups. As hypothesized, the findings revealed the mediating role of religious socialization in the link between all parental background factors and children’s self-perceived academic and social competence.

With respect to children’s academic competence in the Asian sample, parental involvement with the school was mediated by religious socialization, but its mediating effect size was very small and almost close to zero ($r^2 < .001$). Another parental
characteristic variable, parental involvement with child, was negatively related to religious socialization; as a result, the total effect size was reduced slightly. Parental expectation was positively related to religious socialization, yet parental education was negatively mediated by religious socialization to children’s academic competence. According to the total effect sizes, parental involvement with the school was found to have the largest total effect on the Asian children’s academic competence, while parental expectations were found to have the largest total effect on academic competence in the general American sample.

With regard to children’s social competence in Asian American families, parental involvement with child and parental education were negatively mediated by religious socialization. On the other hand, parental involvement with the school and parental expectations were positively mediated by religious socialization. While parental involvement with the school was found to have the largest total effect on social competence in the Asian American sample, religious socialization had the biggest total effect on social competence in the general American sample. Parental involvement with the school was found to have the largest total effect on both academic and social competence in the Asian American sample. Particularly, the variables such as parental expectations and parental education did not exhibit any direct effect on children’s social competence, just as in the
general American sample. As is the case with the entire group, those two parental variables are related to children’s social competence only through religious socialization.

Based on the results aforementioned, in sum, the mediating role of religious socialization between parental attributes and children’s academic and social functioning was found and supported in the Asian American families. This result indicates a more significant role of religious socialization process in the Asian American families. One possible explanation of this finding is that immigration history might be an operating factor. The history of Asian immigrants to the U.S. is relatively short and new. Studies revealed that recent immigrants are more likely to socialize their children regarding their ethnic origin, native language, and cultural legacy, including their ethnic religions, to preserve their home culture and traditions. Hence, parents’ immigration status is significantly linked with the frequency of cultural or religious socialization messages (Alba, 1990; Myers, 1996). When children of immigrants become progressively part of the mainstream society and leave the ethnic community, the role of religious socialization in the third and fourth generations will be considerably weakened.

Deprivation theory can provide another explanation for the results of the study. Asian immigrant families might try to compensate for their deprivations in life including
the loss of social status, language, and culture. While Sue and Sue (1999) discussed how
the wider social milieu could affect a person’s behavioral expressions, they pointed out that
Asians in America have undergone some of the most degrading treatment ever given any
immigrant group, and discrimination and prejudice toward Asians had been pervasive (i.e.,
the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the Alien Land Law in 1913). In addition, more recently,
Southeast Asian refugees have suffered from severe oppression, violence, and war trauma,
and more particularly, homesickness due to an unprepared relocation to a foreign country.
A great number of the problems that the refugees encounter appear to be related to personal
losses involving identity, property, jobs, social status, languages and being separated from
or deaths of members of the family (Nguyen and Henkin, 1983). For example, Vietnamese
refugees report that their children demonstrate less appreciation and obedience, that respect
for elders is diminishing, and that the changing role of women is causing some problems
(Nguyen and Henkin, 1983). As a result, Asian immigrants might tend to put stronger
emphasis on their traditions and culture with their children inside the home and on reliance
on religious resources in order to cope with these significant changes.

Lastly, the role of religious socialization in Asian American families can be
explained based on social learning theory. Some studies found that Asian American parents
utilize modeling as a strategy significantly when transmitting cultural or religious traditions to the children. In their qualitative study, Park and Eklund (2007) found the home-based influence of parents through domestic religious activities in Asian Americans. When they asked interviewees what influences played a role in their religious socialization, the interviewees reported that their parents provided them opportunities to partake in religious activities (i.e., worship services, youth group attendance, and religious education classes) by transporting them to religious gatherings and by modeling participation within the context of the religious organization. Also, the interviewees responded that their parents acted as models of moral instructors, religious teachers, and ritual practitioners in the early experiences of these Asian Americans, regardless of religion. In another study about religious transmission in Asian Indian families, to demonstrate the importance of religion and spirituality in daily life, the mothers accompany their children to the temple, teach stotras (e.g., prayers and hymns), observe certain religious holidays, and participate in religious discussions with their children (Inman, Howard, Beaumont, & Walker, 2007).

Implications for practitioners

The role of religious socialization found in Asian American families offers implications for counselors who work with Asian Americans. According to Frame (2003),
despite the fact that many Asian Americans have adopted Christianity, traditional values and religions continue to influence them in both covert and overt ways. She recommends counselors to explore with Asian American clients the degree to which they are involved in ethnic religion and how much they continue their traditional practices. When working with Asian Americans who are significantly involved with religious socialization in the family, it is also critical that counselors can use the traditional or religious beliefs in the therapeutic process. Exploring how clients’ belief systems fit in to mainstream society and how they integrate them into daily life is essential.

