

THE INFLUENCE OF PATERNAL AUTONOMY-SUPPORT
UPON ETHNIC CULTURE IDENTIFICATION
AMONG SECOND-GENERATION IMMIGRANTS

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate School
At the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by
NEETU SURESH ABAD

Dr. Kennon Sheldon, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

THE INFLUENCE OF PATERNAL AUTONOMY-SUPPORT UPON ETHNIC
CULTURE IDENTIFICATION AMONG SECOND-GENERATION IMMIGRANTS

presented by Neetu Abad

a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Kennon Sheldon

Professor Ann Bettencourt

Professor Nicole Campione-Barr

Professor Duane Rudy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would to thank Dr. Kennon Sheldon for his supervision in the development of this manuscript. His advice throughout the process was invaluable. I would also like to thank Dr. Ann Bettencourt for advising and supporting me, as well as Dr. Nicole Campione-Barr and Dr. Duane Rudy for serving on my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
ABSTRACT	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. STUDY 1 METHOD.....	8
3. STUDY 1 RESULTS.....	13
4. STUDY 1 DISCUSSION.....	16
5. STUDY 2 METHOD.....	18
6. STUDY 2 RESULTS.....	21
7. STUDY 2 DISCUSSION.....	25
8. COMBINED METHOD.....	27
9. COMBINED RESULTS.....	27
10. GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	32
FOOTNOTES.....	38
TABLES	
1. TABLES.....	39
REFERENCES.....	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Study 1	
Means and Standard Deviation.....	39
2. Study 1	
Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB.....	39
3. Study 1	
Intercorrelations between Acculturation and WB.....	40
4. Study 2	
Means and Standard Deviations.....	40
5. Study 2	
Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB.....	41
6. Study 2	
Intercorrelations between Acculturation and WB.....	41
7. Combined Analyses	
Means and Standard Deviations.....	41
8. Combined Analyses	
Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB.....	42
9. Combined Analyses	
Intercorrelations between Acculturation and WB.....	42
10. Combined Analyses	
Means and Standard Deviations.....	42
11. Combined Analyses (US-Born):	
Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB.....	43
12. Combined Analyses (US-Born):	
Intercorrelations between Acculturation and WB.....	43

THE INFLUENCE OF PATERNAL AUTONOMY-SUPPORT
UPON ETHNIC CULTURE IDENTIFICATION
AMONG SECOND-GENERATION IMMIGRANTS

Neetu Abad

Dr. Kennon Sheldon, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Born and raised in the US, children of immigrants often face difficult choices between endorsing their family's country of origin (natal culture) and mainstream US society (host culture). Although second generation immigrants desire to fit into the host society, their parents often demand that they adhere to norms and traditions of the natal culture. Previous studies have shown controlling or non-autonomous parenting to be associated with negative outcomes, so this study sought to demonstrate the role of maternal and paternal autonomy-support in promoting positive and intrinsic natal acculturation among second-generation immigrants. Two studies were conducted to test this hypothesis. In Study 1, college-aged second-generation immigrants were asked to report perceived maternal and paternal autonomy-support, as well as how much they endorse their natal and US cultures. Results demonstrated that paternal, but not maternal, autonomy-support predicted greater immersion into the natal culture and positive well-being. Study 2 replicated the previously mentioned effects and extended them by considering additional WB, acculturation, and autonomy-support measures. Possible explanations for the significance of paternal over maternal autonomy-support in our data are discussed.

The Influence of Paternal Autonomy-Support
Upon Ethnic Culture Identification
Among Second-Generation Immigrants

“According to my parents I was not American, nor would I ever be no matter how hard I tried. I felt doomed by their pronouncement, misunderstood and gradually defiant. In spite of the first lessons of arithmetic, one plus one did not equal two but zero, my conflicting selves always canceling each other out.”

-Jhumpa Lahiri

Introduction

During adolescence and young adulthood, parents-child relationships typically change as both parent and child seek to redefine their roles in each others' lives (Farver, Narang, & Bhadha, 2002b). Previously set guidelines concerning the child's choices become unclear as the child encounters novel experiences. Navigating these uncharted territories can cause tension in families with young adults, sometimes resulting in strained family interactions (Farver et al., 2002b). While these transitions can be difficult for any family, families in which both parents are first-generation immigrants typically experience elevated stress as their second-generation children develop (Farver et al., 2002b; Lay & Safdar, 2003).

