

**Rethinking Immigration**  
Invited Keynote Address  
Western Illinois University  
Dealing with Difference Summer Institute  
May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003

Marcelo Suárez-Orozco  
Carola Suárez-Orozco  
Harvard University

The forces of globalization are transforming our world. They are generating fundamental changes in economies, societies and cultures of a magnitude comparable to the emergence of agriculture ten thousand years ago or the industrial revolution two hundred years ago. Four features characterize globalization. First is the flow of capital and goods around the world (one trillion dollars cross national boundaries everyday). Second, new media, information, and communication technologies connect us as never before and make available the sum of the world's information (though not its wisdom) at the click of a mouse. Third, immigrants are moving worldwide in huge numbers. Immigrants are a fast growing sector of the child population in such diverse countries as China, Sweden, and the United States. Finally, diverse cultures inhabit the same spaces and force us to confront powerful and contrasting models of how to live, love, work, play, and worship. These four features of globalization shall impact the experiences of children growing up today – immigrant and native alike (see Suárez-Orozco and Gardner 2003).<sup>1</sup>

In recent years, globalization and immigration have come to focus and have generated considerable research in the social sciences, humanities, and in policy circles. While globalization has generated debate, controversy, and insight in scholarly, policy, and grassroots circles, we have not started to systematically consider how these accelerating transnational dynamics are affecting the institutions of society most directly implicated in child and adolescent development and well being: families, communities, and especially schools. Yet children growing up today, whether it is in Bali, Beijing, Beirut, Berlin, Boston, or Buenos Aires, will encounter a vastly different world from that of the last generation. Globalization is at the heart of what will make their world different. Whether in Afghanistan or Zimbabwe, human lives will continue to be lived in local social, economic, and cultural realities, but these realities will be increasingly being challenged and integrated into larger global networks of relationships.

Immigration is a center of any conceptual understanding of globalization. Globalization has increased immigration in a variety of ways. First, transnational capital flows tend to stimulate migration; where capital flows, immigrants follow. Second, the new information and communication technologies at the heart of globalization tend to stimulate migration because they encourage new cultural expectations, tastes, consumption practices, and lifestyle choices. Would-be immigrants imagine better opportunities elsewhere and mobilize to achieve them. Third, deeply globalized economies are increasingly structured around a voracious appetite for foreign workers. Fourth, the affordability of mass transportation has put the migration option within the reach of millions who, heretofore, could not do so. In the year 2000, approximately 1.5 billion airline tickets were sold. Fifth, globalization has stimulated new migration because it has produced uneven results.

As a result of globalization the US is in the midst of the largest wave of immigration in history – with a total “foreign born” population of approximately 32.5 million – that is larger than the entire population of Canada -- and a total “foreign stock” population (foreign-born plus the US-born first generation) of over 55 million people. Indeed the United States is the only post-industrial democracy in the world where immigration is both history and destiny. Immigrants are arriving in substantial numbers and are reshaping urban, suburban, and rural settings throughout the nation. The tapestry of our child and youth population is changing dramatically. At the dawn of the new millennium, twenty percent of the nation’s youth are the children of immigrants. They constitute a large and growing share of our school age population – for example, 44.6 percent of all children aged 5 to 17 in California, 28.1 percent in New York, and 22.5 percent in Maryland have an immigrant mother. Their presence is now being felt not only in the traditional immigrant regions of the Eastern seaboard and the Southwest but also throughout the Midwest and South —regions of the country that in the past rarely encountered new immigrants in large numbers. For example, the immigrant Latino-origin population Raleigh, North Carolina grew by over 1000 percent between 1990 and 2000.

In this address I would like to examine in broad strokes the state of the knowledge relevant to the study of immigration with a focus on the children of immigrants. I will then turn to some of the challenges studying this population and I will present a research strategy that we have developed at the Harvard Immigration Project in attempting to deepen our understanding of the immigrant experience. I will conclude with suggestions for future avenues of research.

The children of immigrants are extraordinarily diverse and their experiences resist facile generalizations. Nearly eighty percent are youth of color, coming from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean. They bring with them an astonishing array of languages, religions, social practices and cultural beliefs. Some are the children of highly educated professional parents, and still others have parents who are illiterate, low skilled and struggling in the lowest paid sectors of the service economy.<sup>2</sup> Some families are escaping political, religious, or ethnic persecution; others are lured by the promise of better jobs and the hope for better educational opportunities. Some immigrant children come to settle permanently; others follow their parents from one migrant work camp to another. Some are documented, and others are not. Some engage in transnational strategies living both “here and there” – that is, shuttling between their country of birth and their country of choice.<sup>3</sup>

The immigrant journey today follows complex paths -- often bifurcating into divergent experiences and varied outcomes. Some children and youth thrive with immigration, and yet others struggle to cope. Although the corpus of scholarship on immigrant children is relatively limited, when taken together interesting and sometimes counter-intuitive trends are surfacing.