Regarding the role of religious socialization between parental factors and children’s academic self-competence, because of the strong influence of Confucian principles, there is a great deal of emphasis placed on academic achievement in Asian American families (Sue and Sue, 1999). Lee (1996) described that individuals who are low on assimilation and high on ethnic identity adhere closely to the norms, standards, and values of the traditional Asian family. Although most Asian American students had the highest levels of academic achievement, they also had the highest fear of academic failure compared to their Caucasian peers. Hence, when working with Asian American families, counselors must be aware that Asian American students are most likely to experience intense feelings of shame
and guilt when they are not successful in school. To address these cultural issues, counselors might want to talk about or let the family explore different sets of expectations in terms of different norms or standards about family obligations and individual needs.

Limitations of the current study

There are a few limitations associated with the current study that warrant further caution to the findings reported earlier. One of the limitations of the study was the reliance on the items available in the ECLS-5th grade longitudinal data for this current study. The constructs for the present study were created based only on the availability of the survey items that were already provided. This means that, for example, the construct assessed by this instrument may not represent very well the religious socialization that is unique to this target group. As presented in Appendix, the adopted items to build the construct, religious socialization, only include limited activities such as parents’ attendance to religious services, verbal discussion about religious beliefs or traditions, and participation in special culture events.

A more prominent concern is the fact that the surveys on self-perceived academic and social competence were administered in English, which probably created greater difficulties in understanding and also in completing the survey items for those children who
have recently immigrated to the United States. English fluency was not screened when collecting the original data. In this study, English fluency was not controlled either in the process of analysis. Also, the parents’ generation status (i.e. 1st generation, 2nd generation, 3rd generation) was not controlled either, which would influence their perceiving or responding to the measured items or constructs.

Overall, future studies should account for these limitations to fully convey the more complex nature of the various roles or influences of religious socialization in diverse American families.

*Directions for future research*

Although results of this study provide an indication that in the Asian American group, unlike in the general American sample, religious socialization was found to mediate parental characteristics to children’s self-perceived academic and social competence, findings may be further examined through replications and extensions of the study. Given that this current study supports the hypothesized model in the Asian American sample, future research which includes more comparative studies of the unique effects of religious socialization on the children’s outcome variables will be needed.

Future research on the similarities and differences within particular cultural and
immigrant subgroups is needed to grant a more comprehensive understanding of children
and their families. The diversity of the Asian population in terms of religion, race,
languages, socioeconomic status, reasons for immigration, generation status, and
acculturation level should be addressed. Hernandez, Denton, & Macartney (2007) found
that children in families from Thailand, Cambodia, or Laos have very high poverty rates
that set them apart from other children of immigrants. Also, other researchers noted that
Korean Americans frequently utilized religious activities and leaders as sources of social
support more often than other Asian American ethnic groups (Yeh & Wang, 2000; Bjorck,

It may be fruitful in future research to further investigate the effects of religious
socialization by using a more concrete and robust representation of the construct. For
instance, religious socialization might include other activities such as reading religious
stories, teaching prayers or hymns, and observing important religious holidays, besides
engaging in religious discussions. Due to the lack of available items to establish a robust
construct using the ECLS data, future research might employ or develop more varied items
that could maximize the representation of the construct.

In addition, further analyses using confirmatory factor analyses including multiple
different groups are needed for determining the mediating role of religious socialization across diverse ethnic groups. For instance, the model that was developed and supported in this study for the Asian American sample could be compared to different ethnic groups such as African American or Hispanics.

Conclusion

To conclude, the primary goal of the present study was to explore the mediating role of religious socialization in its relation between parental background factors and children’s outcome variables such as their self-perceived academic and social competence. Prior scholarship has shown the importance of family backgrounds for the academic achievement and social competence of children. Also, religious socialization has been found to be connected with parental characteristics or children’s general outcomes. These findings have been mostly limited to samples from mainstream American culture. In addition, the majority of research typically focuses on finding direct links between the variables. As a result, this study developed a hypothesized model and tested it against the Asian American sample which has been considered as a ‘model’ minority group (Doerner, 1985) in literature, but relatively little research has been done on it. The findings supported the hypothesized model. However, the hypothesized model did not show the best fit with
the general American sample. The mediating role of religious socialization was detected in
the relation between all parental backgrounds and the children’s outcome variables in the
Asian American sample, but limited effects of religious socialization were found in the
general American sample. No mediating role of religious socialization was found in the
links between parental characteristics and children’s self-perceived academic competence
in the full American sample. On the other hand, for the same group, religious socialization
did mediate the relationships of parental expectations and parental education variables with
children’s social competence.
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Appendix

*Question items for Religious Socialization (RS)*

How often did you attend religious services in the past year? Would you say…

- Never or almost year: 1
- Several times a year: 2
- Several times a month: 3
- Once a week, or: 4
- Several times a week?: 5
- Refused: 7
- Don’t know: 9

How about your {name of spouse/partner}’s? How often did {he/she} attend religious services in the past year? Would you say…

- Never or almost year: 1
- Several times a year: 2
- Several times a month: 3
- Once a week, or: 4
- Several times a week?: 5
- Refused: 7
- Don’t know: 9

Do you and {name of current partner} often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never have arguments about religion?