In these families, first-generation immigrant parents and second-generation immigrant children often clash when the children express the desire to adopt aspects of the emigrant (host) culture into their identity (Farver et al., 2002b). Born and brought up in the host culture, second-generation children wish to assimilate, but are often stymied by parents who fear losing them to the host culture. These experiences can cause the

children much stress and confusion, sentiments which are expressed in the above excerpt written by second-generation Indian-American writer Jhumpa Lahiri. The present study seeks to understand the role of different parenting styles in determining the acculturation styles adopted by second-generation college students. In particular, we will utilize Self-Determination Theory to investigate whether individuals whose parents engage in autonomy-supportive parenting will report higher and more internalized identification with their native culture than children whose parents are controlling and non autonomy-supportive.

Acculturation and the Family

Dynamics within the immigrant family are heavily influenced by the process of acculturation. Acculturation refers to changes in beliefs, values, and behavior that occur when members of a cultural minority have repeated contact with a new environment (Farver et al., 2002b; Sam & Oppedal, 2002). During acculturation, immigrants are required to cope with losing direct contact with their native culture while negotiating new and unfamiliar cultural territory. This process can be traumatic due to the difficulty associated with adapting to a new culture. Perceptions of prejudice and discrimination, language barriers, and conflict with members of the old and new cultures are among the many stressors found to be associated with acculturation (Abouguendia & Noels, 2001).

Depending on the immigration status of individuals within the immigrant family, each member is differentially affected by acculturation stressors. Previous research has primarily focused on individuals most obviously affected by acculturation: first-generation immigrants (Abouguendia & Noels, 2001). First-generation immigrants are individuals who have emigrated from one country (termed the natal country) to another

(termed the host country). These individuals are usually unfamiliar with basic tenants of the new culture, and are required to learn the fundamentals of the new society, including language, education, or employment systems (Abouguendia & Noels, 2001).

Given the considerable obstacles facing first-generation immigrants, one might expect them to demonstrate lowered well-being. Surprisingly, however, first-generation immigrants experience less depression, less anxiety and greater positive well-being than their native-born peers (Harker, 2001; Farver, Bakhtawar, & Narang, 2002a). This apparent paradox may be explained by research suggesting that first-generation immigrants often draw upon personal experiences in the natal culture to cope with perceived discrimination in the host country (Farver et al., 2002a). To regain a feeling of belongingness after a negative interaction, first-generation immigrants strengthen their bond to their natal culture, in some cases becoming more religious or culturally observant than they were in their country of origin (Farver et al., 2002a). Reinventing one's ethnic identity in this way gives first-generation immigrants a buffer against alienation from the host culture.

Children of first-generation immigrants, the second-generation, undergo different acculturation processes. Immersed in both the host and natal cultures from birth, second-generation children simultaneously explore two (or more) potentially conflicting cultures to become comfortable in their identities (Farver et al, 2002; Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002; Zhou, 1998). This more complex type of acculturation presents its own consequences. Research suggests that second-generation immigrants are more likely to report more daily hassles and in-group conflict, lowered self-esteem, and more frequent diagnoses of internalizing disorders than either first-generation immigrants or US-born

peers of same age and socio-economic status (Atzaba-Poria, & Pike, 2005; Lay & Safdar, 2003). One reason for this may be that unlike first-generation immigrants, these individuals do not have sustained, direct experiences with their natal culture. Most natal cultural knowledge is delivered to them through family members, scholarly materials, images proliferated through the media, or cultural rituals performed within the household (Schwartz & Montgomery, 2002). As a result, second-generation children often feel disconnected from their family's natal culture.

One way in which second-generation immigrants cope with feelings of alienation from their natal culture is by attempting to assimilate and gain acceptance from the host culture (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Farver et al., 2002b). Second-generation immigrants in America report feeling equally as 'American' as their native-born peers, even when they are told that their ethnic group is perceived to be least American by others (Cheryan & Monin, 2005). Furthermore, when reminded of ways that they differ from their native peers, second-generation immigrants overstate their American identity by exaggerating the amount of time they invest in American activities, such as watching popular TV shows, listening to popular music, and spending time with American friends (Cheryan & Monin, 2005).

