

Positive Immigrant Youth Adaptation in Context:  
Developmental, Acculturation, and Social Psychological Perspectives

Frosso Motti-Stefanidi

University of Athens, Greece

John Berry

Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Xenia Chryssochoou

Panteion University, Athens, Greece

David Lackland Sam

University of Bergen, Norway

Jean Phinney

California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA

*“Immigration is one of the defining issues of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is now an essential, inevitable and potentially beneficial component of the economic and social life of every country and region. The question is no longer whether to have migration, but rather how to manage immigration effectively so as to enhance its positive and reduce its negative impacts. Well-informed choices by migrants, governments, home and host communities, civil societies, and the private sector can help realize the positive potential of immigration in social, economic and political terms.”*

(Brunson McKinley, Director General, International Organization for Migration, 2007)

In A. S. Masten, K. Liebkind, & D. J. Hernandez (Eds.), *Realizing the potential of immigrant youth* (pp. 117-158). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Globally, staggering numbers of people have left their home country for a new country. Many of these immigrants have a strong commitment to putting down roots in their new countries, as evidenced by the fact that they stay throughout their lives and over generations (see chapter by Hernandez, this volume). The presence of immigrants presents both opportunities and challenges for receiving societies. To capitalize on migration, receiving societies must ensure the successful integration and full realization of the immigrant potential (Berry, 2006). Thus, it is crucial that they invest in the adaptation and well-being of immigrant youth.

The quality of adaptation among immigrant youth can be judged on the basis of success in both developmental and acculturative tasks. Like all children, immigrant children face normative developmental challenges (Masten, Burt, & Coatsworth, 2006), but they also face the acculturative challenges that stem from the need to adapt to the realities of at least two cultures (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Successful adaptation with respect to both kinds of challenge can be a harbinger of future adaptation, indicating prospects for positive long-term outcomes of immigrant youth and their receiving societies. Concomitantly, failure to adapt may have negative, and possibly cascading, consequences for the future success of individuals and societies.

To explain individual and group differences in the quality of adaptation among immigrant youth, it is important to acknowledge that immigrant children, like all children, are developing organisms (Sam, 2006), and also that development always emerges from interactions of individuals with their contexts (Boyce et al., 1998). Cognitive, affective and social developmental processes, as well as normative developmental contexts, such as family, school, and peer group, all play a role in adaptation and development. In addition, however, immigrant youth face unique ecological circumstances not shared by nonimmigrant children that also

influence their adaptation. Immigrant status and culture, and related social variables, such as discrimination, are of central importance in explaining individual differences in their adaptation (García-Coll et al., 1996; see chapters by Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Mähönen, this volume; also Sirin & Gupta, this volume).

In psychology, the adaptation of immigrant youth has been examined from three distinct, though inter-related, perspectives within the subdisciplines of developmental psychology, acculturation psychology and social psychology. Developmental researchers emphasize the role of the proximal environment (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006), including the family, peer groups and schools, in which children's lives are embedded. Acculturation researchers stress the influence of culture, particularly the context of the immigrants' home culture and the receiving society's culture (Berry et al., 2006). Social psychologists often focus on the social processes that characterize the new societal and intergroup context, including such contextual phenomena as discrimination (see chapter by Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Mähönen, this volume; Verkuyten, 2005, also this volume). Each subdiscipline offers a unique contribution to the study of immigrant youth adaptation. However, we believe that an integrative approach, blending concepts, methods, and evidence from these three perspectives, will yield a more informative understanding of who succeeds among immigrant youth and why.

The primary goal of this chapter is to propose such an integrative framework encompassing developmental, acculturation, and social psychological approaches to the study of individual differences in immigrant youth adaptation. The chapter consists of three main sections. In the first section, we delineate the major principles and constructs pertinent to research on immigrant youth from these three perspectives. In the second section, we discuss the definition of successful adaptation in immigrant youth, as well as key individual and contextual

factors and processes that promote or hinder adaptation. In the third section, we present the integrative model, which consists of three levels of analysis, ranging from the individual to the societal, and discuss its implications.

In keeping with McLoyd's (2006) distinction between the conceptual and ideological perspectives on issues of race, ethnicity and culture, we emphasize that the integrative model we propose reflects a conceptual (rather than ideological) approach to the issue. Nonetheless, the chapter also reflects three fundamental beliefs shared by the authors about adaptation in the context of immigration, in general, and with respect to immigrant youth adaptation in particular. First, we believe that the adaptation of immigrant children needs to be examined in its own right, and not always in comparison to the mainstream standard, which often leads to the conclusion that immigrant youth suffer from either a genetic or cultural inferiority. Second, we believe that even though our emphasis is on immigrant youth adaptation, native youth also must adapt to the presence of immigrants in the country, and to a multicultural reality. Intercultural contact changes immigrants and it also changes natives, although typically to a lesser degree, and brings about the pressing need for mutual accommodation (Berry, 2006). And finally, in keeping with the suggestions of the European Union's Commission of the European Communities (2003), we assume that in order to promote the adaptation of immigrants, it is important to acknowledge that all peoples living in a country should be allowed to maintain their heritage cultures, and that any barriers to full economic, social, cultural, and political participation in society should be eliminated.

### **Core Principles of Three Perspectives on Immigrant Youth Adaptation**

#### **Developmental Perspective**

To explain individual differences in immigrant youth adaptation it is important to use a developmental lens since immigrant children are developing organisms. In developmental psychology, development often is discussed in terms of systematic and successive changes in the structure, organization and functioning of the child's biological, emotional, cognitive and behavioral systems, with increasing complexity, differentiation and integration within and across these systems, moving generally the organism towards a direction of increasing adaptability (Masten, 2006; Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, & Collins, 2005). It is considered to arise from many interactions within individuals (among genetic and hormonal systems, personality, and cognition) and among individuals and the contexts (e.g., family, school, neighborhood) in which their life is embedded (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Gotlieb, Wahlsten, & Lickliter, 2006; Lerner, 2006). Furthermore, it is argued that all levels of organization within the ecology of human development, ranging from genes and cells, through individual mental and behavioral functioning, to school and family contexts, and ultimately to society and culture, are interconnected, mutually influencing each other.

Developmental changes have a significant impact on the way children attribute meaning to reality (Magnusson & Stattin, 2006), and in the way they act on and/or interact with their environment (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). For example, it is around six years of age that children acquire the basic cognitive skills that allow them to perceive discrimination within given situations, but not until adolescence, after having acquired more advanced cognitive skills, that they are able to identify discrimination at the societal, institutional, and systemic levels (Brown & Bigler, 2005).

Changes are also observed in the developmental tasks and issues (e.g. school achievement, rule abiding behavior, getting along with peers, identity formation) that are

characteristic of different periods in an individual's life (McCormick, Kuo, & Masten, in press; Masten et al., 2006). Individuals are expected to engage and become competent in age-appropriate developmental tasks that reflect psychosocial milestones of development. Multiple stakeholders, including parents, teachers, other society members, and young people themselves, often consider the quality of adaptation with respect to these developmental tasks an index for how well development is proceeding and how it will proceed in the future. However, in the case of immigrant youth, family and teachers may have conflicting developmental task expectations rendering adaptation a more challenging task for them.

Furthermore, developmental changes also occur in the contexts in which children spend their time, and with whom and how they spend it. Such changes may present new opportunities and challenges for their adaptation. For example, in many societies, young children spend much of their time with families, whereas adolescents spend much more time with friends (Masten et al., 2006). Friends who support each other to fulfill their academic obligations have a beneficiary effect on immigrant students' academic achievement (Fuligni, 1997), whereas spending unsupervised time with peers is associated with risky behavior, and lower GPA in Mexican adolescents (Updegraff, McHale, Whiteman, Thayer, & Crouter, 2006).

The most influential description of human development nested in context is Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model of human development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). According to this model, children's lives are embedded in hierarchically nested, multidimensional, continuously unfolding and changing contexts. Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006) described four hierarchically nested levels of environmental influence. The microsystem involves children's interaction with the persons, objects, and symbols in their immediate environment, such as the family and the school. The mesosystem involves the interactions

between the different microsystems in children's life. The exosystem refers to environmental influences that do not directly involve children, but may still impact their development. The macrosystem refers to the broader and more distal social and historical context, involving societal, cultural, and institutional-level influences. The influence of the distal context on adaptation is considered to be indirect, filtering through the proximal environment (Boyce et al., 1998; Magnusson & Stattin, 2006).

Even though developmental theorists have increasingly called attention to the importance of the distal sociocultural environment, they place special emphasis in their studies on the interpersonal, relational dimension of the proximal contexts. Human development is seen as the result of interactions that must take place on a fairly regular basis and over an extended period of time between an active and evolving human organism and the persons in his or her immediate environment. These proximal processes are considered to be the "primary engines of development" (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006).

Children are not passive receivers of experience and, therefore, contexts are not the sole influence on their adaptation. Instead, they exert their human agency, and thus influence the course of their own development, within the opportunities and constraints of historical and social circumstances (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Human agency is, firstly, reflected in their self-initiated efforts at interpreting, evaluating, and making sense of their social environment and experience (Kuczynski & Navara, 2006). In that vein, a distinction has been drawn between the actual, objective environment and the perceived environment (Magnusson & Stattin, 2006). Children's subjective experience and unique perception of the world have been argued to actually shape their effective experience of the environment and are, therefore, most likely to affect the quality of their adaptation (Boyce et al., 1998). Furthermore, individual differences in

children's personalities significantly contribute to shaping their social environment. For example, as their ability to self-regulate increases, their personalities shape their choices about the activities they become involved in and the people they associate with. (Caspi & Shiner, 2006).

Finally, to understand intraindividual change in the patterns of immigrant youth's adaptation, it is important to take into account that the developmental system is characterized by the potential for change in response to experience, i.e., by plasticity. The potential for plasticity of the developmental system allows for the promotion of positive youth development, through the alignment of strengths of individuals and contexts (Lerner, 2006; also see chapter by Lerner, this volume).

To summarize, immigrant youth are developing organisms, a fact that has significant implications when trying to explain individual differences in their adaptation. However, immigrant youth live with and between at least two cultural worlds. The same contexts that propel their development are also the arena where their acculturation takes place.