- Often: 1
- Sometimes: 2
- Hardly ever: 3
- Never: 4
How often does someone in your family talk with {child} about (his/her) ethnic or racial heritage? Would you say…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month, or</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often does someone in your family talk with {child} about your family’s religious beliefs or traditions? Would you say…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month, or</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often does someone in your family participate in special culture events or traditions connected with your racial or ethnic background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a month, or</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question items for Parental Involvement with School (PIWS)**

Why did you contact the teacher or school?

- To discuss school policies/records
  - Yes
  - No
- To discuss volunteering in class
  - Yes
  - No
- To inform teacher family issues
  - Yes
  - No

Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household attended an open house or back-to-school night?

- Yes
- No

Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household attended a meeting of a PTA, PTO, or Parent-Teacher Organization?

- Yes
- No

Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household gone to a regularly scheduled parent-teacher conference with {child}’s teacher or meeting with {child}’s teacher?

- Yes
- No

Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household attended a school or class event, such as a play, sports event, or science fair?

- Yes
- No

Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household volunteered at the school or served on a committee?

- Yes
- No
Since the beginning of this school year have you or the other adults in your household participated in fundraising for {child}’s school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Question Items for Parental Involvement with Child (PIWC)*

During this school year, have you or another adult in your household taken it upon yourself to contact {child}’s teacher or school for any reason having to do with {child}?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why did you contact the teacher or school?

- To report an absence or tardiness
  - Yes
  - No
- To discuss problems the child is having at school
  - Yes
  - No
- To request special placement or services
  - Yes
  - No
- To request evaluation by a specialist
  - Yes
  - No
- To request a specific teacher
  - Yes
  - No
- To check on {child}’s progress
  - Yes
  - No
- To discuss special needs
  - Yes
  - No
- To discuss transportation issues
  - Yes
  - No

In the past month, how often have you talked with your child about day at school?

- Not at all
  - 1
- A few times a month
  - 2
- A few times a week
  - 3
- Everyday
  - 4
- Refused
  - 7
- Don’t know
  - 9
In the past month, how often have you talked with {child} about friends?

- Not at all: 1
- A few times a month: 2
- A few times a week: 3
- Everyday: 4
- Refused: 7
- Don’t know: 9

Have you met {child}’s teacher yet?

- Yes: 1
- No: 2
- Refused: 7
- Don’t know: 9

In the past week, how often did {child} read to {himself/herself} or to others outside of school?

- Never: 1
- Once or twice a week: 2
- Three to six times a week, or: 3
- Everyday?: 4
- Refused: 7
- Don’t know: 9

In the past month, that is, since {month} {day}, has anyone in your family visited a library with {child}?

- Yes: 1
- No: 2
- Refused: 3
- Don’t know: 4

Are there family rules for {child} about any of the following television-related activities?

- What programs {child} can watch? Yes No
- How early or late {he/she} may watch television? Yes No
- How many hours {he/she} may watch television on weekends? Yes No
- How many hours {he/she} may watch television each week? Yes No
Approximately, how much time is set aside every day for {child} to do homework? Enter amount in hours  ___ ___

During this school year, how often did someone help {child} with {his/her} reading, language arts or spelling homework? Would you say…

- Never 1
- Less than once a week 2
- 1 to 2 times a week 3
- 3 to 4 times a week, or 4
- 5 or more times a week 5
- Refused 7
- Don’t know 9

During this school year, how often did someone help {child} with {his/her} math homework? Would you say…

- Never 1
- Less than once a week 2
- 1 to 2 times a week 3
- 3 to 4 times a week, or 4
- 5 or more times a week 5
- Refused 7
- Don’t know 9

In a typical week, please tell me the number of days…

- At least some of the family eats breakfast together ___
- {child} has breakfast at a regular time ___
- Your family eats the evening meal together ___
- The evening meal is served at a regular time ___

On weeknights during the school year, does {child} usually go to bed at about the same time each night, or does {his/her} bedtime vary a lot from night to night?

- Has usual bedtime 1
Bedtime varies 2
Refused 7
Don’t know 9

*Question item for Parental Expectations (PEXP)*

How far in school do you expect {child} to go? Would you say you expect {him/her} ....

- To receive less than a high school diploma, 1
- To graduate from high school 2
- To attend two or more years of college 3
- To finish a four- or five-year college degree, 4
- To earn a master’s degree or equivalent, or, 5
- To finish a Ph.D., MD or other advanced degree? 6
- Refused 7
- Don’t know 9