The second-generation child's desire to assimilate is frequently met with resistance from their first-generation parents. Immigrant families tend to endorse more traditional values than native-born families in the US, and these values often conflict with the kinds of freedom desired by second-generation immigrants seeking assimilation (Castillo, Conoley, & Brossart, 2004; Farver et al., 2002b; Killian & Hegtvedt, 2003). Basic rites of passage such as dating, expression of sexual attraction, and engaging in

social interactions outside of school can become battlegrounds in immigrant families, with parents restricting their child's behavior (Castillo et al., 2004; Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie, & Farah, 2006; Farver et al., 2002b; Killian & Hegtvedt, 2003). First-generation parents often urge their children to identify with their natal culture by insisting that they participate in natal cultural activities, establish friendships and romantic relationships with mostly natal peers, and adopt values and beliefs consistent with the natal culture (Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2005; Dwairy et al., 2006; Farver et al., 2002b). These discrepant goals and motives tend to have a deleterious effect on parent-child relationships within immigrant families, frequently fostering resentment and distrust (Farver et al., 2002b). In many cases, the adolescent may hide various choices they have made from their parents in an effort to avoid punishment or scorn, even if they consider those choices to be age-appropriate (Farver et al., 2002b; Harker, 2001).

These strained family dynamics are problematic for a variety of reasons. Research has suggested that complete acculturation into either the host or the natal culture is associated with lowered well-being among second-generation immigrants. In contrast, optimal and sustained well-being seems to come from adopting a bicultural identity wherein both natal and host cultures are represented (Farver et al., 2002a; Harker, 2001; Lay & Safdar, 2003; Sam & Berry, 1995). Children who are intrinsically interested in maintaining this balance have been shown to do well over time (Farver et al., 2002a; Harker, 2001; Lay & Safdar, 2003; Sam & Berry, 1995). If second-generation children are discouraged from exploring their host culture by their parents and become resentful towards their natal culture as a result, then conditions within the family are not favorable for the development of a healthy natal cultural identity among second-

generation immigrants, potentially placing them at risk for experiencing negative well-being. The question becomes—which parenting styles would be most likely to facilitate endorsement of the natal culture among second-generation children? Self-Determination Theory may be useful in addressing this question.

Self-Determination Theory

We posit that autonomy-supportive parenting, as defined by Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), might play a crucial role in determining how a second-generation child incorporates their natal culture into their identity. That is, we believe that second-generation immigrants whose parents engage in autonomy supportive parenting will report stronger identification with their natal culture than will individuals who have controlling parents. Perhaps paradoxically, we suggest that children may be more likely to embrace their natal culture when their parents give them the freedom to make their own choices.

Self-Determination-Theory posits that all human beings, no matter the age or background, need to feel self-directed, or autonomous, in their lives. Feelings of autonomy are thought to be fostered by supportive psychological environments (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The benefits of autonomy-supportive environments for individual well-being have been found in health care, sports, education, business, interpersonal relationships, and other applied domains (Grolnick, 2003). Recently, researchers have extended this concept of autonomy to characterize parenting styles in one of two ways: autonomy supportive or controlling.

Parenting is defined as autonomy-supportive when it encourages parents to take the child's perspective when making decisions that affect them (Grolnick, 2003). For

example, when establishing rules and guidelines, autonomy-supportive parents engage the child in a dialogue to make sure that he or she understands why such rules are being enacted (Grolnick, 2003). If there is resistance, the caregiver works with the child to achieve a mutual understanding. This allows the parent to provide the structure and discipline needed for the child's optimal development, but also encourages a sense of empowerment in the child by including them in the process (Grolnick, 2003). In contrast, controlling parents make parenting decisions without taking the child's perspective into account and make little attempt to engage the child in a discussion about why certain actions are being taken. Resistance to commands is sometimes met by physical or verbal force, with minimal attention given to helping the child understand why certain actions are desired over others (Grolnick, 2003).

