

Determinants for Healthy Development of youth from a Parent-Child Relationship perspective

1

**Siu Ming Kwok, Ph.D.
University of Calgary**

**Symposium on Gender, Family,
and Marital Relationship among Arab Refugee
Families in Canada**

London, Ontario

Feb 23, 2018

Determinants for Healthy Development: A comparison between Racialized and Non-racialized Youth

2

Research Questions and Method

- What protective and risk factors that promote or prevent healthy youth development between racialized and non-racialized youth?
 - Those identified themselves as non-White
 - Excluding First Nations
- A Secondary Data Analysis on the Cycle 4 data of the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY)
 - The NLSCY started in 1994/95 following a representative sample children from birth to 11 years of age into adulthood, with data collection occurring at two-year intervals
 - The Cycle 4 was conducted in 2000/01

Literature Review: Factors Affecting Healthy Development of Youth (1)

3

1. Individual factors

- Gender and intrapersonal strain are two strongest predictors of violence among youth (Dupere et al., 2007)

2. Familial factors

- Parenting approach (e.g. nurturance vs. hostile)
- Overall home and family relationship (Vaillancourt et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2013)
- Socioeconomic status of the parents (e.g. families live on low-income or poverty)

Literature Review: Factors Affecting Healthy Development of Youth (2)

4

3. Environmental factors

- Neighbourhood stability/instability (Krishnakumar et al., 2014)
- Social capital (e.g. social networks)
- Peer influence (Kwok, 2008; Pires & Jenkins, 2007)

Literature Review (1): Factors affecting Youth from Racialized Groups

5

- Acculturative stress (Berry, 1997; Lui, 2015)
- Structural inequalities and racial discrimination (Agnew, 1992)
- Development of a strong ethnic identity can be a protective factor for positive psychosocial outcomes (St. Louis & Liem, 2005; Gfellner & Armstrong, 2011)

Literature Review (2)

6

- In addition to the multiple risk and protective factors affecting the healthy development of all youth, the literature has also suggested that there are other factors unique to the experiences of youth from racialized groups that may further impact on their development
- **Acculturative stress** refers to the difficulties experienced by immigrant individuals and communities as they struggle to negotiate differences in ethnic and host cultures
- The challenges associated with acculturative stress and the **process of developing an ethnic identity** is a fit with models and frameworks that attempt to explain problematic behaviors.

Literature Review (3)

7

- For instance, the strain model (Agnew, 1992) suggests that racialized groups' negative **life experiences** and frustrations with structural inequalities and racial discrimination are the primary causes of crime
- most youth from **racialized groups had experienced racial discrimination** and that those youth who had experienced discrimination had higher self-reports of engaging in problematic and high-risk behaviors.
- However, while acculturative stress can add to the challenges already experienced during adolescent development, the development of a **strong ethnic identity can be a protective factor** for positive psychosocial outcomes among visible minority youth

Variables

8

- Examined
 - 51 Independent (Predictor) variables. For example:
 - ✦ Gender of Youth
 - ✦ Race of Youth (White vs. Non-White, excluding Aboriginal)
 - ✦ Youth's General Health
 - ✦ Intact Family Status
 - ✦ Education of Parents
 - ✦ Household Income
 - ✦ Family Functioning Score
 - ✦ Neighbours Score
 - ✦ Friends who Broke the Law
 - 9 Dependent (Outcome) variables. For example:
 - ✦ Math Score
 - ✦ General Self Score
 - ✦ Conduct Disorder Score
 - ✦ Indirect Aggression Score

Descriptive Statistics ($n=3712$)

9

Individual Factors (selected)

Gender of Child	F = 1802 (48.5%)	M = 1910 (51.5%)
Color-White of Child	No = 331 (8.9%)	Yes = 3207 (86.4%)
Age of Child	12 = 921 (24.8%)	
	13 = 915 (24.6%)	
	14 = 928 (25.0%)	
	15 = 948 (25.5%)	

Familial Factors (selected) (1)