### **An Acculturation Perspective**

Acculturation refers to the process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between cultural groups and their individual members (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). These changes continue after initial contact in culturally-plural societies, where ethnocultural communities maintain features of their heritage cultures, and where they interact with others in the larger society.

Acculturation takes place in various ways; it is a multidimensional process. The adaptations that groups and individuals make to living in culture-contact settings take place over time. Occasionally this process is stressful, but often it results in some form of mutual accommodation, which refers to the changes that groups and individuals in both groups make in



order to live together in relative harmony. Most recent acculturation research has focused on how immigrants (both voluntary and involuntary) have changed following their entry into and settlement in receiving societies (see Sam & Berry, 2006, for an overview of this literature). Nowadays, there are many different kinds of peoples in contact. In addition to immigrants, refugees and sojourners (such as guestworkers) constitute important groups that experience intercultural contacts as a result of social, political and economic factors. Acculturating groups experience various outcomes from this process, such as discrimination and rejection. Furthermore, they often have to compete with dominant communities for recognition and equitable access to resources. However, acculturation also takes place by way of globalization, as cultural influences spread around the world to local populations.

Graves (1967) introduced the concept of psychological acculturation, which refers to changes in an individual who is a participant in a culture contact situation, being influenced both by the external (usually dominant) culture, and by the changing (usually non-dominant) culture of which the individual is a member. There are two reasons for keeping the cultural and psychological levels distinct. The first is that most acculturation researchers view individual human behaviour as interacting with the cultural context within which it occurs; hence separate conceptions and measurements are required at the two levels (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis & Sam, 2011). The second reason is that not every individual enters into, or participates in the dominant culture, or changes in the same way during their acculturation; there are vast individual differences in psychological acculturation, even among individuals who have the same cultural origin and who live in the same acculturative arena.

Berry (2006) developed a framework that outlines and links cultural and psychological acculturation, and identifies the two (or more) groups in contact (see also Sam & Berry, 2010).

This framework portrays a number of features of the acculturation process, at both the group and individual levels. At the group level are key features of the two original cultural groups prior to their major contact. Migrants and members of the receiving society bring cultural and psychological qualities with them to the contact setting. The compatibility (or incompatibility) in cultural features and personal attributes between the two cultural communities in contact needs to be examined as a basis for understanding the acculturation process that is set in motion following contact. Second, it is important to understand the nature of the contact relationship between the groups. It may be one of domination of one group over the other, of mutual hostility, or respect. Third, we need to understand the resulting cultural changes that emerge during the process of acculturation in both groups. No cultural group remains unchanged following culture contact; acculturation is a two-way interaction, resulting in actions and reactions to the contact situation (see chapter by Kagitcibasi, this volume) . In many cases, most change takes place in the non-dominant communities; however, all societies of settlement (particularly metropolitan cities) have experienced massive transformations following periods of receiving migrants. These changes can be minor or substantial, and range from being easily accomplished to being a source of major cultural disruption.

At the individual level, we need to consider the psychological changes that individuals in all groups undergo, and their eventual adaptation to their new situations. These changes can be a set of rather easily accomplished behavioural shifts (e.g., in ways of speaking, dressing, and eating) or they can be more problematic (e.g., producing acculturative stress; Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1997) as manifested by uncertainty, anxiety, and depression. Adaptations can be primarily psychological (e.g., sense of well-being, or self-esteem) or sociocultural (Ward,

Bochner, & Furnham, 2001), linking the individual to others in the new society as manifested, for example, in competence in the activities of daily intercultural living.

There are important individual and group differences in the way that people seek to address the process of acculturation. These variations have become known as acculturation strategies (Berry, 1980). This concept signifies preferences regarding how to acculturate, and include attitudes (towards ways of acculturating), behaviours (such as language use, friendship choices), and cultural identities (both national and ethnic). Clearly these aspects of acculturation differ from one another (Liebkind, 2001; Liebkind et al, this volume): some refer to attitudinal preferences; others refer to cultural practices, including retention and change; and yet others refer to feelings of belonging.

From the point of view of immigrant and ethnocultural groups, there are four acculturation strategies. When individuals do not wish to maintain their cultural heritage and seek daily participation with other cultures in the larger society, the assimilation strategy is defined. In contrast, when group members place a value on holding on to their original culture, and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others, then the separation alternative is defined. When there is an interest in both maintaining one's original culture and interacting with other groups, integration is the strategy. Finally, when there is little possibility or interest in cultural maintenance (often for reasons of enforced cultural loss), and little interest in having relations with other groups (often for reasons of discrimination) then marginalization occurs.

From the point of view of the receiving society, other terms are employed. Assimilation, when sought by the dominant group, is termed the melting pot. When separation is forced by the dominant group, it is referred to as segregation. Marginalization, when imposed by the dominant group, is exclusion. Finally, for integration, when diversity is a widely-accepted feature of the

society as a whole, and embraces all the various ethnocultural groups, it is called multiculturalism.

An important question is whether there are relationships between the acculturation strategies of members of non-dominant groups and the acculturation expectations of the larger society. The two sets of strategies are parallel approaches to acculturation. Research on this issue has been carried out since the 1970s (Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977), and has been the focus of interactive acculturation models (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Kagitcibasi, this volume; Navas, Rojas, García, & Pumares, 2007).

During the course of development, features of the culture are transmitted from individual to individual. Berry et al. (2011) described three sources of cultural transmission, i.e. from parents, teachers and peers to child, arguing that in all three cases the influence is in fact bidirectional. During the process of acculturation, an individual becomes enmeshed in a network of multiple interpersonal and intergroup relations. For immigrant youth, these multiple relationships are typically more complex than for non-immigrant youth. Most people in non-immigrant children's proximal environment represent one culture; these contribute to their enculturation (i.e., the transmission of their own culture). However, immigrant children interact with people who represent at least two different cultures. Parents, members of the family's ethnocultural group and same ethnicity peers transmit the culture of the country of origin. Teachers and native peers transmit the culture of the receiving society. This interplay between cultural transmission from within a person's own ethnocultural group and from the new culture constitutes the complex matrix of cultural influences during the course of development among acculturating youth.

To summarize, acculturation for immigrant children involves learning the characteristics of two cultures mainly through their interactions with people in their proximal environment.

However, the contexts that are responsible for their acculturation also mirror the beliefs of the wider society regarding multiculturalism, which have a significant impact on their adaptation

### **A Social Psychological Perspective**

Despite their long interest in intergroup relations, identity, and prejudice, social psychologists only recently focused specifically on ethnicity and migration (see Chryssochoou 2000, 2004; Deaux, 2006; Verkuyten 2005). Immigration challenges the real and symbolic boundaries of nation-states and as a consequence, changes the framework of representations, intergroup relations, and identity dynamics. It is within this new context that both immigrant and non-immigrant youth grow up.

Social psychologists have suggested that in order to understand the phenomenon of immigration and ethnic identity, we need to consider different levels of analysis (Deaux 2006; Verkuyten, 2005). The following levels have been suggested (Doise, 1986): the individual, the inter-individual, the group (positions and intergroup relations), and the societal (ideologies, representations institutional constraints). Although social psychology focuses on the processes involved at the societal and group contexts, there is growing interest in inter-individual processes and interactions (Verkuyten, 2005) and on individual differences. In fact, according to Moscovici (1988) social psychology is characterized by the mediation of others (real or symbolic, individuals or groups) in the relation between an organism and the social context. Social psychology can contribute to the understanding of immigrant youth adaptation and development by investigating how, directly or through others (individuals, groups, media or even virtual communities if one thinks of social networks on the internet), the social context becomes salient and influences choices and behaviors. To do so, it is important to analyze how

individuals and groups perceive the social context and what the consequences of this perception are.

Several issues in immigrant research are of social psychological interest. Social psychology focuses on how beliefs and representations are generated and what they do for the life of individuals and groups. Another research interest is how identities are constructed, enacted, and mobilized, and with what consequences for intergroup relations and social cohesion (see also chapter by Verkuyten, this volume). Moreover, social psychology investigates how power dynamics and social positions influence social relations. These issues characterize the social context, as perceived by individuals and groups, mainly at two different levels of analysis: the societal and the group level.

As discussed in the previous section, for immigrant youth the proximal contexts (family, school, peers, neighborhood in which they are socialized (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) comprise both the cultures of origin and the culture of the receiving society (Berry, 1997). Moreover, their immigrant status gives them an additional social position beyond the one attached to their gender. Often this position coincides with a low socio-economic status (see also chapter by Nolan, this volume) and it is unclear whether the way they are perceived and treated relates to their different cultural background, their social class, or both. Thus, immigrant youth need to understand this position, overcome the barriers that may exist to their advancement and use the resources they have in order to succeed.

What are the challenges immigrant youth face? The societal level is characterized by the different belief systems and social representations that exist in the society at large as well as their culture of origin (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2006). These representations include beliefs regarding the way the receiving society is representing itself (i.e., as a culturally homogeneous nation, as a

multicultural nation, as an immigration nation) and its relation to the new members (i.e., former colonial subjects, new economic immigrants). Research has shown that beliefs about multiculturalism and essentialistic beliefs about the ingroup and the outgroup influence intergroup relations and the acceptance of the new immigrants by others (Verkuyten & Brug, 2004). Representations also affect beliefs about individual mobility and success. Beliefs about the legitimacy of the system, perceptions of acculturative expectations, and social mobility have been found to intervene in the choices of immigrants and their social insertion (Bourhis et al., 1997). All these beliefs are transmitted as part of the general process of cultural transmission by different agents of influence and “entrepreneurs of identity” (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001) to the young people. They are communicated through politicians, media, and the education and migration policies either directly or through youngsters’ proximal environment (family, neighborhood, teachers, and peers) and influence both individual and collective choices. Research needs to investigate further which of these factors contributes to the well-being and successful development of immigrant youth and which are obstructing them.

Immigrant youth occupy different positions: they are young, of immigrant origins, with particular cultural, national and religious backgrounds; they often grow up in poor families and differ on gender ideologies. These identities are constructed within a framework of intergroup relations often characterized by power asymmetries and competition. Discrimination and negative stereotypes are the outcomes of these power asymmetries that have important consequences for the everyday life of young people (see also chapter by Liebkind et al. this volume). Discriminative behaviors and negative stereotyping from majority members communicate to young people the position they have in society and the level of success that they can obtain, and they undermine people’s well-being (Jasinskaja-Lahti & Liebkind, 2007).