Much of the recent scholarship on immigrant children has focused on schooling processes and outcomes. For all youth, academic processes and outcomes are a powerful barometer of current as well as future psychosocial functioning.<sup>4</sup> The significance of schooling for immigrant children is intensified, however, as schools are the primary entry point into the host society. How immigrant youth fare in schools in many ways forecasts their contributions as citizens to our society. Findings from a number of recent studies examining the performance of the children of immigrants in schools suggest a complex picture. Many immigrant youth are navigating successfully the American educational system, disproportionately winning prestigious academic awards and entering the most exclusive universities in numbers never before seen in the history of immigration to the United States. In 2002, for example, four of ten Intel Science Prizewinners went to immigrant students. The numbers for 2003 look quite similar. The children of immigrants today are substantially over represented at our most prestigious and competitive colleges – the Princetons and Yales.

On the other hand, many immigrant youth struggle academically, leaving schools without acquiring the tools that will enable them to compete in the global economy. Nationwide, nearly a third of all Latino youth (the majority of whom are immigrants or the children of immigrants) drop out of school.<sup>5</sup> Immigrant youth who are unschooled or unskilled will face dim odds in today’s economy. Many will get stuck in the service sector of the opportunity structure with little promise

for status mobility. Others will gravitate towards the informal economy. Yet others will gravitate towards the world of gangs and will face the danger of incarceration in the new country – a country that today has the largest prison population in the post-industrial world.<sup>6</sup> Half of the children under the supervision of the California Youth Authority today originate in Latino-origin homes (most of them immigrants or the children of immigrants). How can we explain this Princeton or Prison, Yale or Jail syndrome?

Two counterintuitive but robust research findings have emerged from a number of studies conducted in a variety of disciplines – disciplines that often seem engaged in parallel play. First, data suggest that it is the second generation – the US born children of foreign-born parents that tend to maximize the opportunities afforded by the education system in the new land. Subsequent generations do not seem to capitalize on the gains of the second generation in terms of a variety of outcomes. Second, for immigrants, length of residence in the United States and generational status tends to be associated with declining health, attitudinal, and behavioral outcomes.<sup>7</sup> This is generally known in the health sciences literature as the immigrant epidemiological paradox. It seems to begin at birth and continue throughout the life cycle. For example, immigrant mothers tend to have lower rates of infant mortality, lower rates of low- birth weight babies, lower rates of neonatal mortality, and lower rates of post-neonatal mortality than either their US born co-ethnics, African American and White American mothers.

In addition, a large-scale National Research Council (NRC) study considered a variety of measures of physical health, risk behaviors, and school adjustment among children and adolescents from immigrant families—including general health, learning disabilities, obesity, emotional difficulties, and risk behaviors. The NRC researchers found that immigrant youth tended to be healthier than their counterparts from non-immigrant families. These findings are counterintuitive in light of the racial and ethnic minority status, lower overall socioeconomic status, and higher poverty rates that characterize many immigrant children and their families. The NRC study also found that the longer immigrant youth are in the United States, the poorer their overall physical and psychological health. Furthermore, the more "Americanized" they became, the more likely they were to engage in risky behaviors such as substance abuse, unprotected sex, and delinquency.<sup>8</sup> Other data suggest that among adult immigrant workers the prevalence of psychiatric disorders increases rather than decreases with time in the US and generational status.

In the area of education, sociologists Ruben Rumbaut and Alejandro Portes surveyed more than 5,000 high school students in San Diego, California and Dade County, Florida examining grade point average and aspirations. They found that length of residence in the United States was

associated with declining academic achievement and aspirations.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, a national study of over 20,000 adolescents by Steinberg, Brown, and Dornbusch uncovered an isomorphic trend. They found that immigrants spent more time on homework, were inclined to be more oriented to doing well in school and were more likely to report having friends who thought that academic achievement was important than their non-immigrant counterparts. In addition, they found that immigrant adolescents reported less drug use, less delinquency, less misconduct in school, fewer psychosocial problems, as well as less psychological distress than did their American-born peers. They found this adverse effect of Americanization among both Asian and Latino youngsters.<sup>10</sup>

These findings are in direct violation of the prediction of unilineal assimilation theories of adaptation that hypothesize that immigrant youth would do better over time and across generations.<sup>11</sup> A similar pattern was established in a large-scale study conducted of Canadian immigrants families—length of residence was associated with declining well-being and academic engagement. Likewise new data from France and Belgium suggest that the general contours of the immigrant epidemiological paradox are found among North African immigrants in the continent.

In sum, data, coming from many sources, considering immigrant youth from a number of countries of origin, and using different methodologies and across disciplines, reveal a disturbingly consistent pattern. While many of these studies rely on panel and cross sectional data that are inherently limiting they nevertheless suggest a powerful formation in need of more sophisticated interdisciplinary research.<sup>12</sup>

How immigrant children fare in schools will have a profound impact on their future. While academic attitudes among immigrant youth are largely reported to be quite favorable and though there is considerable range in academic outcomes, recent research should give us pause. All too many immigrant origin youth eventually perform poorly on a variety of academic outcomes indicators including performance on achievement tests, grades, dropout rates, and in college attendance.<sup>13</sup>

Academic achievement and outcomes have long been linked to a variety of structural factors including parental socio-economic status and attainment and school segregation.<sup>14</sup> Poor, segregated schools with toxic school climates resulting from limited resources, obsolete curricula, low-teacher expectations, and disengaged and hostile peer cultures tend to perpetuate social inequalities.<sup>15</sup> There is also a direct relationship between parental education and performance on achievement tests, grades, and dropping out.<sup>16</sup> Immigration status (whether they are documented,

undocumented, or refugees), patterns of social cohesion and the maintenance of authority and sanctioning mechanisms within the immigrant family and community, cultural traditions, race and color, and the socio-economic and cultural climate encountered by immigrants are important factors that affect children's school experiences.