Risk factors in bold

Color-White of PMK	Yes = 3190 (85.9%)	No = 312 (8.4%)
Single Parent Family	Both Parent=2962 (79.8%)	Single =750 (20.2%)
Dwelling Owned	Yes = 3040 (81.9%)	No = 672 (18.1%)
Religion Practice of PMK	Yes = 3190 (85.9%)	No = 415 (11.2%)
Religion Practice of Spouse	Yes = 3235 (87.1%)	No = 382 (10.3%)
Drank Alcohol-PMK	Once/week=2992 (80.6%)	2-3/week=625 (16.8%)
Drank Alcohol-Spouse	Once/week=2018 (54.4%)	2-3/week=759 (20.5%)

Familial Factors (selected) (2) **Risk factors in bold**

Depression Score of PMK	$M=4.76, SD=5.86, n=3536$
Family Functioning	$M=9.39, SD=4.74, n=3528$
Conflict Resolution	$M=6.49, SD=4/38, n=3446$
Parental Nurturance	$M=20.05, SD=5.68, n=2668$
Parental Rejection	$M=10.36, SD=4.94, n=2670$
Parental Monitoring (Supervision)	$M=14.54, SD=3.21, n=2763$

Environmental Factors (selected)

Risk factors in bold

Friends Broke the Law	None=2210 (59.5%)	Some=617 (16.6%)
Safety Score	$M=6.58, SD=1.57, n=3546$	
Neighbour Score	$M=10.75, SD=2.35, n=3206$	
Social Support	$M=18.41, SD=3.62, n=3563$	

Dependent/Outcome Variables

Indirect Aggression	$M=1.44, SD=1.70, n=2812$
Emotional Disorder	$M=3.33, SD=2.82, n=2807$
Conduct Disorder	$M=1.16, SD=1.78, n=2822$
Hyperactivity/Inattentive	$M=3.81, SD=2.83, n=2764$
Property Offence	$M=.97, SD=1.39, n=2794$
Pro-social Score	$M=12.3, SD=3.99, n=2774$
Scaled Math Score	$M=548.2, SD=99.0, n=2611$
Friends Score	$M=13.46, SD=2.54, n=2843$
General Self	$M=13.01, SD=2.61, n=2828$

Analysis: Two Group Comparison (*t*-test)

14

- Is there any group difference on the dependent variables?
- Independent *t*-tests were conducted

T-test Results (1)

Gender of Child (Girls vs. Boys)

Emotional Disorder	$(t = 16.22, p = .000)$
Pro-social Score	$(t = 14.46, p = .000)$
Friends Score	$(t = 6.65, p = .003)$
Conduct Disorder	$(t = -6.90, p = .002)$
General Self	$(t = -9.93, p = .001)$

Girls are likely to experience emotional disorder, but they also tended to have higher pro-social and friends score.

Boys are more likely to exhibit conduct disorder, and lower self-concept.

T-test Results (2)

16

Dwelling Owned or not (No vs. Yes)

Property Offence

($t = 4.30, p = .012$)

General Self

($t = -5.77, p = .004$)

Youth who lived in **rental housing** are more likely to involve in crime and have lower self-concept

T-test Results (4)

17

Race/Color-White-PMK (No vs. Yes)

Property Offence

$(t = 5.63, p = .004)$

Parental Nurturance

$(t = -4.44, p = .011)$

Youth, **whose has a racialized PMK**, have significant higher report of property offence and experienced lower level of parental nurturance

T-test Results (5)

18

Intact Family (No vs. Yes)

Indirect Aggression	$(t = 4.85, p = .008)$
Conduct Disorder	$(t = 4.09, p = .015)$

Youth, who came from **non-intact family**, are more like to report indirect aggression and conduct disorder

Multiple Regression Analysis

19

- What factor(s) best predict healthy youth development?
- Predicting variables with a Pearson's $r \geq .30$ are selected for multiple regression analysis
- $p \leq .01$ to be considered significant
- Multiple Imputation method was used to address missing values
- Parental Nurturance, Rejection, and Monitoring are entered as control variables

Multiple Regression Results (1)