Restricted social mobility and feelings of injustice might lead young people to become marginalized, to reject the receiving society, and to consider themselves to be only members of their ethnic group (Berry et al., 2006) or to fight collectively to redress these inequalities. The specific conditions that would lead to either choice are investigated with particular groups and social conditions.

Of particular interest is how young people of immigrant descent negotiate different memberships and combine social identities, and how discrimination influences this process (see also chapter by Sirin and Gupta, this volume). Any social identity carries “the project” of the group it represents (Chrysochoou, 2003). It is well established in social psychology that people wish to belong to groups that are considered worthy in society. Thus, when the opportunity is open to belong to a more valued group, people would do so (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). However, this could mean for immigrants to psychologically de-identify with their heritage culture which could be difficult and painful. Although immigration positions often people in a low socio-economic level, their cultural identity and their socio-economic status should not be confused (Liebkind, 2001).

However, in the case of migration, the process becomes more complex. Receiving societies might not give the opportunity to members of low status immigrant groups to become full members of the national ingroup. In addition, discrimination might lead immigrants to reactive ethnicity (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999; Rumbaut, 2008) that would feed the receiving society’s beliefs and fears about immigrants’ divided loyalties. In turn, these beliefs would undermine immigrants’ perception of compatibility between ethnic and national identities with consequences for well-being and intergroup attitudes (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim, 2009; see also chapter by Liebkind et al., this volume). It is also possible that members



of the receiving society sustain beliefs of incompatibility between identities in order to maintain their privileges (Chrysochoou & Lyons, 2011). This context frames young people's choices and actions.

Power asymmetries have consequences both at the level of the individual and at the level of society at large. Discrimination and low status foster negative stereotypes that impact self perception and reduce possibilities of advancement. In particular, it was found that when members of minorities are aware of the negative stereotype existing in a particular domain against them, the fear of confirming the stereotype (stereotype threat) might have disrupting effects and might block them in such a way that they end up failing and thus confirming it (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998). Stereotype threat, fear of rejection, and situations where devalued identity is made salient might lead young people of immigrant descent to disengage from particular domains, such as education, putting their future at risk and confirming predicted negative outcomes for their social group.

Being identified with the receiving group is a marker of inclusion and positive intergroup attitudes. Moreover, the development of dual identity has been shown to be related to the politicization of immigrants and to their better social integration in society (Simon & Rhus, 2008). As the climate developed in the receiving society and the perceptions and threats felt by all groups involved are important aspects of the context, social psychological research has focused particularly on the receiving society in order to understand the threats felt by majorities due to migration and to be able to propose possible interventions (Green, 2007). However, the context is rapidly changing and it is important to study how minority groups and individuals react to these changes. For instance, in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the context became extremely negative for Muslims in the US and research showed how young

people were obliged to quickly re-negotiate their identities as Muslims and American (Sirin & Fine, 2008; see also chapter by Sirin and Gupta, this volume). Social psychological research, aiming to unpack the societal and group contexts and their consequences, needs to be included with studies of the development and adaptation of immigrant youth in the larger social framework that facilitates or obstructs adaptation.

### **Successful Adaptation of Immigrant Youth**

In order to integrate these three distinct disciplinary perspectives to account for individual differences in immigrant youth adaptation, it is important to address the issues inherent in defining successful adaptation. Developmental and acculturation psychologies each offer a unique perspective on how successful adaptation might be defined.

In developmental psychology, as noted above, developmental task theory offers a conceptual framework for judging positive adaptation in children. Success can be defined in terms of competence in age-salient developmental tasks (Masten et al., 2006). The quality of children's adaptation is assessed based on whether they meet the expectations and standards for behavior and achievement related to these tasks, that parents, teachers, and society set for them, and that they themselves usually come to share.

In this perspective, adaptive success is multidimensional and developmental in nature (McCormick, Kuo, & Masten, in press; Masten et al., 2006). Success in a toddler or preschooler might be defined, for example, by achievements such as learning to walk and talk, early identity understanding (e.g., that one is a boy or girl), and early forms of behavioral self-control (beginning to comply with rules and commands when an adult is present). Success in the adolescent years might be defined, for example, by success in school, having close friends, knowing and obeying the laws of the society, more advanced self-control (e.g., complying with

rules of the family when no one is monitoring), and establishing a cohesive, integrated and multifaceted sense of identity.

Children do not pass or fail these tasks. However, the effectiveness with which they engage and master these developmental challenges has significant implications for their self-perceptions, as well as for the way others perceive them and their future prospects. As noted above, the quality of children's adaptation with respect to the tasks of one developmental period forecasts success or failure in future developmental tasks (Masten et al., 2006).

Developmental tasks can be organized in broad domains: individual development, relationships with parents, teachers, and peers, and functioning in the proximal environment and in the broader social world (Sroufe et al., 2005). For example, self-regulation and identity formation are developmental tasks pertinent to individual development. School adjustment and success, civic engagement, and political participation of youth are tasks that characterize their functioning in the proximal and distal social environments. Furthermore, forming and maintaining positive relationships with parents, teachers, and peers are significant goals throughout development, and are concurrently and over time related to success in other domains of adaptation.

There are some commonalities in developmental tasks across cultures and also some differences. Developmental task theory places adaptation and development in cultural and historical context (Masten et al., 2006), but the complexities of adaptation in the context of multiple cultures with potentially conflicting developmental task expectations has not been well elucidated to date (McCormick et al., 2011). Particularly problematic for understanding adaptation of immigrant youth is the assumption that they are faced with only one set of developmental tasks, the one defined by the dominant culture. This monoculture assumption is

called into question in the case of immigrant children, whose lives are embedded in proximal contexts representing at least two different cultures (Oppedal, 2006; Sam, 2006). For immigrants, parental ethnotheories, which refer to the values and beliefs parents consider adaptive for success in their culture (Harkness & Super, 1996), and which guide the cultural pathways they provide their children (Weisner, 2002), and their child-rearing practices (Ogbu, 1991), may be at odds with the criteria for success set by teachers. In a context where youth are faced with contradictory developmental goals, expectations, and relatedly, socialization practices, adaptation with respect to developmental issues may be more challenging than it is for their non-immigrant peers.

The success of immigrant children's adaptation is, therefore, not only judged by the way they deal with developmental challenges, but also by the way they deal with the challenges of simultaneously enculturating and acculturating, and of living with and growing between two cultures. This point leads to consideration of the acculturative tasks that immigrant youth face. Based on evidence that the learning and maintenance of both cultures, is conducive to better developmental outcomes and psychological well-being (Berry et al., 2006; Sam, 2006), immigrant children are faced with the task of learning the language, values, beliefs, behaviors, and customs that are typical of the larger society, as well as those of their home culture (Sam, 2006; Oppedal, 2006), of making sense of, and of bridging, their different worlds (Cooper, 2003), and of developing positive ethnic and national identities (Phinney et al., 2001).

Developmental and acculturative tasks are intricately related. To be successful in dealing with certain developmental tasks such as doing well in school, immigrant children need to have achieved a level of competence in the language and other facets of the receiving society's culture (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2006). It follows that positive school adjustment

is an index that adaptation with respect to both developmental and acculturative tasks is proceeding well. Furthermore, maintaining positive relations with parents during adolescence presupposes that the immigrant child is able to strike a balance, through the processes of accommodation and negotiation with parents, between demands for autonomy and willingness to adhere to family values (Kuczynski & Navara, 2006; Kwak, 2003).

It should be noted here that the term “sociocultural adaptation”, as used by acculturation psychologists, refers primarily to “doing well” in school and other dominant-culture environments. These indices of adaptation would be encompassed under the broader rubric of developmental tasks in the developmental science concept described above.

The need to evaluate the success of immigrant youth adaptation raises questions related to the norms against which to compare their behavior and achievement. Current behavior and performance that is related to youth’s future adaptation in the receiving society should be compared to that of their native peers. For example, doing adequately well in school, which presupposes receiving grades that are comparable to the normative performance of native students, and not dropping out early, are important markers of present adaptation and forerunners of future adaptation in society for both immigrant and native youth (Masten & Motti-Stefanidi, 2009).

A related issue concerns the values that should be used when evaluating adaptive outcomes, especially when the private values, i.e., the values related to linguistic and cultural activities, to religious expression, and to the domestic and interpersonal domains of the family (Bourhis et al., 1997), and those of the larger society are at odds with each other. Bourhis et al. (1997) noted that Western nation states, independently of their ideological orientation regarding the acculturation of immigrants, expect that immigrants will adopt the public values of the host

country. However, success could be judged not by whether immigrant youth have espoused either set of values, but by whether they have been able to select, interpret, resist, or manage the competing messages stemming from their family, school, peers and the media, and to form their unique working models of culture (Kuczynski & Navara, 2006).

Another important marker of positive adaptation is good internal functioning (versus distress and misery) (Masten et al., 2006). The presence of self-esteem and life satisfaction, and the absence of emotional symptoms are common markers of psychological well being used by developmental and acculturative researchers (e.g., Berry et al., 2006; Masten et al., 2006). The evidence is contradictory regarding the psychological well being of immigrant, compared to native, youth (e.g., Berry et al., 2006; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos, Obradović & Masten, 2008; Alegría et al., 2008). Immigrant youth's psychological well being seems to be related to several factors, including the immigration policies of the society of settlement, and their acculturation orientations (Berry et al., 2006; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos, Obradović & Masten, 2008). Psychological well-being and successful adaptation with respect to developmental and acculturative tasks are all interrelated, mutually influencing each other, both concurrently and across time.

A seminal study, the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY) project, conducted in 13 countries, examined 5366 immigrant youth, aged 13 to 18 years, and studied their adaptation with respect to developmental and acculturative tasks and their psychological well-being (Berry et al., 2006). The group level analyses comparing immigrant and national youth revealed that, on the whole, the groups were equally well-adjusted. In some cases the immigrant youth were better adjusted with respect to developmental tasks, such as school adjustment and lack of conduct problems, than the national youth. The two groups did not

differ with respect to their psychological well-being. Furthermore, it was found that immigrant youth who developed competencies in both their home culture and the culture of the new society did better with respect to the developmental tasks examined, but not with respect to psychological well-being. Immigrant youth with an ethnic orientation fared better with respect to developmental tasks and also reported higher psychological well being, although the effect was stronger for the latter.

