

Predicting Intergenerational Cultural Conflict in Ecuadorian Immigrant Families Based on Acculturation Gaps, Language Brokering, Perceived Discrimination, Parenting Styles, and Family Communication Patterns

Carla. Quispe¹, Camila. Espinoza^{2*}

¹ Department of Community Psychology, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, La Paz, Bolivia

² Department of Educational Psychology, Universidad de Guayaquil, Guayaquil, Ecuador

* Corresponding author email address: camila.espinoza@ug.edu.ec

E d i t o r

Salami Mutiu Olagoke
Associate Profesor, Head of
Counseling Psychology and
Guidance Department, Ibn Haldun
University, Turkey
salami@fpm.upsi.edu.my

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Hassan Ghanifar
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Birjand, Iran. Email: ghanifar@iaubir.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Keivan Kakabraee
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: keivan@iauksh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript identifies the study population as Ecuadorian immigrant families residing in the New York metropolitan area, including New York City, Long Island, Westchester County, and northern New Jersey. This geographical definition is broad and includes areas with potentially different socioeconomic, institutional, and immigrant-community characteristics. The authors should report the distribution of participating families across recruitment locations and test whether conflict scores differed by site or region. If recruitment location was not associated with the outcome, this should be stated; if differences were present, site should be included as a covariate or clustering variable.

The sampling procedure is described as a “multistage community-based sampling procedure,” but the subsequent description appears closer to purposive or convenience recruitment through community institutions. The authors should avoid terminology that implies probability sampling unless organizations and families were selected through a formally randomized process. The recruitment method should be renamed and described transparently, including the number of organizations contacted, the number agreeing to participate, the number of families screened, the number excluded, the number declining participation, and the final response rate.

The perceived-discrimination measure was administered only to adolescents, although the theoretical discussion emphasizes that parents' discrimination experiences may shape family emotional climates and parenting responses. The authors should acknowledge this asymmetry more explicitly and, if parent discrimination data were collected, incorporate them into the model. If such data were not collected, the Discussion should avoid implying that the study directly tested intergenerational transmission of parental discrimination. The manuscript should consistently distinguish between adolescent-perceived discrimination and family-level exposure to discrimination.

The parenting-style analysis uses adolescent-reported parenting as the primary predictor while parent self-reports are described as being collected "for descriptive comparison." The authors should report these parent data rather than leaving them unused. Parent-adolescent discrepancies in perceived parenting may themselves be theoretically relevant indicators of relational strain. At minimum, the manuscript should present correlations between parent and adolescent parenting ratings and conduct sensitivity analyses using parent reports, adolescent reports, and discrepancy scores.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The eligibility criteria state that families were excluded when a participant reported "a severe cognitive impairment, active psychotic disorder, developmental condition, or language limitation that prevented independent comprehension of the questionnaires." The manuscript should explain how these conditions were assessed. It is unclear whether eligibility was determined through self-report, parent report, medical documentation, researcher judgment, or a formal screening instrument. The authors should also reconsider the broad phrase "developmental condition," because excluding all developmental conditions may be scientifically unjustified unless the condition specifically prevented informed assent or questionnaire completion.

The power analysis paragraph states that the calculation assumed "a medium overall effect size, a significance level of .05, statistical power of .95, and the inclusion of the principal predictors and relevant demographic control variables." The authors should report the exact effect-size parameter used, such as Cohen's f^2 , the total number of tested predictors, the statistical software employed, and the resulting minimum sample size. Because interaction effects were subsequently tested, a separate power analysis for moderation should also be provided. Interaction terms commonly require substantially larger samples than main-effect models, and the adequacy of $N = 312$ for detecting the reported interaction effects should be demonstrated.

The manuscript states that "parent and adolescent scores were standardized and averaged to create a family-level measure" of intergenerational cultural conflict. This scoring procedure requires stronger psychometric justification. Averaging standardized scores assumes that parent and adolescent reports are equally valid indicators of one latent family-level construct and that disagreement between reporters is measurement error rather than meaningful information. The authors should report the correlation and agreement between parent and adolescent conflict scores, ideally using intraclass correlation coefficients. Separate reporter-specific analyses or dyadic models should also be presented to determine whether predictors operate differently for parent-perceived and adolescent-perceived conflict.

The section describing the culturally adapted Intergenerational Conflict Inventory indicates that the measure covered autonomy, family obligations, cultural identity, social relationships, and everyday behavioral expectations. However, the manuscript does not identify the original source, number of items, response-scoring procedure, subscale composition, or evidence for factorial validity. The authors should provide a complete psychometric description and report whether confirmatory factor analysis supported the intended structure in both language versions and across parent and adolescent respondents. Internal consistency alone is insufficient to establish validity after cultural adaptation.

The manuscript reports that the Vancouver Index of Acculturation was adapted so that heritage-culture items referred to Ecuadorian culture and mainstream-culture items referred to the United States. The authors should clarify whether measurement invariance was evaluated across parents and adolescents, Spanish and English versions, and Ecuador-born versus United States-

born adolescents. Without evidence of at least configural and metric invariance, differences between parent and adolescent scores may partly reflect differential interpretation of items rather than true acculturation gaps.

In the language-brokering section, the manuscript states that “the total language-brokering burden score was used because the theoretical model proposed that conflict would be more strongly associated with coercive responsibility, emotional strain, and inappropriate role expectations than with translation frequency alone.” This decision appears theoretically reasonable but introduces a risk of selective outcome construction. The authors should report results for both frequency and burden dimensions, including their intercorrelation and their separate associations with conflict. A model including both dimensions would help establish whether burden predicts conflict beyond the amount of brokering performed.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.