Such structural contributors to academic performance are unlikely to change significantly over time in the lives of immigrant children. A more mutable factor in academic performance—academic engagement—is also significant factor in academic performance (Marks, 2000). We conceptualize academic engagement as a process that involves two broad domains—behavioral and cognitive. Behavioral engagement refers to students' behaviors and efforts around academic tasks—doing homework, turning in assignments on time, paying attention in class, classroom behaviors, and attendance. Cognitive engagement refers to the students' intellectual involvement with schoolwork. Is learning inherently interesting? Are students intellectually invested in their schoolwork? Do they report deriving pleasure in the process of mastering new materials?

Research suggests that as they enter American schools, newly arrived immigrant children tend to be both optimistic about their future and interested and engaged in learning—especially learning English.<sup>17</sup> Over time, however, this engagement is precarious and vulnerable to change. Our ethnographic work has led us to detect a variety of patterns of engagement and disengagement among our participants. Most begin their schooling in U.S. quite engaged in their education.<sup>18</sup> Some remain engaged, others may increase their engagement over time, still others demonstrate variable engagement depending upon subjects and teachers, while many disengage over time. A variety of risk and protective factors may account for this variation in academic engagement and outcomes, ranging from individual, family, peer group, and school background characteristics to the networks of social supports and the nature of social cohesion and supervision that are available to immigrant children and youth.

A number of sociological and anthropological studies have explored the “ideologies of opportunity” and “cultures of optimism” that motivate immigrant parents to move.<sup>19</sup> Some single out immigrant “cultural values” said to promote educational success.<sup>20</sup> Others suggest that some immigrant families succeed by inoculating their children against the negative social mirror and hostilities that they encounter in the new culture.<sup>21</sup> Still other studies note that successful immigrant parents are able to maintain social cohesion by orienting the children away from toxic elements of adolescent peer culture in the new setting. Successful adaptations among immigrant

youth have also been linked to the patterns of social capital that immigrants bring with them from their countries of origin as well as the resources they are able to deploy in their new settings.<sup>22</sup>

Cultural traditions structuring family and community dynamics, parental educational levels and finances, trauma and family separations histories, their race and color, are examples of the kinds of crucial realities immigrants “bring with them” to the new setting. Availability of work, quality of neighborhood schools, and networks of relations are examples of receiving context factors that also matter.

Indeed, social support (a psychological construct) and social cohesion (a sociological Durkheimian construct) have been implicated in the academic adaptation of students, and immigrant students appear to be no exception.<sup>23</sup> Social relations provide a variety of protective functions— a sense of belonging, emotional support, tangible assistance and information, cognitive guidance, and positive feedback.<sup>24</sup> Parents and peers play a particularly crucial role in fostering academic engagement and achievement.<sup>25</sup> Beyond the structural obstacles and opportunities in the new setting, the role of parents and peers would be critical factors in the different academic trajectories of immigrant youth.

Parents can support their children’s schooling in a variety of ways. At a minimum, good parenting provides an emotional safe haven for children, fostering the development of a healthy sense of belonging, self-esteem, and emotional well-being. Parents concretely support educational outcomes by maintaining a value of education and establishing a standard of expectation—what is the minimum acceptable standard for grades or for level of educational pursuit?<sup>26</sup> They establish expectations and sanctioning mechanisms about appropriate behaviors and attitudes vis-à-vis school authorities and peer interactions. No doubt, parents are crucial in their ability to provide educational opportunities and resources. Parents with higher educational levels are able to provide a variety of resources to their children that place them at a clear advantage. These advantages include more sophisticated vocabularies, providing more literacy opportunities as well as access to computers, actively scaffolding homework assignments, providing private SAT instruction, accessing college pathway knowledge, and the like.<sup>27</sup> Unfortunately, however, immigrant parents who work long hours and may have limited educations are at a distinct disadvantage in this regard. In considering immigrant families, it is important to keep in mind the critical role of extended family members—godparents, aunts, uncles, older cousins, and the like—who may have been in the new country for longer periods of time and may be more informed sources of tangible support. In addition, preliminary data from the Harvard Immigration Project suggest that the initial pattern

of cohesion that is secondary to every immigration story – immigration at first tends to bring families together – over time gives room to a centrifugal dynamic of increasing alienation between immigrant parents and their usually more acculturated children.

Peers provide important emotional sustenance that sustain and support the development of significant psychosocial competencies in youth.<sup>28</sup> In a variety of ways, peers can specifically serve to support or detract from academic engagement.<sup>29</sup> By valuing (or devaluing) certain academic outcomes and by modeling specific academic behaviors, peers establish the “norms” of academic engagement.<sup>30</sup> Peers may further support academic engagements through conversations and discussions where ideas are exchanged.<sup>31</sup> Peers tangibly can support academic engagement by clarifying readings or lectures, helping one another in completing homework assignments, and by exchanging information (about SAT’s, helpful tutors, volunteer positions, and other college pathway knowledge). Because immigrant youth often attend highly segregated deep poverty schools,<sup>32</sup> however, they may have limited access to knowledgeable networks of peers.