The question of how well immigrant children are adapting with respect to different developmental tasks compared to their native classmates remains an unresolved issue to date, with contradictory findings in the literature. In recent years, a number of mainly North American researchers have reported, for example, findings revealing that some immigrant students are doing better in school than their national peers, and in any case better than expected given the fact that they live with higher socioeconomic risk (e.g., Berry et al., 2006; Fuligni, 1997; Kao & Tienda, 1995). The presence of this phenomenon, which came to be known as the “immigrant paradox” (see also chapter by García-Coll et al., this volume), refers to the finding that first generation immigrants show better adaptation than either their national peers or second generation immigrants, and/or the finding that second generation immigrants’ adaptation appears to be on par or worse than that of their national peers (Sam, Vedder, Liebkind, Neto, & Virta, 2008). Sam et al. (2008) also pointed out that the immigrant paradox seems to hold for adaptation with respect to developmental tasks (such as school adjustment) but not with respect to psychological well-being. In contrast to these findings, other researchers have reported a significant achievement gap between immigrant and native youth (e.g., Cooper, 2003; Motti-Stefanidi, Pavlopoulos, Obradović, et al., 2008).

In the rest of this section, positive adaptation of immigrant youth is discussed in terms of key developmental and acculturative tasks and contexts. The focus is on tasks of central interest in the developmental, acculturation and social psychological literatures.

### *School Adjustment*

Schools are one of the most important developmental contexts for all children and adolescents in contemporary societies. They play an instrumental role in helping children acquire the knowledge and the thinking skills, as well as the behaviors and values that are considered important for the welfare of both youth and society. For immigrant children and adolescents, schools also serve as one of the main acculturative contexts, since they represent, and introduce the immigrants to, the culture of the receiving society (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; see also chapter by Horenzcyk & Tartar, this volume). A successful trajectory through school is an asset for the future employment opportunities and choices of most youth (Masten & Motti-Stefanidi, 2009), and is considered by many immigrant students as the avenue for upward social mobility and for a better life than their parents had (Fuligni, 1997).

Different individual characteristics, such as cognitive abilities (Masten et al., 2006), proficiency in the language of the receiving culture, (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2006), as well as, a strong motivation to succeed in school (Fuligni, 1997) are linked to academic achievement. The acculturation orientation has also been shown to be related to school achievement among immigrant youth. According to some studies a bicultural orientation (Berry et al., 2006; Phinney et al., 2001), and according to others, a national, not an ethnic or a bicultural (e.g. Motti-Stefanidi, et al., 2008), have been shown to be linked to better school adjustment. Finally, a number of school characteristics, such as non-differential treatment by teachers (Roeser, et al.,



1998), family, and peer factors have been shown to also contribute to a positive school outcome (Fuligni, 1997; see also chapter by Horenzcyk & Tartar, this volume).

### *Family Relations*

Maintaining positive family relations is an important task throughout development. During adolescence this task requires “letting go” of the complete dependence on parents and other family members for care and survival, to take on adult-like roles and to contribute to the care, well-being and survival of others (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003). For adolescents to achieve this task, parents have to resolve a challenging issue: allowing the increasingly maturing and competent adolescent to make decisions and be increasingly responsible for his or her life vis-à-vis sustaining the close bond that has characterized their relationship with the child during the first decade of life (Kağitçibaşı, 2007).

Some developmental scientists regard this developmental task in adolescence as the period of individuation, and separation, which is characterized by increasing time with, and influence of peers and growing attachments to peers. The idea that this developmental task entails separation from parents has been questioned in recent years, particularly with respect to diverse cultures (e.g., Georgas, Berry, van de Vijver, Kağitçibaşı, & Poortinga, 2006; Kwak, 2003). Research suggests that the assumed separation process entails finding a balance between what has variously been referred to as “autonomy and relatedness” or “individuation and connectedness” (Kroger, 2007; Ryan & Lynch, 1989; see also chapter by Kağitçibaşı, this volume). Finding the correct balance is suggested to be conducive for adolescent adjustment, as the balance provides children the opportunity to develop the ability to think and act independently within the context of supportive relationships with parents (e.g., Kuczynski & Navara, 2006 ).

Research further suggests that families and societies differ in the extent to which they emphasize the “autonomy-relatedness” balance; with Western industrialized societies emphasizing more “autonomy”, and non-Western societies emphasizing more “relatedness”. According to the eco-cultural model of Berry et al. (2011), these differences in emphasis in socialization reflect the different eco-cultural challenges faced in different societies.

Through socialization and enculturation, in what has been referred to as cultural transmission (Schönpflug, 2008; Vedder et al., 2009), parents and societies inculcate in their children the culture of the society. During these processes, the prevailing norms, values and beliefs of the society (which have arisen as an adaptation to the eco-cultural challenges) may be passed on. The autonomy-relatedness balance takes its root in the two fundamental types of cultural values: (1) assertiveness, independence, competitiveness, and autonomy on the one hand, and (2) compliance, nurturing, and obedience, with both being transmitted during enculturation and socialization. The extent to which “autonomy” or “relatedness” is emphasized, expected, and granted during adolescence depends on the society (Rothbaum, Pott, Azuma, Miyake, & Weisz, 2000), the ethnic group (Phinney, Kim-Jo, Osorio, & Vilhjalmsdott, 2005), and the socioeconomic conditions of the family (Kağitçibaşı, 2007).

In an immigration context, the development of autonomy and relatedness get complicated because both parents and adolescents are involved in an acculturation process. During this process, adolescents and parents have different experiences of cultures, and different future expectations (Bornstein & Cote, 2006; Kwak, 2003), and this may result in conflicts within the family. For example, in the ICSEY study (Berry et al., 2006), the values held by youth and their parents with respect to youth obligations and youth rights differed in both the immigrant samples and in the larger society. However, this difference was greater in the immigrant samples.

Moreover, the greater the generational difference in the obligations valued in the immigrant samples, the worse the psychological well-being and adaptation of immigrant youth with respect to developmental tasks. This is an example of one of the the commonest form of conflict within immigrant families, variously known as the “assimilation gap”; “acculturation gap”; “intergenerational gap” and “developmental gap” (Merz, Özeke-Kocabas, Oort, & Schuengel, 2009).

### *Peer Relations*

Peer relations are important both for children’s development and their acculturation. Developing and maintaining positive peer relations is an important developmental task that forecasts future adaptation (Masten et al., 2006). Youth who relate well to normative peers at school also perceive school more favorably and perform better in the classroom. On the other hand, peer rejection has been shown to predict, longitudinally, poor academic achievement and truancy. Furthermore, children and adolescents who get along with peers, have friends, and are accepted by classmates, show higher self-esteem and fewer behavioral and emotional symptoms than their rejected peers, currently and over time (for review see Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006).

Peer relations are closely linked with the previously described developmental task of “autonomy and relatedness.” These two developmental tasks seem to go hand-in-hand: as adolescents enter into the autonomy phase, often spending less time with their parents, they also spend increasing time with and develop closer friendships with peers.

Children and adolescents often choose friends who are similar to themselves in terms of socio-economic status, ethnicity, and chronological age. Consistent with this phenomenon, termed “friendship homophily”, immigrant youth tend to choose their friends from within their

own ethnic group (Quillian & Campbell, 2003; Strohmeier & Spiel, 2003; Titzmann & Silbereisen, 2009; see also chapter by Spiel et al., this volume). However, length of residence in the new country and ethnic composition of the neighbourhood are related to immigrant youth choices regarding their friends. Longer residence in the society of settlement and living in more ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, are related to more contact with national peers than with peers from their own ethnic group (Phinney, Berry, Vedder, & Liebkind, 2006).

Friendships from one's own ethnic group and/or from the national society likely play fundamental roles in the processes of acculturation. It could be argued that association with national peers helps introduce immigrant youth to the new culture, and association with ethnic peers supports immigrant parents' efforts at maintaining the home culture.

#### *Civic engagement and political participation*

Civic engagement and political participation in the context of immigration includes both involvement in the political sphere and involvement with others in the community (Jensen & Flanagan, 2008). It concerns forms of political and civic participation such as voting, protesting, volunteering, joining associations, and assuming leadership positions. Civic engagement is considered to "enhance development by giving people positive motivations, beneficial peer networks, feelings of worth and longer time horizons" (Levine, 2008). Those youth who engage in civic and political activities are more likely to be successful in other domains. For young people, in general, being civically engaged is an indication of their interest in the society in which they live (see also chapter by Silbereisen et al., this volume). For immigrant youth, it is also an indicator of their inclusion in this society. Research (Lopez & Marcelo, 2008) has shown that the civic engagement rates of immigrant and non-immigrant youth in the US are similar.

Both contexts of immigrant youth (ethnic group and society of settlement) are possible environments for civic engagement. Immigrant youth have civic assets because of their biculturalism that enable them to contribute to both cultures (Jensen, 2008, see also chapter by Lerner et al., this volume), and civic activities are an indicator of how they negotiate the relationship between the two societies. They can be engaged in activities that promote the aims, values and needs of their ethnic group and/or of the receiving society according to their understanding of how the “social contract” applies to people like them (Wray-Lake, Syversten, & Flanagan, 2008). The terms of this contract are filtered through lay theories and stereotypes of the dominant group about particular ethnic groups and multiculturalism (Sirin & Fine, 2008). Young people of immigrant descent learn what it means to be a citizen through everyday experiences and challenges, such as discrimination. Their perception of the receiving society as just or not relates to these experiences.

People’s engagement in civic activities might be an expression of a collective identity. When this identity concerns the ethnic group, the sense of “we” might include shared grievances, ethnic pride, common cultural and religious values and a common fate. If the ethnic group has a low position within society, people might opt to abandon it and join the high status group. This is why often, for immigrant youth, mobility has been erroneously conflated with assimilation (Waters, 2008). However, young people could act as group members to enhance the position of their ethnic group when the boundaries of the groups are not permeable and when they perceive the asymmetries between groups as illegitimate and changeable (Tajfel, 1974).