Indirect Aggression

Model 1	$R = .18$	$R^2 = .03$ (3% change of variance)
Model 2	$R = .34$	$R^2 = .11$ (11% change of variance)

Pooled Coefficients (Model 2)

Conflict Resolution	$\beta = .03$	$P = .003$
Parental Nurturance	$\beta = -.04$	$P = .004$
Parental Rejection	$\beta = .08$	$P = .000$











Multiple Regression Results (2)

Emotional Disorder

Model 1 $R = .30$ $R^2 = .09$ (9% change of variance)

Model 2 $R = .41$ $R^2 = .17$ (17% change of variance)

Pooled Coefficients selected (Model 2)

Gender of Child (F  M) (0  1)	 = 1.03	$P = .000$
Color White-Child (Yes  Non)	 = -1.45	$P = .002$
Color White-PMK	 = .87	$P = .002$
Chile Single Parent	 = .99	$P = .003$
Parental Nurturance	 = -.04	$P = .004$
Parental Rejection	 = .08	$P = .000$
Parental Monitoring	 = .08	$P = .005$

Multiple Regression Results (1a)

22

- After the controlling variables were added onto the model, R square increased in Model 2.
- **Parent-child conflict and parental rejection** contributed significantly to the **increase of indirect aggression of the child**; whereas, **parental nurturance** is a significant **protective factor**

Discussion (1)

23

- Findings support the theoretical framework that there are individual, familial, and environmental factors affecting healthy youth development
- At individual level, a youth's **ethnicity** has an impact on one's "Indirect Aggression" and "Friends score." Moreover, a **youth being a male** is associated with more at-risk/problem behaviors

Discussion (2)

24

- At familial level, **single parent family, family lives in rental home, and the PMK identified as non-white** are evidenced as risk factors
- However, **religious practice of parents** and attending child's extra-curricular activities showed as protective factors
- Among all, the level of **parental nurturance, rejection, and monitoring** have showed to be significant predictors on youth's healthy development

Discussion (3)

25

- At environmental level, **those mingled with friends who broke the law** are at higher risk on a number of problem behaviors such as property offence;
- Moreover, those lived in **rental home** are more susceptible to depression, family dysfunction, low sense of neighborhood safety, fewer social support, and low sense of neighborhood cohesiveness; and these factors might mediating various outcome variables

Our Study & DIFI Research Report

26

Our Study

DIFI Report's Themes

Single parent family; PMK as non-white (Risk factors)

Gender role changes

Peers' influence (differential association theory)
(Risk factors)

Traumatic experiences

Parental nurturance, rejection, and monitoring
(Protective factors)
Male vs. Female

Martial conflict

Religious practice; ethnic self-identity (Protective factors)

Family value

Selected References

- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30, 47-87.
- Caro, D.H., McDonalds, J.T., & Willms, J.D. (2009). Socio-economic status and academic achievement trajectories from childhood to adolescence. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32(3), 558-590.
- Cleveland, M.J., Collins, L.M., Lanza, S.T., Greenberg, M.T., & Feinberg, M.E. (2010). Does individual risk moderate the effect of contextual-level protective factors? A latent class analysis of substance use. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 38(3), 213-228.
- Dupere, V., Lacourse, E., Willms, J.D., Vitaro, F., & Tremblay, R.E. (2007). Affiliation to youth gangs during adolescence: The interaction between childhood psychopathic tendencies and neighborhood disadvantage. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35, 1035-1045.
- Kwok, S.M. (2008). Experiences of Asian youth in the Criminal Justice System of Canada. *Journal of Gang Research*, 15(3), 1-17.
- Olives, E.V., Forero, C.G., Mayeu-Olivares, A., Almansa, J., Vieira, J.A.P., Valeras, J.M., ...Alonso, J. (2013). Environmental risk and protective factors of adolescents; and youths' mental health: Differences between parents' appraisal and self-reports. *Quality of Life Research*, 22(3), 613-622.
- Schleider, J.L., Patel, A., Krumholz, L., Chorpita, B.F., & Weisz, J.R. (2014). Relation between parent symptomatology and youth problems: Multiple mediation through family income and parent-youth stress. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 1-9.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.