During two decades of interdisciplinary, comparative, and longitudinal research with immigrant youth and their families, we have become increasingly aware of the crucial role of networks of social relations—not only parents, other relatives, and peers—in the successful adjustment of immigrant youth. In nearly every story of immigrant success there is a caring adult who took an interest in the child and became actively engaged in her life. Connections with non-parent adults—a community leader, a teacher, a member of the church, a coach—are important in the academic and social adaptation of adolescents in general<sup>33</sup> and appear to be particularly important to immigrant adolescents. These youth are often undergoing profound shifts in their sense of self and are struggling to negotiate changing circumstances in relationships with their parents and peers.<sup>34</sup> Protective relationships with non-parent adults can provide immigrant youth with compensatory attachments, safe contexts for learning new cultural norms and practices, and information that is vital to success in schools.<sup>35</sup>

Conducting research with immigrant children and youth presents a number of challenges. We are confronted with finding strategies that are culturally, linguistically, and developmentally sensitive. All cross-cultural research forces us to reexamine the traditional social science assumptions around validity and reliability.<sup>36</sup> Questions and prompts that are valid for one group may not be valid for another. Hence, it is a challenge to develop single instruments that capture the experiences of individuals from a variety of backgrounds. Further, much of cross-cultural research

has been conducted with adult populations rather than with children and adolescents yielding instruments that are developmentally inappropriate. There is a growing consensus in the field of cross-cultural research that mixed method designs, linking emic (outsider) and etic (insider) approaches, triangulating data, and embedding emerging findings into an ecological framework are essential to this kind of endeavor.<sup>37</sup>

I would like to present a model of research we developed designed to address many of the challenges and opportunities afforded by studying immigrant populations. Currently in its sixth year, the Harvard Longitudinal Immigrant Student Adaptation Study was designed to deepen our understanding of the experiences of the children of immigrants in and out of school – with a focus on longitudinal changes in academic engagement and schooling outcomes. Our study takes an interdisciplinary, psychosocial, longitudinal and comparative approach. Research anthropology strategies are utilized to gain perspective on immigrant “cultural models” of schooling and immigrant social practices relevant to schools in the new setting. Youth are observed and interviewed in their schools, communities, and homes. Research psychology strategies are deployed to carefully establish a data baseline on immigration histories, social and family relations, and academic attitudes and behaviors. Using triangulated data is crucial when faced with the challenges of validity in conducting research with groups of diverse backgrounds. By sifting through self reports, parent reports, teacher reports and our own observations, we are able to establish both concurrence and disconnection in what youth say they do, what others say they do, and what we see them do. The longitudinal design allows us to caliber changes over time.

A total of 400 students, ages 9 to 14, stratified by gender and country of origin, from Central America, China, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Mexico were recruited within the first few years of immigration. Youth were recruited from fifty-one schools in seven school districts in Massachusetts and northern California. Participating schools provided access to students, teachers, staff, and school records.

The project employs several data collection strategies. The work of ethnography allows us frame their experiences and “points of view,” and to identify locally relevant themes. Further, it guides us in the development of strategies of assessment, which then allows us to interpret findings in context. Based on systematic observations of interactions among students and staff in classrooms, hallways, school libraries, cafeterias, assemblies, fieldtrips, and various informal conversations with school personnel, we are able to craft realistic and holistic profiles of the school contexts immigrant youth inhabit. Home and neighborhood fieldwork supplement the data.

We selected a total of 75 key informants, 15 from each immigrant group, representing a range of patterns of academic engagement—highly engaged (cognitively and behaviorally), variably engaged (sometimes school focused and sometimes not, depending upon subject or personal circumstances), disengaging (initially school focused but increasingly less), and disengaged (cognitively and behaviorally). Carefully crafted case studies have been developed (and are updated on a yearly basis) for each key informant. These portraits richly depict continuities and changes in schooling engagement of immigrant youth in social context. By the end of this project, based on triangulated data, we will have 75 detailed psycho-culturally informed case studies of youth from 5 immigrant groups.

Psychological techniques are deployed to systematically follow-up on the tentative theoretical constructions that emerge from the ethnographic process. We use structured interviews, sentence completion tasks, narrative techniques, and achievement testing to establish “baselines” of psychological, social, educational, health, and economic resources at the entry point of immigration. We consider motivations, aspirations, and everyday realities and how these interact to influence individual agency. In turn, we strive to establish how these dynamics are related to academic engagement, schooling processes, and outcomes. We explore the nature of changes over time-- changes in attitudes towards school and the future, and changes in school behavior. Throughout the course of this research there is a dynamic inductive process involving field-emerging themes, culturally informed questionnaire development, analysis of triangulated data, theoretical formulations, and interpretation.

Each student has been formally interviewed on an annual basis during the course of the study. Parents were interviewed at home the first year and are being interviewed again during the last year of the study. The structured interviews were developed to systematically gather data on a variety of relevant topics including: migration and demographic history, schooling in the country of origin, initial impressions of U.S. society in general and U.S. schools in particular, aspirations, attitudes towards schooling, patterns of cognitive and behavioral academic engagement, kinship, family life, and networks of social relations and support. The structured student interviews employ a variety of question formats—some open ended, others are forced-choice, and still others are narrative. Structured interviews are translated into Spanish, Haitian Kreyol, Mandarin, and Cantonese. Informants can choose the language in which they wish to be interviewed.