Identifying as a member of the ethnic group, however, is not enough for engaging in collective political activities. To do so it is important that a *politicized collective identity* is formed. Simon and Klandermans (2001) propose three antecedents for the formation of a

politicized collective identity: a) awareness of shared grievances, b) adversarial attribution and c) involvement of the wider society in the conflict. This theorization considers political participation as the outcome of processes of social influence (Mugny, 1982). Thus, for participation three poles should be present: a minority group with a collective identity and awareness of shared grievances, a powerful adversary to who blame for one's condition is attributed and society at large that is supposed to take position. If young immigrants acknowledge that their ethnic group suffers from injustice, attribute this condition to a particular group, institution, or authority, and seek to win the support of the larger society, they become collectively politicized and might engage in actions of protest and claiming. To do so they need to claim inclusion in the wider social group (Jensen, 2008).

In cross-sectional and longitudinal studies with Turks in Germany (Simon & Rhus, 2008), the authors concluded that dual identification with the ethnic group and the receiving society is not a consequence of prior politicization, but rather is its antecedent. Moreover, identification with Germany reduced acceptance of political violence and was associated with weakened support for radical ingroups over time, especially for those with strong Turkish identification. It is possible that those young people who follow an integration strategy and develop a dual identification are more prone to engage in political activities on behalf of their ethnic group within the wider context of the receiving society. Their political participation might also signal that they feel included in this society.

### *Identity Formation*

The formation of a secure, coherent identity is one of the primary tasks of adolescence (Erikson, 1968). For immigrant youth, a secure identity is central to dealing with the differing demands of their multicultural context and becoming a productive member of society.

According to Erikson (1968), the process of achieving an identity is located “in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his [sic] communal culture” (p. 22). Individuals do not form an identity in isolation; the contexts in which adolescents grow up are as important as the individual’s actions and choices. Contexts of identity formation can both enhance and restrict the formation of adult identities, depending on the extent to which they provide options and obstacles (Ogbu, 1991). For all youth, the family, peer group, and community are key factors in determining whether young people achieve a coherent and stable identity (Kroger, 2007). For immigrant youth, these settings include differing, often conflicting, expectations and possibilities.

Identity formation is strongly influenced by parental expectations and goals. In many cases, families immigrate to a new country in order to provide educational and career opportunities for their children. However, immigrant parents often lack the background to understand the issues that children face. Parents may be too uninformed or busy working multiple jobs to provide the guidance the youth need in developing an identity in a diverse society (Fuligni & Fuligni, 2007; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

Schools and school classmates are also important influences on identity formation, as young people strive to find their place in the world. When peers, teachers, or the community do not provide positive role models and options, immigrant youth often find their identities in the underclass of gangs and other antisocial activities (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). A secure identity helps young people to deal more effectively with challenges in their communities and in the larger society and to integrate the differing demands of each (Kiang, Yip, & Fuligni, 2008).

Identity formation for adolescents involves making decisions across various domains important to their lives, such as occupation, religion, gender, and lifestyle. For immigrant youth, cultural identity, that is, a secure sense of oneself as a cultural being, is arguably the most important identity domain. To achieve a secure cultural identity, young people must explore and internalize feelings and attitudes regarding who they are in relation to the diverse and often conflicting values, attitudes, and practices in their multiple contexts (Sirin & Fine, 2008); they must develop a sense of belonging to one or more cultural groups. However, immigrants may have broad contacts with their new society and adopt its language and customs without necessarily self-identifying as part of the national group or giving up their ethnic identity (Snauwaert et al., 2003).

Across virtually all immigrant studies, the dominant and preferred pattern of identity in immigrant youth is a bicultural identity, in which individuals have a strong sense of belonging to both their ethnic culture and the larger dominant or mainstream culture (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). Nevertheless, some youth retain a separated ethnic identity, often as a result of obstacles or rejection that prevents them from identifying with the larger society. Other youth may strive for an assimilated national identity. These differing identity patterns are formed as young people wrestle with the demands of the environment and make decisions across the diverse contexts of their lives, including family, peers, school, and community (see also Verkuyten, this volume).

Within the family, adolescents balance competing pressures as they try to resolve questions about adherence to ethnic or national cultural values. Immigrant adolescents must make daily decisions on how to deal with parents over cultural differences, such as parents' more restrictive attitudes on whom to date or on the choice of college major (Phinney et al., 2005).



Parents may influence these decisions, for example, with the expectation that one child will maintain the ethnic traditions (Pyke, 2005). As a result, one sibling in a family may remain strongly ethnically identified while another becomes more identified with the larger society.

Immigrant adolescents face similar cultural identity negotiations among their peers. They may feel pressure from their same-ethnic peers to remain identified with their own group (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). Conversely, recently arrived immigrant youth may be scorned by American-born peers for being too ethnic (Palmer, 2007). The process of constructing a cultural identity requires young people to explore these issues and decide where they stand.

The ethnic composition of schools also influences cultural identity processes. In many immigrant communities, schools are often made up of diverse immigrant groups, so that cultural identity issues involve defining oneself in relation to other minority groups, rather than to the larger society (Way, Santos, Niwa, & Kim-Gervey, 2008). The ethnic composition of their communities constrains the identity options of young immigrants. In communities that are almost entirely ethnic, a strong ethnic identity may be more common than a bicultural identity (Berry et al., 2006). In order to become bicultural, young people need opportunities to meet and interact with members of the larger society.

However, contact with the mainstream society can result in experiences of discrimination and rejection that constrain the development of a national identity. Although most immigrants arrive with a desire to become part of their new country, they often meet obstacles to doing so (Liebkind, Jasinkaja-Lahti, & Mähönen, this volume; Sirin & Fine, 2008). Immigrants who are discriminated against are less likely to identify with the larger society or become bicultural (Berry et al., 2006). Nevertheless, most immigrants are not passive in the face of discrimination; rather, they resist and challenge discrimination (Phinney, 2006; Sirin & Fine, 2008). The

development of a secure ethnic identity can serve as a buffer against discrimination (Lee, 2005; Verkuyten, this volume). Encouraging cultural retention among immigrants leads to stronger ethnic communities that provide support for young people to develop positive cultural identities and resist the destructive effects of discrimination.

Cultural identity develops within the context of larger social and historical forces (Bhatia & Ram, 2001). It is easier for immigrants to feel accepted in societies with a strong history of immigration, such as the United States and Canada, than in those where immigration is a recent phenomenon (Berry et al., 2006). Furthermore, with longer residence in their country of settlement, more immigrant youth have bicultural identities and fewer show the confusion of a diffuse identity (Berry et al., 2006).

In summary, developing a secure cultural identity involves integrating multiple influences, both developmental and acculturative. In situations that provide opportunities for exploration, young people can match their own preferences, abilities, and goals with choices that allow for continued productive development. If their choices are restricted or lacking in positive options, they may turn to destructive means of self-validation. When societies provide basic supports to immigrants, such as educational and occupational choices, and promote positive and accepting attitudes toward them in the larger society, immigrant youth can achieve secure cultural identities that form the basis for becoming productive members of society.

### *Cultural Competence*

Successful adaptation in the areas discussed above forms the basis of cultural competence. Culturally competent individuals have gained the knowledge and skills to live comfortably within their various cultural contexts (Clement & Noels, 1992; Oppedal, 2006). They are able to communicate effectively in the ethnic and national languages and to switch between them as

necessary. They can socialize with friends from their own and other groups. They are aware of the differing practices and values of various groups and can choose among them as appropriate. To achieve such cultural competence, immigrant youth must successfully negotiate their multiple worlds of family, peers, school, and society, by learning how to navigate across cultural borders (Liebkind, 2001).

In a study of students in diverse high schools in California, Phelan, Davidson, and Yu (1998) identified the many borders that these youth must negotiate, including psychological, sociocultural, socioeconomic, linguistic, and gender related borders. They must learn to deal with structural borders, such as institutional factors that impede students from doing well in school, due to lack of information, resources, or services.

Adolescents from immigrant families vary in the extent to which they are able to accomplish this negotiation process. Phelan and her colleagues found four different patterns of adaptation to the challenges of their multiple worlds. For non-immigrant youth, mainly those from European American backgrounds, the worlds of family, school, and peers were congruent so that there were minimal problems in making transitions among them. However, for students with differing or non-congruent cultural worlds, that is, most immigrant youth, the authors found three patterns that differed in how and how well the students fared. One group, the more culturally competent, was able to manage border crossings and adapt to different settings, by either alternating between settings or blending aspects of different worlds. A second group found border crossings difficult, causing discomfort or friction, due, for example, to values or practices that differed between home and school. These students were struggling to adjust, and they were more likely to do poorly in school. A third group perceived the borders so incongruent that crossing them was resisted or seen as impossible. These students showed the poorest adaptation;

they might therefore reject school completely or immerse themselves in their peer culture. This research highlights the complex, interactive nature of the acculturation process. Immigrant youth may want to become integrated into their multicultural communities, but if the barriers between their cultural worlds are difficult or impossible for them to cross, they will have little opportunity to develop as culturally competent members of society.

### **An Integrative Framework for Research on Immigrant Youth Adaptation**

Immigrant youth adaptation, arising from multifaceted and multidetermined processes, cannot be accounted for by any one discipline, and certainly not from one subdiscipline of psychology. The full story of who among immigrant youth succeeds and why requires a multidisciplinary and integrative approach. Here, as a first step, we focus on integrating the developmental, acculturation and social psychological perspectives. These approaches to the study of the phenomenon of immigration, in general, and of immigrant youth adaptation, in particular, are based on different paradigms and intellectual traditions, have different emphases, focus on different research questions, and follow different methods in this area of investigation. However, to build a more comprehensive understanding of positive adaptation in immigrant youth, it is important to bring these perspectives together.

A model of our integrative framework is provided in Figure 1. The backbone of the model is conceived in three levels, i.e., the individual level, the level of interaction and the societal level. These levels are interconnected and embedded within each other. No precedence is given in this model either to the individual as sole agent, or to society as sole determinant of individual differences in immigrant youth's adaptation. Instead, it is argued that both the individual and society, i.e., both sociocultural circumstances and structures, and human agency play a central role in the adaptive processes that lead to the success (or failure) of immigrant

youth. The three-level approach was proposed by Verkuyten (2005), but also follows closely a similar model proposed by Deaux (2006), whose purpose was to study issues of ethnicity and migration. Both these models are comprehensive and heuristically useful for situating different perspectives to the issue under investigation, and for explaining individual differences in immigrant youth adaptation from these perspectives.