Autonomy support has been linked to a variety of positive outcomes among children of all ages, including increased motivation to succeed academically, increased self-regulation and responsibility-taking, lower incidence of behavioral problems, and higher overall levels of well-being (Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2005; Grolnick, 2003; Joussemet, Koestner, Lekes, et al., 2005; Sorkhabi, 2005). Controlling parenting has been linked to decreases in academic achievement, internal motivation, compliance, and overall well-being, as well as to increases in behavioral problems (Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2005; Grolnick, 2003; Sorkhabi, 2005).

Outcomes associated with autonomy-supportive parenting can be used to theorize about how first-generation immigrant parents may play a role in the development of their second-generation immigrant child's ethnic identity. If parents allow their children to explore aspects of the host and natal cultures without overly restricting their behavior, he

or she may feel the freedom to approach and understand their native culture on their own terms. This may then cause them to recognize the importance of embracing their natal cultural identity, and develop a strong, internalized attachment to it. In contrast, parents who curtail their child's freedom may have children who are not intrinsically motivated to explore their ethnic identity, and therefore will not be as strongly identified with their natal culture. We do not believe that parents' autonomy-supportive or controlling styles will influence how assimilated the children are, as most second-generation immigrants express a desire to be accepted by the host culture (Cheryan & Monin, 2005). Rather, we believe that autonomy-supportive parenting will be associated with the endorsement of the child's natal culture, the presence of which will aid the second-generation immigrant in creating a fully formed bicultural identity.

Hypotheses:

To test these ideas, the following hypotheses were investigated:

- (1) Higher levels of perceived parental autonomy-support will be positively related to greater natal acculturation among second-generation immigrants.
- (2) Higher level of perceived parental autonomy-support will be positively related to higher levels of well-being among second-generation immigrants.
- (3) Higher levels of natal acculturation will be positively related to higher levels of positive well-being among second-generation immigrants.

Study 1 Method

Participants

Participants in Study 1 were recruited from Introductory Psychology classes at a large Midwestern university, during two successive semesters. Students in these classes

had previously completed a pretest measure which contained several demographic items. They were contacted and invited to complete the online study if they indicated that they were born in the US or came to live in the US before the age of 10, and if both of their parents had immigrated to the US from a foreign country.

Sixty-eight individuals completed the survey. 11 of these participants reported being raised by someone other than their first-generation immigrant mother or father, so they were dropped from the analyses to ensure that participants were exposed to similar developmental influences. This procedure yielded fifty-five-second-generation immigrants who were raised in two-parent immigrant households. Of these, 49% were men and 51% were women. 11% were African-American, 36% were Asian-American, 11% were Hispanic-American, 27% were Caucasian or European-American, and 15% did not ethnically categorize themselves.

75% of the participants were born in the US and 25% migrated to the US before the age of 10. When asked to categorize themselves, 29% of participants identified themselves as American, 27% identified themselves as belonging to their family's natal culture, and 44% identified themselves as both. When asked to ethnically categorize their parents, 13% of participants identified their mother as American, 56% identified their mother as belonging to her natal culture, and 29% identified their mother as both. Similarly, 13% identified their fathers as American, 62% identified their father as belonging to his natal culture, and 25% identified their father as both. These statistics are consistent with our assumption that our second generation immigrant participants are more US acculturated than their first generation immigrant parents.

Procedure

Eligible participants were contacted and emailed a link to the online survey. After consenting to take part, participants answered a variety of questions described in the following section. After completing the survey, participants were debriefed and given class credit. The total duration of the study was a half-hour.

Measures

Demographics. Participants were asked to indicate their gender, family income, and grade point average.

Natal and American Culture Exposure. To assess participants' developmental exposure to their natal culture and to U.S. culture, we created four statements assessing exposure and education to each culture (i.e., "my parents exposed me to/educated me about my native culture/U.S. culture"). The scale for these four items ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), and natal culture exposure and American culture exposure scores were computed by averaging the relevant two items. The alpha reliability for natal culture exposure was .93 and the alpha reliability for US culture exposure was .80.