We measure each youth’s network of social relations with an instrument devised to identify who are the members of the participant’s social network and what roles they belong to—family, peers, adults in school, adults in community, and family in country of origin. It also measures the

density of the network, the various functions of the relations, and their convergence or divergence in supporting academic engagement. This is very important as preliminary data suggests that when peers, parents, teachers, counselors, and natural mentors converge in sending and acting on the same message that school is important, students are more likely to remain engaged. Cognitive and behavioral academic engagement is measured through a series of structured questions included in the yearly student interviews. In addition, two Teacher Behavior Ratings considering classroom participation and behaviors are gathered for each child. These data are essential in comparing how teachers view the academic engagement of immigrant youth to how the youngsters view their own engagement.

We have found sentence completion tasks to be particularly useful for assessing academic attitudes. To this end, since Year 1 we have used a number of sentence completion tasks including such items as “Schools are \_\_\_\_\_” “Teachers are \_\_\_\_\_” “In five years from now I will \_\_\_\_\_” and others. These projective techniques provide rich data that are especially useful when supplemented by ethnographic data and in the context of the ongoing rapport between the informant and the RA.

For the educational outcome data, grades and achievement scores are the primary measures. Report cards are gathered for each participant each year of the study. An Academic Grade Point Average is calculated averaging the grades for math, science, language arts, and social studies courses. Attendance information is also derived from the report cards.

We determined that the standardized achievement data collected by the schools would not yield valid information. These measures are culturally and linguistically biased. In addition, nearly every school district involved uses a different standardized test, rendering comparisons impossible. Hence, we individually administer the Bilingual Verbal Abilities Test (BVAT) along with 4 academic subtests of the Woodcock Johnson-Revised Test of Achievement. The BVAT is normed on all of the languages represented in the study. The BVAT was designed for use alongside the Woodcock Johnson-Revised Test of Achievement to determine whether discrepancies between ability and achievement scores are related to limitations in English proficiency. We feel confident that these data give a valid assessment of the student’s mastery of her language of origin, of English, and of her academic skills in math and reading. This was administered the third year of the study and again in the fifth.

A project of such as this requires a community of researchers. We have assembled a team who lend complementary expertise to this endeavor. Carola Suárez-Orozco is a cultural psychologist with expertise on the psychological and educational experiences of immigrant youth. I

am an anthropologist who has over two decades of basic research in the areas of immigration and globalization. Our consultant Dr. Jean Rhodes, is a community/clinical psychologist at the University of Massachusetts, and a leading authority on the topic of youth mentoring. Because this project involves an extremely diverse population, we also recruited Cultural Advisors to provide us with guidance on the groups under consideration with which we did not have a specific research expertise (namely the Asian and Caribbean immigrants). The Cultural Advisors have a dual role: they work with us in the training of RAs and they will help us with the interpretation of emerging findings.

Our 30 bilingual and bicultural research assistants are crucial to the success of this project. In essence, we combine “outsider” and “insider” approaches to our ethnographic data collection and analysis.<sup>38</sup> By hiring bicultural and bilingual research assistants, we have been able to establish rapport and trust within the communities and gain entry into immigrant populations that might otherwise be difficult to access; further, the insider RA’s explain and inform their culture in depth. We provide extensive training and very close supervision, lending our conceptual and methodological expertise as well as the fresh perspective of an outsider. Boston area RAs meet weekly with the co-directors in meetings that function as ‘ethnographic supervision’—a model we borrow from clinical practice. The San Francisco RAs meet weekly with a project coordinator and approximately monthly with one of the co-directors to discuss emerging issues. This steady stream of communication provides RAs with intense supervision and guidance and keeps the principal investigators apprised of the denouements in the research. Several doctoral dissertations, scholarly publications and books have already emerged from this enormous corpus of data.

Ours is a longitudinal study. We have completed the field-based data-gathering phase of the basic research. This year we are completing qualitative and quantitative analyses. Next year we will be involved in the careful interpretation of data within our diverse interdisciplinary interpretive community in order to provide a culturally sensitive framework to examine causal patterns and conceptual relationships. We expect our findings to be fully developed for dissemination by the end of next academic year.

In conclusion, as researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners, it is essential that we deepen our understanding of our burgeoning immigrant child population. Given their growing numbers, the healthy development of the children of immigrants will have fundamental long-term implications for the remaking of our cultural democracy. Unfortunately, until recently psychologists have largely ignored the particular circumstances of immigrant child development.

We must recognize the specific strengths and challenges of immigrant youth and strive to conduct culturally sensitive quality research that considers the multiplicity of factors—structural, cultural, familial, and individual—that contribute to differential outcomes.

While some interesting and important research on academic outcomes has been conducted with immigrant children and youth, a number of other important intellectual avenues relevant to the immigrant child have been left largely unexplored. Several research directions seem of particular relevance for developmental researchers concerned with deepening the understanding in this field.