--- Insert Figure 1 around here ---

The middle level of this model, the level of interaction, refers, according to Verkuyten (2005), to the dynamics of the everyday and concrete contacts in many different situations. All three approaches, i.e., developmental, acculturation and social psychological, stress the importance of this middle space, and of the role of social interactions for the outcomes they study, and consider the contexts in which such interactions take place as a privileged ground for investigating the phenomena of interest. Developmental and acculturation psychologies have provided a detailed account of the social networks that constitute the lived space of immigrant children, as well as of the contextual factors and interpersonal processes that are related to their adaptation. The level of interaction in the proposed model is then elaborated to include the contexts of interaction considered by developmental (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and acculturation psychologists (Berry et al., 2011) as central for the development and acculturation of immigrant youth (Figure 1).

Before proceeding with the more detailed presentation of the three levels, it is important to clarify the concept of levels, which is used by both developmental and social psychologies, with each discipline denote somewhat different ideas or phenomena. Developmental psychologists have used the term mostly to refer to levels of context (micro, meso, exo and macrosystemic levels of context). Social psychologists use the idea of levels to refer mostly to

levels of analysis (individual, interactive, societal levels of analysis) or of scientific explanation. The levels of analysis, as conceived by social psychologists, are considered to be interdependent, but each level to be analytically different from the other two (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Verkuyten, 2005). For example, individual differences in school adjustment, an important developmental task for all youth, can be explained by individual variables examined at the individual level of analysis, where variables are assigned to individuals, and/or by contextual variables, either at the interactive or at the societal level, where the independent variables are examined at the level of class, school, city or country. To do justice to the different levels of analysis, multilevel statistical models, such as HLM models (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), would need to be used. These methods allow investigators to examine hierarchical, or nested, data structures, and to disentangle individual and group effects on the outcome of interest.

The definition of context, within and across these three subdisciplines of psychology, is also a possible source for confusion (Liebkind, 2006; Verkuyten, 2000). For example, context may refer to the social or physical context, to interactions that take place at a fairly regular basis and over an extended period of time, or, in contrast, to interactions that take place in a specific circumstance as presented in an experimental condition, or to immigration conditions. This variability in the definition of context renders the comparison and integration of findings from different studies a complex task.

The first level, the individual level, of the proposed model concerns intraindividual characteristics, such as personality, temperament, motivation, self regulation, and cognition. The second level, the level of interaction, includes the contexts in which the child is in continuous interaction with other people. These are the contexts that developmental psychologists call proximal. This term will be used in the rest of the chapter to refer to social contexts in the child's

immediate environment. In the case of immigrant youth, these contexts serve the purpose both of development and acculturation, and are divided into those representing the home culture and into those representing the culture of the receiving society (Berry et al., 2011). However, this level could also include, even though they are not depicted in Figure 1, those contexts in which the persons are not in direct contact and interaction with the immigrant child, but are in regular interaction with people who are. These contexts form, in Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Model, the exosystem (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). For example, native peers' parents and people in immigrant parents' workplace would be part of the exosystem. Finally, immigrants' home culture is also represented at this level mainly through parents' working models of culture, i.e., of the beliefs, attitudes, values, and practices which were formed in their culture of origin (Kuczynski & Navara, 2006), as well as by their ethnic group network, when one is available, and by their ethnic peers.

The third level includes the societal level variables, such as cultural beliefs, social representations and ideologies that have been shown to have an impact on immigrants' adaptation (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti & Liebkind, 2007). Ideally, in a multicultural society which values diversity and equity among all ethnocultural groups, both immigrants' home culture and the culture of the receiving society would be represented at the societal level. Multicultural societies recognize different ethnocultural groups' uniqueness and specific needs, and this is reflected at the societal level by the fact that their institutions have adapted so as to accommodate for the presence of all groups (Berry, 2006). Currently, though, in most countries, only the culture of the receiving society is actually represented at this level, since their institutions follow uniform programs and standards based on the receiving society's cultural views. However, immigrants, due to developments in modern communication technology, are, not only exposed

through the media to the norms, values, ideologies and representations of the receiving society, but also to those of their home country (Deaux, 2006). In major cities around the world, which host large numbers of immigrants, foreign-language channels often broadcast exclusively in their language. However, immigrants can also watch, through cable television, programs directly from their home country. Finally, at this level variables reflecting power positions within society, such as ethnicity and social class, are also included (Chrysochoou, 2004).

Taking a top-down approach, societal level variables may have an impact on the child in two possible ways, either indirectly, by filtering through the contexts of the child's proximal environment (e.g., Boyce et al., 1998; Magnuson & Stattin, 2006; Verkuyten, 2005), or directly, for example, through media exposure.

The indirect path of influence results from the way societal level variables contribute in shaping the contexts of children's everyday interactions (García-Coll et al., 1996). However, it should be noted here, that for some immigrant groups actual local circumstances (characterized, for example, by high concentration of this immigrant group) may be different, and more important, than national policies and other societal level variables. Even though these ethnic groups may be considered to have low status and lack of power on the level of society, they have a different experience, with regard to discrimination and prejudice, at the local level, where the majority-minority model is being redefined (Liebkind, 2006).

In the case of immigrant youth, societal level variables predominantly filter through contexts, such as the school, that represent the dominant culture. They actually become instantiated in the school context, whose functioning is usually guided by the laws, values, and beliefs of the dominant, receiving culture. Schools teach knowledge and thinking skills to all students. Furthermore, they constitute one of the contexts for the enculturation of native youth,



and the main acculturative context for immigrant youth (Vedder & Horenczyk, 2006). However, powerful social variables, such as ethnicity and social class, and their derivatives, such as discrimination, prejudice, and segregation, also become instantiated in this context, and contribute in shaping the unique experiences of immigrant youth (García-Coll et al., 1996), having the potential to adversely affect both their development and their acculturation (Ward et al., 2001; Wong et al., 2003).

The societal level variables filter also through the peer group. For example, in a study of the classroom contextual effects of race on children's peer nominations, it was found that both white and black students, independently of the race composition of the classroom, rated white students more positively than black students. The authors argued that the dominant social position of white students, prevalent in the larger societal context, filtered through the peer context (Jackson, Barth, Powell, & Lochman, 2006).

The societal level variables also affect immigrant children's adaptation through their influence on contexts representing their home culture, such as the family. Immigrant parents learn the characteristics of the new culture and become themselves exposed to the influence of social variables, such as discrimination and prejudice, through their regular contact with native people at work, in the neighborhood, through their dealings with the health system, and other such institutions (García-Coll et al., 1996). Perceived discrimination reported by immigrants has been shown to be associated with stronger ethnic identity, weaker national identity, and lower commitment to the new culture (Berry et al., 2006; Ward et al., 2001; see also chapter by Liebkind et al., this volume). In this context immigrant parents need not only enculturate their children to their home culture, but must also support them in getting along in the culture of the receiving society and in succeeding in society at large, and, furthermore, to help them

understand, and to teach them how to deal with, issues of discrimination and prejudice (Phinney & Chavira, 1995).

How do proximal contexts affect immigrant children's quality of adaptation? Children's regular interactions with people in their proximal environment have been argued to be the primary engines for their development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) and acculturation (Oppedal, 2006; Sam, 2006). Proximal contexts need to provide immigrant children with normative experiences, such as supportive and caring relationships with teachers, as well as with experiences that address immigration related issues, such as non differential treatment by ethnicity on the part of teachers (Roeser et al., 1998). The effect of proximal relational processes may be moderated by structural features of contexts, such as the family's socioeconomic status, or the availability of immigrants' own ethnocultural social network, which supports parents in their efforts to enculturate their children to the home culture (e.g., Halgunseth, Ispa, & Rudy, 2006).

Children are active agents both in their development and acculturation (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Kuczynski & Navara, 2006). Influences from both societal (e.g., media) and interaction level variables are processed by them before they become translated into an adaptational outcome. The meaning they attribute to experience functions as a mediator between the "actual" context and their behavior and adaptation in that context (Magnuson & Stattin, 2006). They are actively constructing working models of culture, which need to accommodate for the often competing messages emanating from their parents, their peers, their teachers, and the broader social context. As their ability to self-regulate develops, immigrant children also become better able to position themselves with respect to the values and demands of the family and those of the larger society, to accept or reject them in their totality or in part, as well as to

choose the environments in which they will spend their time and the people with whom they will become involved.

More than the attributes of any of the proximal contexts or of the individual himself/herself, it is, according to the person-environment fit theory, the congruence between the characteristics that the individual brings to the environment and the characteristics of the environment that is the most important determinant of the quality of youth adaptation (Eccles et al., 1993). The match between the needs of the developing and acculturating immigrant children and the opportunities afforded them by their proximal environments significantly predicts adaptation. For example, the schools that offer immigrant students the opportunity to experience their learning environment as relevant and meaningful promote better adaptation (Roeser et al., 1998). In the same line, the quality of interactions between people in children's proximal contexts may also meet, or fail to meet, the latter's developmental and acculturative needs. For example, parents and teachers who support the missions of both school and the family are likely to have a positive influence on children's adaptation (Coatsworth, Pantin, McBride, Briones, Kurtines, & Szapocznik, 2000). Following this argument, the degree of congruence, or the cultural distance, between the social contexts of immigrant youth is also an important predictor of their adaptation. For example, for immigrant groups who value strong family embeddedness and delayed autonomy, migrating to an individualistic society may put a strain on parent-child relations, as adolescents demand more autonomy sooner than parents are ready to grant it to them (Kwak, 2003).

The influences in the proposed integrative model are bidirectional, which implies that not only do factors related to the three levels have an impact on the quality of immigrant youth adaptation, but the latter in turn also feeds back and influences children's functioning, as well as

the functioning of the proximal contexts and of society. Success or failure with respect to adaptational outcomes would be expected to have an impact on individual characteristics, such as self-efficacy, as well as on proximal processes, and as a result quality of adaptation at time 1 would indirectly influence quality of adaptation at time 2 (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Furthermore, some adaptational outcomes, such as civic engagement and political participation, would be expected to have an impact on society through collective action (Silbereisen & Chen, 2010).