Well-Being. General happiness was measured by the 4-item subjective happiness scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999). Example items include "In my life right now, I consider myself..." with a scale ranging from 1 (not a very happy person) to 5 (a very happy person), and "Compared to most of my peers right now, I consider myself..." with a scale ranging from 1 (less happy) to 5 (more happy). The alpha reliability for the happiness scale was .85. We also employed the 5-item satisfaction with life scale (Diener, Larsen, Emmons, & Griffin, 1985), which contains items such as "In most ways

my life is close to my ideal” and “The conditions of my life are excellent.” The alpha reliability for the Life Satisfaction Scale was .82.

Internalization of native cultural activities. The Perceived Locus of Causality scale (PLOC; Ryan & Connell, 1989) was adapted to assess how internally motivated participants are to participate in their natal cultural activities. Participants read: “When you are doing things to express your family’s cultural heritage (i.e., participating in ceremonies and traditions, engaging in religious rituals, dressing in traditional clothing, etc.), why are you doing them?”, then rated their reasons in terms of 1) external motivation (“Because the situation makes me. Other people want me to do these cultural practices, or would disapprove of me if I didn’t”), 2) introjected motivation (“Because I make myself. I’d feel bad about myself, i.e. guilty and unworthy, if I didn’t do these cultural practices”), 3) identified motivation (“Because I want to. I fully identify with these cultural practices; they express my core values”) and 4) intrinsic motivation (“Because I like to. I fully enjoy these cultural practices; they are interesting and engaging in their own right”). All ratings were made on a 1 (not at all for this reason) to 5 (very much for this reason) scale. As in much prior research (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000), ratings for external and introjected motivation were reverse coded and averaged with ratings of introjected and intrinsic motivation to obtain an aggregate “natal culture internalization” score. In our sample, the alpha reliability of this scale was .74.

Natal and American acculturation. Acculturation was also measured using the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS; Stephenson, 2000). This 30-item, 4-point Likert scale asks participants to indicate their agreement with statements

assessing their knowledge, familiarity, and preference for activities relating to either their natal or host culture (e.g. “I eat traditional foods from my native culture,” “I regularly read an American newspaper”). Out of the 32 total items, 15 form the dominant society immersion subscale (DSI), while 17 form the ethnic society immersion subscale (ESI). Mean scores were calculated for each subscale to give an indication of how immersed the participant is in the host (in this case, US) and natal cultures, respectively. In this sample, the alpha reliability for the ESI subscale was .91, and the alpha reliability for the DSI subscale was .74.

Autonomy-Supportive Parenting. General autonomy-supportive parenting was assessed using the Autonomy support subscale from Robbins’ (1994) Perception of Parents Scale (POPS). The autonomy-support subscale is comprised of 9 items, such as “My mother, whenever possible, allows me to choose what to do” and “my father allows me to decide things for myself.” The items were presented twice, with respect to both mother and father, and were averaged to create maternal and paternal autonomy support variables. In this data, the alpha reliability for maternal autonomy support was .89, and the alpha for paternal autonomy support was .87.

Domain Specific Autonomy-Supportive Parenting. The 6-item short form of the Learning Climate Questionnaire (Williams, Wiener, Markakis et al., 1994) was adapted to evaluate the amount of autonomy support that parents gave to their children in the following five domains relevant to young adults: career path, friendships, romantic relationships, participation in activities of native culture, and participation in American cultural activities. For example, the item “I feel that my parents have provided me with choices and options regarding...” was asked five times, once for each domain (30 items

in all). However, because the five domain scores were highly inter-correlated (r s ranging from .51 to .90) and did not form a discriminative pattern in the results, we aggregated them into a single “parental autonomy support” variable (note that mothers and fathers were not examined separately via these items). The alpha reliability for all 30 items was .96.

Study 1 Results

Preliminary Results

Table 1 provides means and standard deviations for the major study variables. Supporting the assumed immigrant status of the sample, participants reported more developmental exposure to their natal culture than they were to U.S. culture ($t(54) = 4.24$, $p < .001$). However, on the SMAS, our participants reported being more acculturated into American culture than they were into their natal culture ($t(54) = 6.57$, $p < .001$). This suggests that despite parental emphasis on native culture exposure, our second-generation participants felt more assimilated into U.S. culture than into their natal culture. This discrepancy again demonstrates the importance of discovering which factors might influence natal culture endorsement among second-generation immigrants.