An obvious area in need of further conceptual and empirical work is that of loss and ruptures in attachments. For example, 85 percent in our normative sample of immigrant youth had been separated from one or both parents for periods of six months to ten years.<sup>39</sup> Hence, family separations appear normative to the migratory process. Children left with caretakers for extended periods of time will become attached to them. When the children and adolescents are called upon to join the parents in the new land, although they will be happy about the prospect of “regaining” them, but they will also “lose” sustaining contact with the caretakers to whom they have become attached. What are the long-term developmental implications of such multiple ruptures in primary relationships?

Challenges in identity development are another avenue in need of exploration. Identity formation is, of course, a (if not the) primary developmental challenge of adolescence.<sup>40</sup> How immigrant youth come to define themselves, as well as how others define them has important implications for where they live, who they live with, where they work, and how they envision their future and mobilize towards that realization. Erickson argued that for optimal development, the individual’s sense of self and the varied social milieus needed to complement one another. When there is too much cultural dissonance, cultural hostilities, and role confusion, and when the cultural guides are inadequate, adolescents may find it difficult to develop a flexible and adaptive sense of identity.<sup>41</sup> Immigrant origin youth may be torn between an attachment to the parental culture of origin, the lure of the often more intriguing adolescent peer culture, and aspirations to join the ‘mainstream’ American culture. We need better theoretical and empirical work to examine the vicissitudes of identity formation in the era of globalization. The idea that there is a single, coherent, and continuous “identity” that is the result of a series of crises unfolding in a unilinear, stage-specific process of change can no longer explain the lived experiences of many, if not most, immigrant youth of color. The most promising work in this area will pay close attention to the construction and performance of multiple identities and divided loyalties in varied contexts.<sup>42</sup>

Another fruitful area of inquiry is that of gendered experiences. How is the experience of immigration both similar and different for boys and girls? Data from several ethnographic studies seem to indicate a pattern whereby immigrant girls have significantly greater levels of what Jurkovic and Kuperminc and colleagues term ‘filial responsibilities.’<sup>43</sup> They also tend to be considerably more supervised by their caretakers and the community.<sup>44</sup> Immigrant boys of color appear to suffer the brunt of racialization experiences in schools more dramatically and systematically than girls.<sup>45</sup> Are these factors that contribute to the pattern of immigrant boys performing significantly more poorly on school related outcomes than their female counterparts? What other factors may be at play? What other indicators of adaptation besides school related outcomes should we be considering in our exploration of gendered experiences? We should expect significant differences between groups of origin in gendered outcomes as cultural role expectations vary widely. There are, of course, many other areas of inquiry.

Globalization and large-scale demographic transformations are two of the most important vectors of change in the new millennium. Managing difference is becoming one of the greatest challenges to all multicultural countries. From France to Sweden, from Brazil to Bolivia, from Singapore to Malaysia, the work of managing difference calls forth a new developmental and educational agenda predicated on the cultivation of new competencies, flexibilities, and sensibilities in all children – immigrant and native alike. Children growing up are more likely than in any previous generation in human history, to face a life of working and networking, loving and living with others from different national, linguistic, religious, and racial backgrounds. It is increasingly clear that children growing up in settings where difference is normative are challenged to engage and work through competing and contrasting models such as kinship, gender, language (monolingual and multilingual), and the complicated relationships between race, ethnicity, and inequality in new ways. It is by interrupting “thinking as usual,” that is, the taken-for-granted understandings and world-views that shape cognitive and metacognitive styles and practices that the work of difference can do the most for youth growing up today.

Our neighborhoods, our schools, our places of worship, and our workplaces are being transformed in ways never imagined a decade ago. While demographers, economists, sociologists, and anthropologists have developed ambitious research agendas deploying their disciplinary skills to investigate these phenomena, psychologists have lagged behind. The other social sciences, however, have neglected children and adolescents from immigrant families nearly altogether. I would argue, therefore, that scholars of child development have a particular responsibility and foci of

contribution. Our youth population is more likely than ever before to be of richly diverse cultural, linguistic, religious, and racial backgrounds. We must add our voices to the increasingly interdisciplinary chorus endeavoring to understand our new world.

## REFERENCES

- Beiser, M., Dion, R., & al, e. (1995). Immigrant and refugee children in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* (March).
- Berndt, T. J. (1999). Friends' influence on students' adjustment to school. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(1), 15-28.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Branch, C. W. (1999). Race and human development, *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices: Aspects of human development* (pp. 7-28). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bronfenbrenner, V. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cauce, A. M., Felmer R.D., & Primavera, J. (1982). Social support in high-risk adolescents: Structural components and adaptive impact. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 10, 417-428.
- Cobb, S. (1988). Social support as a moderator of life stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 3(5), 300-314.
- Coleman, J., & al., e. (1966). *Equality and educational opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cooper, C. R., Jackson, J. F., Azmitia, M., & Lopez, E. M. (1998). Multiple selves, multiple worlds: Three useful strategies for research with ethnic minority youth on identity, relationship and opportunity structures. In V. McCloyd & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Studying minority adolescents: Conceptual, methodological, and theoretical issues* (pp. 111-125). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- DeVos, G. (1983). Achievement motivation and intra-family attitudes in immigrant Koreans. *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology*, 6, 25-71.
- Doucette-Gates, A., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Chase-Lansdale, L. P. (1998). The role of bias and equivalence in the study of race, class, and ethnicity. *Studying Minority Adolescents: Conceptual, Methodological, and Theoretical Issues*, 211-236.
- Dubow, E. F. e. a. (1991). A two-year longitudinal study of stressful life events, social support, and social problem-solving skill: Contributions to children's behavioral and academic adjustment. *Child Development*, 65 (583-599).
- Erik Erikson (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York: W W Norton.
- Gándara, P. (1994). The impact of the educational reform movement on limited English proficient students. In B. McLeod (Ed.), *Language and learning: Educating linguistically diverse students*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Gibson, M. A. (1988). *Accommodation without assimilation: Sikh immigrants in an American high school*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