An important dimension that is not depicted in Figure 1 is the time dimension. Children's development and acculturation, of course, both involve change over time. However, as was already mentioned, acculturation not only changes immigrants, but is also a mechanism of social change, since the characteristics of the receiving society are changing through the cultural contact between ethnocultural groups (Berry et al., 2011). Furthermore, children's proximal contexts are themselves undergoing changes as they adapt to the new reality. For example, parents' working models of culture, which were mainly formed based on the traditions of the culture of origin, are also undergoing change in light of immigration, teachings of "experts", and as a result of their present and future economic and social positions (Halgunseth et al., 2006). These parallel changes at all three levels would be expected to influence intraindividual change in immigrant youth adaptation (Szapocznik & Coatsworth, 1999).

Interindividual differences in intraindividual change in the adaptation of immigrant youth have been examined in a number of longitudinal studies. Such studies may compare changes over time in immigrant groups compared with native peers. For example, in a three wave longitudinal study of immigrant students', and of their Greek native peers', adaptation, it was found that the former had at all times significantly lower school performance than the latter, and

furthermore, that performance decreased in all three groups to a similar extent from age 12 to age 15 (Motti-Stefanidi, Asendorpf, & Masten, 2011). The similar pattern in longitudinal change in adaptation suggests that it may be related to a developmental rather than an acculturative process.

Two time variables, age at migration (see chapter by Corak, this volume) and years spent in the new country (Berry et al., 2006), have been shown to have an important influence on immigrant youth's adaptation. The first is a rough index of children's developmental stage at the time they migrated, and the second, of their degree of acculturation to the new culture. In what concerns time at migration, children who migrated before starting primary school seem to have a smoother adaptation over time than children who migrated later, and those who migrated in the adolescence seem to have more difficulties in their adaptation than children who migrated earlier (Berry et al., 2006; Phinney, 2006). It should be noted here that immigrant children who were doing well before migrating, probably because they had adequate social and individual resources to support their development, and after an initial period of difficulties following migration, would be expected to do better than children who were not doing that well before migrating. Furthermore, with more years spent in the new country, an increase towards adopting the integrated and the national acculturation profiles, and a move away from the diffuse profile have been reported; a change that may be due to acculturation (Berry et al., 2006).

This integrative framework allows an organized approach to addressing the question of what determines positive immigrant youth adaptation. The three levels of analysis proposed are viewed as interdependent but analytically distinct (Verkuyten, 2005). Each of the three levels of process is assumed to make an independent, unique contribution to understanding the adaptation of immigrant youth.

Immigration is a challenging phenomenon not only for the individuals migrating, but also for their proximal contexts as well as for receiving societies. Societies, schools, families, as well as individuals, both immigrants and natives included, need to adapt to the new reality created by the coexistence of people from different cultures. Each level may present opportunities and/or challenges for immigrant youth adaptation. Immigrant children who live in societies that have developed a multicultural ideology would be expected to show better adaptation than children who live in societies that hold negative attitudes towards the presence of immigrants in the country (Berry et al., 2006). Furthermore, immigrant children whose lives are embedded in contexts that deal more effectively with the issues raised by immigration and with which they address their needs would be expected to be better adapted than their peers whose proximal contexts do not have these characteristics. Finally, immigrant children's personal resources, such as a good cognitive capacity, high self-efficacy or an easy going temperament may also promote their positive adaptation (Masten et al., 2006). One could conceive of immigrant children who live in societies that are not positive towards the presence of immigrants, but who attend a well-functioning school, and/or have a resilient family, as being better adapted than children whose proximal environments do not have such positive qualities.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to integrate the developmental, acculturation, and social psychological perspectives in order to account for individual differences in immigrant youth adaptation. Adaptation was examined in a developmental and acculturative context, taking into account the influence of societal and individual level variables.

This integrative account underscores the complexity of defining and explaining immigrant children's adaptation. Development and acculturation processes are intricately related

and, therefore, difficult, if not impossible, to disentangle. First, behavior and performance with respect to developmental and acculturative tasks, which are the basic criteria for judging the quality of immigrant youth's adaptation, are intertwined, mutually influencing each other, both currently and over time. Second, the contexts in which children interact with other people on a regular basis and that propel developmental change, also support immigrant children's acculturation and enculturation. Third, society, children's social contexts and, of course, the children themselves, are in a state of continuous, interdependent change, partly resulting from acculturation, and affecting their adaptation. Furthermore, development and acculturation take place in a larger societal context that is often replete with discrimination and prejudice, with negative consequences for both.

Most immigrants move to a new country often with the intention to stay and make a better life for themselves and their children. It is in the interest of receiving societies to ensure their positive adaptation. Policy and program initiatives, which will promote a positive public attitude towards immigrants, are needed. Politicians and the mass media have a major responsibility in educating the public (Commission of the European Communities, 2003). A positive attitude of native populations will become reflected in the functioning of proximal environments, for example, through more positive attitudes of teachers towards immigrant children, and should result in the allocation of resources to children's proximal contexts, that will be used, for example, to develop school programs and to offer educational support appropriate for their needs. Support in the proximal contexts of immigrant children will serve to promote positive development and effective adaptation in the new country, for the good of the immigrants and for the benefit of society as a whole.

## References

- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–68.
- Berry, J. W. (2006). Contexts of acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 97–112). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Supply & Services.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21, 491–511.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H. Breugelmans, S., Chasiotis, A. & Sam, D.L.(2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking “acculturation” in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development*, 44, 1–18.
- Bornstein, M., & Cote, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Acculturation and parent-child relationships*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.



- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social-psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32*(6), 369–386.
- Boyce, W. T., Frank, E., Jensen, P. S., Kessler, R. C., Nelson, C. A., Steinberg, L., et al. (1998). Social context in developmental psychopathology: Recommendations for future research from the MacArthur Network on Psychopathology and Development. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*(2), 143–164.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(1), 135–149.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bioecological model of human development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (6th ed., pp. 793–828). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Brown, C. S., & Bigler, R. (2005). Children's perceptions of discrimination: A developmental model. *Child Development, 76*, 533–553.
- Caspi, A., & Shiner, R. L. (2006). Personality development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology. Vol. 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 300–365). New York: Wiley.
- Chrysochoou, X. (2000). Multicultural societies: Making sense of new environments and identities. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10*, 343–354.
- Chrysochoou, X. (2003). Studying identity in social psychology. Some thoughts on the definition of identity and its relation to action. *Language and Politics, 22*, 225–242.
- Chrysochoou, X. (2004). *Cultural diversity: Its social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Chryssochoou, X., & Lyons, E. (2011). Perceptions of (in)compatibility between identities and participation in the national polity of people belonging to ethnic minorities. In A. E. Azzi, X. Chryssochoou, B. Klandermans, & B. Simon (Eds.), *Identity and participation in culturally diverse societies: A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp.69-88). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Clement, R., & Noels, K. (1992). Towards a situated approach to ethnolinguistic identity: The effects of status on individuals and groups. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *11*(4), 203–232.
- Coatsworth, J.D., Pantin, H., McBride, C., Briones, E., Kurtines, W., & Szapocznik, J. (2000). Ecodevelopmental correlates of behavior problems in young Hispanic females. *Applied Developmental Science*, *6*(3),126-143.
- Commission of the European Communities (2003). *Communication on immigration, integration and employment*, COM (2003)336, Brussels.
- Cooper, C.R. (2003). Bridging multiple worlds: Immigrant youth identity and pathways to college. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *27*(6, Suppl.), 1–4.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 504–553). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Deaux, K. (2006). *To be an immigrant*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Doise, W. (1986). *Levels of explanation in Social Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Miller-Buchanan, C., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., et al. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young

- adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. *American Psychologist*, 48(2), 90–101.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting White". *The Urban Review*, 18(3), 176–296.
- Fuligni, A. J. (1997). The academic achievement of adolescents from immigrant families: The roles of family background, attitudes, and behavior. *Child Development*, 68, 261–273.
- Fuligni, A., & Fuligni, A. (2007). Immigrant families and the educational development of their children. In J. Lansford, K. Deater-Deckard, & M. Bornstein (Eds.), *Immigrant families in contemporary society* (pp. 231–249). New York: Guildford Press.
- García-Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H., et al. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development*, 67, 1891–1914.
- Georgas, J., Berry, J. W., van der Vijver, F. J. R., Kağitçibaşı, C., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2006). *Families across cultures: A 30 nation psychological study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gotlieb, G., Wahlsten, D., & Licliter, R. (2006). The significance of biology for human development: A developmental psychobiological systems view. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 210-258). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Graves, T. (1967). Psychological acculturation in a tri-ethnic community. *South-Western Journal of Anthropology*, 23, 337–350.