- Hamilton, S. F., & Darling, N. (1996). Mentors in adolescents' lives. In K. Hurrelmann & S. F. Hamilton (Eds.), *Social problems and social contexts in adolescence: Perspectives across boundaries* (pp. 199-215). New York: Aldine D. Gruyter.
- Handlin, O. (1951). *The uprooted*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Hernández, D., & Charney, E. (Eds.). (1998). *From generation to generation: The health and well-being of children of immigrant families*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Higham, J. (1975). *Send these to me: Jews and other immigrants in urban America*. New York: Atheneum.
- Hughes, D., Seidman, E., & Edwards, D. (1993). "cultural phenomena and the research enterprise: Toward a culturally anchored methodology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 21(6), 1--170.
- Jencks, C., & et al. (1972). *Inequality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jurkovic, G. J., Kuperminc, G., Perilla, J., Murphy, A., Ibanez, G., & Casey, S. (2001). Ecological and ethical perspectives on filial responsibility: Implications for primary prevention with immigrant latino youth. *Journal of Primary Prevention*.
- Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76(1), 1-19.
- Kasinitz, P., Mollenkopf, J., & Waters, M. (Forthcoming). The immigrant second generation in metropolitan New York.
- Kennedy, R. (2001). Racial trends in the administration of criminal justice. In N. J. Smelser & W. J. Wilson & F. Mitchell & (Editors) (Eds.), *America becoming: Racial trends and their consequences* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-20). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Levitt, M. J., Guacci-Franco, Nathalie, Levitt, Jerome L. (1994). Social support and achievement in childhood and early adolescence: A multicultural study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 15, 207-222.
- López, N. (in press). Race(ing) the gender gap: Education and second generation Caribbean youth. In P. Kasinitz & M. Waters (Eds.), *The second generation in metropolitan New York*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Children's relationships with adult and peers: An examination of elementary and junior high school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35 (81-99).
- Madaus, G., & Clarke, M. (1998). *The adverse impact of high stakes testing on minority students: Evidence from 100 years of test data*. Paper presented at the High Stakes K-12 Testing Conference, New York, NY.
- Mandel, H. P., & Marcus, S. I. (1988). *The psychology of underachievement: Differential diagnosis and differential treatment*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 153-184.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). *American apartheid*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McLoyd, V., & Steinberg, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Studying minority adolescents: Conceptual, methodological, and theoretical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mehan, H., Villanueva, I., Hubbard, L., & Lintz, A. (1996). *Constructing school success: The consequences of untracking low achieving students*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18( 4), 312-334.

Ogbu, J. U., & Herbert, S. (1998). Voluntary & involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 29, 155-188.

Orfield, G. (In press). Commentary. In M. Suárez-Orozco & M. Paez (Eds.), *Latinos: Remaking America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Orfield, G., & Yun, J. T. (1999). *Resegregation in american schools*. Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

P.A.C.E.E.H.A. (1996). *Our nation on the fault line: Hispanic American education*. Washington, D.C.: President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic American Education.

Pianta, R. C. (1999). *Enhancing relationships between children and teachers*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rhodes, J. E. (2002). *Stand by me: The risks and rewards of youth mentoring relationships*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roeser, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. J. (1998). Academic and emotional functioning in early adolescence: Longitudinal relations, patterns, and prediction by experience in middle school, *Development and psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 321-352): Cambridge University Press.

Roffman, J., Suarez-Orozco, C., & Rhodes, J. (in press). Facilitating positive development in immigrant youth: The role of mentors and community organizations. In D. Perkins & L. M. Borden & J. G. Keith & F. A. Villaruel (Eds.), *Positive youth development: Creating a positive tomorrow*. Brockton, MA: Kluwer Press.

Ruiz-de-Valasco, J., Fix, M., & Clewell, B. C. (2001). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in u.S. Secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Rumbaut, R. (1995). The new californians: Comparative research findings on the educational progress of immigrant children. In R. R. a. W. Cornelius (Ed.), *California's immigrant children*.

Rumbaut, R. G. (1996, February 10). *Becoming american: Acculturation, achievement, and aspirations among children of immigrants*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Baltimore MD.

Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., & Pierce, G. R. (1990). Social support: The search for theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*, 133-147.

Selman, R. L., Levitt, M. Z., & Schultz, L. H. (1997). The friendship framework: Tools for the assessment of psychosocial development. In R. L. Selman & M. Z. Levitt & L. H. Schultz (Eds.), *Fostering friendship: Pair therapy for treatment and prevention* (pp. 31-52). New York: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Steinberg, S., Brown, B. B., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1996). *Beyond the classroom*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Suárez-Orozco, C. (2001). Afterword: Understanding and serving the children of immigrants. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(3).

Suárez-Orozco, C. (2001). Psychosocial factors in the adaptation of immigrant youth: Gendered responses.

In M. Agostin (Ed.), *Women & human rights: A global perspective*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Todorova, I., & Louie, J. (in press). "Making up for lost time:" he experience of separation and reunification among immigrant families. *Family Process*.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez -Orozco, M. (in press). *Adolescent Lives: Relationships & Transitions*. Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, (Editor) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, M. (2000). Everything you ever wanted to know about assimilation but were afraid to ask. *Daedalus--Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 129*(4), 1-30.

Sue, D., & Sue, S. (1987). Cultural factors in the clinical assessment of Asian Americans. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 579-487.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waters, M. (1999). *Black identities: West Indian dreams and American realities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social relationships and motivation in middle school: The role of parents, teachers, and peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 202-209.

Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Social influences and school adjustment: Commentary. *Educational Psychologist, 34*(1), 59-69.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Farnborough, England: Saxon House.

Wills, T. A. (1985). Supportive functions of interpersonal relationships. In S. L. S. S. Cohen (Ed.), *Social support and health* (pp. 61-82). Orlando: Academic Press.

Zhou, M. (1996, February 12). *Growing up american: The adaptation of vietnamese children*. Paper presented at the The Current Issues in Educational Research Workshop, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge MA.

Zimbardo, P., & Haney, C. (1998). The past and future of U.S. Prison policy: Twenty-five years after the stanford prison experiment. *American Psychologist*, 53(7), 709-727.

## ENDNOTE

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Suárez -Orozco M. and H. Gardner. Education for Globalization. Keynote Address. Pocantico Workshop on Education and Globalization. Pocantico Hills, Tarrytown New York, April 2002.
- <sup>2</sup> (Suárez-Orozco, 2000)
- <sup>3</sup> (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>4</sup> (Mandel & Marcus, 1988; Steinberg, Brown, & Dornbusch, 1996)
- <sup>5</sup> (P.A.C.E.E.H.A., 1996)
- <sup>6</sup> (Kennedy, 2001; Zimbardo & Haney, 1998)
- <sup>7</sup> (Hernández & Charney, 1998; Kao & Tienda, 1995)
- <sup>8</sup> (Hernández & Charney, 1998)
- <sup>9</sup> (Rumbaut, 1996)
- <sup>10</sup> (Steinberg et al., 1996), p. 97-98.
- <sup>11</sup> (Handlin, 1951; Higham, 1975)
- <sup>12</sup> (Beiser, Dion, & al, 1995)
- <sup>13</sup> (Gándara, 1994; P.A.C.E.E.H.A., 1996; Ruiz-de-Valasco, Fix, & Clewell, 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>14</sup> (Massey & Denton, 1993; Orfield & Yun, 1999; Orfield, In press)).
- <sup>15</sup> (Gándara, 1994; Mehan, Villanueva, Hubbard, & Lintz, 1996; Willis, 1977)
- <sup>16</sup> (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Jencks & et al, 1972; Madaus & Clarke, 1998)
- <sup>17</sup> (Kao & Tienda, 1995; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>18</sup> [Suárez-Orozco, 2001 #831]
- <sup>19</sup> (Gibson, 1988; Kao & Tienda, 1995; Ogbu, 1987; Rumbaut, 1995; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>20</sup> (Sue & Sue, 1987)
- <sup>21</sup> (DeVos, 1983; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>22</sup> [Zhou, 1998 #819; Portes, 2001 #928]
- <sup>23</sup> (Cauce, 1982; Dubow, 1991; Levitt, 1994; Wentzel, 1999)
- <sup>24</sup> (Cobb, 1988; Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990; Wills, 1985)
- <sup>25</sup> (Wentzel, 1998)
- <sup>26</sup> (ibid)
- <sup>27</sup> (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>28</sup> (Selman, Levitt, & Schultz, 1997)
- <sup>29</sup> (Berndt, 1999)
- <sup>30</sup> (Berndt, 1999; Ogbu & Herbert, 1998; Steinberg et al., 1996)
- <sup>31</sup> (Berndt, 1999; Vygotsky, 1978)
- <sup>32</sup> (Orfield & Yun, 1999)
- <sup>33</sup> (Hamilton & Darling, 1996; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1997; Pianta, 1999; Rhodes, 2002; Roeser, Eccles, & Sameroff, 1998)
- <sup>34</sup> (Rhodes, 2002)
- <sup>35</sup> (Roffman, Suarez-Orozco, & Rhodes, in press)
- <sup>36</sup> (McLoyd & Steinberg, 1998; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995)
- <sup>37</sup> (Branch, 1999; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Doucette-Gates, Brooks-Gunn, & Chase-Lansdale, 1998; Hughes, Seidman, & Edwards, 1993; Sue & Sue, 1987)
- <sup>38</sup> (Cooper, Jackson, Azmitia, & Lopez, 1998)
- <sup>39</sup> (C. SuárezOrozco, M. Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, in press).
- <sup>40</sup> (Erik Erikson, 1963).
- <sup>41</sup> (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001)
- <sup>42</sup> (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, in press)
- <sup>43</sup> (Jurkovic, et al. 2001)

---

<sup>44</sup> (C. Suárez-Orozco, 2001).

<sup>45</sup> (López, in press).