- Green, E. G. T. (2007). Guarding the gates of Europe: A typological analysis of immigration attitudes across 21 countries. *International Journal of Psychology, 42*(6), 365–379.
- Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 461–490.
- Halgunseth, L. C., Ispa, J. M., & Rudy, D. (2006). Parental control in Latino families: An integrated review of the literature. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1282–1297.
- Harkness, S., & Super, C. M. (Eds.). (1996). *Parents' cultural belief systems: Their origins, expressions, and consequences*. New York: Guilford.
- Jackson, M. F., Barth, J. M., Powell, N., & Lochman, J. E. (2006). Classroom contextual effects of race on children's peer nominations. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1325–1337.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Liebkind, K. (2007). A structural model of acculturation and well-being among immigrants from the former USSR in Finland. *European Psychologist, 12*(2), 80–92.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Solheim, E. (2009). To identify or not identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination. *Applied Psychology, 58*(1), 105–128.
- Jensen, L. A. (2008). Immigrants' cultural identities as sources of civic engagement. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 74–83.
- Jensen, L. A., & Flanagan, C. A. (2008). Immigrant civic engagement: New translations. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 55–56.
- Kağitçibaşı, Ç. (2007). *Families, self and human development across cultures: Theory and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1995). Educational aspirations of minority youth. *American Journal of Education, 106*(3), 349–384.
- Kiang, L., Yip, T., & Fuligni, A. (2008). Multiple social identities and adjustment in young adults from ethnically diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 18*, 643–670.
- Kroger, J. (2007). *Identity development: Adolescence through adulthood* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kuczynski, L., & Navara, G. (2006). Sources of change in theories of socialization, internalization and acculturation. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Development* (pp. 299–327). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kwak, K. (2003). Adolescents and their parents: A review of intergenerational family relations for immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Human Development, 46*, 115–136.
- Lee, R. M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(1), 36–44.
- Lerner, R. M. (2006). Developmental science, developmental systems, and contemporary theories. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 1–17). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Levine, P. (2008). The civic engagement of young immigrants: Why does it matter? *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 102–104.
- Liebkind, K. (2001). Acculturation. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 386–406). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Liebkind, K. (2006). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lopez, M. H., & Marcelo, K. B. (2008). The civic engagement of immigrant youth: New evidence from the 2006 Civic and Political Health of the Nation Survey. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 66–73.
- Magnusson, D., & Stattin, H. (2006). The person in context: A holistic-interactionistic approach. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 400–464). New Jersey: Wiley.
- Masten, A. S. (2006). Developmental psychopathology: Pathways to the future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 46–53.
- Masten, A. S., Burt, K., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2006). Competence and psychopathology in development. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology. Vol. 3: Risk disorder and psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 696–738). New York: Wiley.
- Masten, A. S., Long, J. D., Roisman, G. I., Burt, K. B., Obradović, J., Roberts, J. M., Boelcke, K., & Tellegen, A. (2005). Developmental cascades: Linking academic achievement, externalizing and internalizing symptoms over 20 years. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(5), 733–746.
- Masten, A. S., & Motti-Stefanidi, F. (2009). Understanding and promoting resilience in children: Promotive and protective processes in schools. In T. Gutkin & C. Reynolds (Eds.), *The Handbook of School Psychology* (4th ed., pp. 721–738). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Masten, A.S., & Cicchetti, (2010). Editorial: Developmental Cascades. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*, 491-495.

- McCormick, C.M., Kuo, S.I., & Masten, A.S. (in press). Developmental tasks across the lifespan. In K. L. Fingerman, C. Berg, J. Smith, & T. C. Antonucci(Eds.), *The Handbook of lifespan development* (pp. 117-140). New York: Springer.
- McLoyd, V. (2006). The legacy of Child Development's 1990 special issue on minority children: An editorial retrospective. *Child Development, 77*, 1142–1148.
- Merz, E-M., Özeke-Kocabas, E., Oort, F. J., & Schuengel, C. (2009). Intergenerational family solidarity: Value differences between immigrant groups and generations. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 291–300.
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Le domaine de la psychologie sociale. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Psychologie Sociale* (pp. 5–22). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., Masten, A. S., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2011). Adaptation of immigrants in adolescence: The mediating and moderating role of personality. In F. Motti-Stefanidi & A.S. Masten (Chairs), *Personality, vulnerability, and resilience in development: International perspectives*. Symposium at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal.
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., Pavlopoulos, V., Obradović, J., Dalla, M., Takis, N., Papathanasiou, A., & Masten, A. S. (2008). Immigration as a risk factor for adolescent adaptation in Greek urban schools. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 5*(2), 235–261.
- Motti-Stefanidi, F., Pavlopoulos, V., Obradović, J., & Masten, A. (2008). Acculturation and adaptation of immigrant adolescents in Greek urban schools. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*(1), 45–58.
- Mugny, G. (1982). *The power of minorities*. London: Academic Press.

- Navas, M., Rojas, A. J., García, M., & Pumares, P. (2007). Acculturation strategies and attitudes according to the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): The perspectives of natives versus immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 67–86.
- Ogbu, J. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M. Gibson & J. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities* (pp. 3–33). New York: Garland.
- Oppedal, B. (2006). Development and acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 97–112). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, J. (2007). Who is the authentic Korean American? Korean-born Korean American high school students' negotiation of ascribed and achieved identities. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 6, 277–298.
- Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Yu, H. C. (1998). *Adolescents' worlds: Negotiating family, peers and school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Phinney, J. (2006). Ethnic identity exploration in emerging adulthood. In J. Arnett & J. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adults in American* (pp. 117–134). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J., Berry, J. W., Vedder, P., & Liebkind, K. (2006). The acculturation experience: Attitudes, identities and behaviors of immigrant youth. In J. W. Berry, J. S. Phinney, D. L. Sam, & P. Vedder (Eds.), *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts* (pp. 71–116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.



- Phinney, J. S., & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with problems related to ethnicity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 5*, 31–53.
- Phinney, J. S., & Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 7*, 3–32.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 493–510.
- Phinney, J. S., Kim-Jo, T., Osorio, S., & Vilhjalmssdottir, P. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-parent disagreements: Ethnic and developmental factors. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*, 8–39.
- Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. (2007). Ethnic identity development in immigrant families. In J. Lansford, K. Deater-Deckard, & M. Bornstein (Eds.), *Immigrant families in contemporary society* (pp. 51–68). New York: Guilford Press.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pyke, K. (2005). “Generational deserters” and “black sheep”: Acculturative differences among siblings in Asian immigrant families. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*, 491–517.
- Quillian, L., & Campbell, M. E. (2003). Beyond Black and White: The present and future of multiracial friendship segregation. *American Sociological Review, 68*, 540–566.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*, 149–152.

- Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London: Sage.
- Roeser, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. J. (1998). Academic and social functioning in early adolescence: Longitudinal relations, patterns, and prediction by experience in middle school. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 321–352.
- Rothbaum, F., Pott, M., Azuma, H., Miyake, K., & Weisz, J. (2000). The development of close relationships in Japan and the United States: Paths of symbiotic harmony and generative tension. *Child Development, 71*, 1121–1142.
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships and groups. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 571–645). New York: Wiley.
- Rumbaut, R. G. (2008). Reaping what you sow: Immigration, youth, and reactive ethnicity. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2) 108–111.
- Ryan, R. M., & Lynch, J. H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development, 60*, 340–356.
- Sam, D. L. (2006). Adaptation of children and adolescents with immigrant background: Acculturation or development. In M. Bornstein & L. R. Cote (Eds.), *Acculturation and parent-child relationships: Measurement and development* (pp. 97–112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (Eds.). (2006). *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sam, D. L., Vedder, P., Liebkind, K., Neto, F., & Virta, E. (2008). Immigration, acculturation and the paradox of adaptation. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 138–158.

- Sam, D. L., & Virta, E. (2003). Intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and host-national families and their impact on psychological adaptation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26, 213–231.
- Sam, D.L., & Berry, J.W. (2010). Acculturation: When individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 5, 472-481.
- Schönpflug, U. (Ed). (2008). *Cultural transmission: Psychological, developmental, social and methodological aspects*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Silbereisen, R. K. & Chen, X. (2010). *Social change and human development: Concepts and results*. Sage: London.
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56, 319–331.
- Simon, B., & Ruhs, D. (2008). Identity and politicization among Turkish migrants in Germany: The role of dual identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1354–1366.
- Sirin, S., & Fine, M. (2008). *Muslim American youth: Understanding hyphenated identities through multiple methods*. New York: New York University Press.
- Snauwaert, B., Soenens, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2003). When integration does not necessarily imply integration. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 231–239.
- Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., Carlson, E. A., & Collins, W. A. (2005). *The development of the person: The Minnesota study of risk and adaptation from birth to adulthood*. New York: Guilford.

- Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2003). Immigrant children in Austria. Aggressive behavior and friendship patterns in multicultural school classes. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 99–116.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Suárez-Orozco, M., & Todorova, I. (2006). *Moving stories: Educational pathways of immigrant youth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Szapocznik, J., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1999). An ecodevelopmental framework for organizing the influences on drug abuse: A developmental model of risk and protection. In M. Glantz & C. R. Hartel (Eds.), *Drug abuse: Origins and interventions* (pp. 331–366). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65–93.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Titzmann, P. F., & Silberreisen, R. K. (2009). Friendship homophily among ethnic German immigrants: A longitudinal comparison between recent and more experienced immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 301–310.
- Updegraff, K.A., McHale, S.M., Whiteman, S.D., Thayer, S.M., & Crouter, A.C. (2006). The nature and correlates of Mexican-American adolescents' time with parents and peers. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1470-1486.

- Vedder, P.H., & Horenczyk, G. (2006). Acculturation and the school. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 419-429). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Vedder, P., Berry, J. W., Sabatier, C., & Sam, D. (2009). The intergenerational transmission of values in national and immigrant families: The role of zeitgeist. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 642–653.
- Verkuyten M. (2005). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M. (2000). The benefits to social psychology of studying ethnic minorities. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*, 12(3), 5–21.
- Verkuyten, M., & Brug, P. (2004). Multiculturalism and group status. The role of ethnic identification, group essentialism and protestant ethic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(6), 647–661.
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2006). The endorsement of minority rights: The role of group position, national context, and ideological beliefs. *Political Psychology*, 27(4), 527–548.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. London: Routledge.
- Waters, M. C. (2008). The challenges of studying political and civic incorporation. *Applied Developmental Science*, 12(2), 105–107.
- Way, N., Santos, C., Niwa, E., & Kim-Gervey, C. (2008). To be or not to be: Exploration of ethnic identity development in context. In M. Azmitia, M. Syed, & K. Radmacher (Eds.), *The intersections of personal and social identities* (pp. 61–79). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Weisner, T. S. (2002). Ecocultural understanding of children's developmental pathways. *Human Development, 45*, 275–281.
- Wong, C. A., Eccles J. S., & Sameroff A. (2003). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *Journal of Personality, 71*(6), 1197–1232.
- Wray-Lake, L., Syvertsen, A. K., & Flanagan, C. A. (2008). Contested citizenship and social exclusion: Adolescent Arab American immigrants' views of the social contract. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 84–92.

### Authors Note

The names after the first author appear in alphabetical order.

The authors wish to thank Lauren Pacelli for her editorial assistance.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Frosso Motti-Stefanidi, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Athens, Greece. Tel: (0030) 210 7277525, E-mail: [frmotti@psych.uoa.gr](mailto:frmotti@psych.uoa.gr)

Figure 1. Immigrant youth adaptation in context: An integrative framework.