Within-subject t-tests revealed that there was no difference between perceived paternal and maternal autonomy support ($t(54) = .71$, $p > .50$). It is also worth noting that maternal and paternal autonomy support were significantly positively correlated ($r = .23$, $p < .05$), signifying that participants’ parents converge in their supportive vs. controlling parenting styles. As expected, life-satisfaction and happiness were strongly positively correlated ($r = .65$, $p < .01$), showing that these measures are assessing similar constructs.

Hypothesis Tests

Intercorrelations. Recall our first two hypotheses which suggested that parental autonomy-support would be associated with higher ethnic acculturation and well-being among second-generation immigrants. Table 2 shows these intercorrelations. Paternal autonomy support was significantly positively correlated with ethnic society immersion ($r = .33$), internalization of natal cultural activities ($r = .31$), happiness ($r = .40$), and life satisfaction ($r = .29$). In contrast, maternal autonomy support was not significantly correlated with any of the culture or well-being variables. As expected, neither maternal nor paternal autonomy support was associated with dominant (i.e. U.S.) society immersion.

Similarly, the domain specific autonomy support measure, which assessed total parental support rather than individual support received from each parent, was significantly correlated with happiness ($r = .35$) and life satisfaction ($r = .41$) but not with any of the acculturation variables. The effects of this measure may have been diluted by the inclusion of both parents as a referent. In Study 2, maternal and paternal domain-specific autonomy-support are assessed separately.

In hypotheses 3, we predicted that natal acculturation would be related to higher levels of well-being. Table 3 shows these intercorrelations. Counter to our hypothesis, ethnic society immersion and natal culture internalization were unrelated to life satisfaction and happiness in this study. We suspect that this finding occurred because our acculturation and well-being measures did not comprehensively assess these concepts. For example, our well-being indices only assessed positive and not negative well-being, and we only included a measure of natal culture internalization and not host

culture internalization. Additional indices of acculturation and well-being will be added to Study 2 to better test this hypothesis.

Multiple Regressions. The previously discussed correlational analyses yielded some unexpected findings. In particular, maternal autonomy-support was unrelated to acculturation and well-being, and natal acculturation was not predictive of well-being. However, the possibility remained that though these variables may not independently predict outcomes, they may interact with other key variables to produce meaningful results.

We considered that maternal and paternal autonomy-support might have an interactive relationship such that their combined influence may trump their unique contributions. To test this idea, a multiplicative product term was created from maternal and paternal autonomy-support scores, and entered into a series of regressions predicting acculturation and well-being outcomes. This interaction term was not significant in any of the analyses. However, when the interaction term was removed from all analyses leaving only the main effects, paternal autonomy-support significantly predicted ethnic society immersion ($\beta = .34, t(54) = 2.46, p = .02$), natal culture internalization ($\beta = .29, t(54) = 2.12, p = .04$), and happiness ($\beta = .41, t(54) = 3.09, p < .01$), and marginally predicted life satisfaction ($\beta = .27, t(54) = 1.92, p = .06$) over and above the influence of maternal autonomy-support. Both paternal and maternal autonomy-support were unrelated to dominant society immersion. These analyses refute the presence of synergistic associations between maternal and paternal autonomy-support, and instead provide further evidence for the distinctive effects of paternal, but not maternal, autonomy-support on outcomes associated with second-generation immigrants.

We wished to similarly determine if our acculturation variables might be interactive rather than independently predictive of our well-being outcomes. We tested this possibility by predicting life satisfaction and happiness from the interaction between ethnic society immersion and dominant society immersion (represented by a multiplicative product term created from ethnic society immersion and dominant society immersion scores). In both analyses, the interaction term was not significant. Furthermore, when the interaction term was removed from the analysis, neither variable significantly predicted either outcome independently. This provides further evidence that acculturation did not influence well-being in our Study 1 data in any form.

The above analyses were conducted without controlling for gender or ethnicity, as the number of participants of each gender or ethnic minority group was too small to make meaningful comparisons. The potential effects of participant gender and ethnic background will be explored in the supplementary analysis section, where participants from Study 1 and Study 2 will be combined to detect potential group-level differences with greater power.

Study 1 Discussion

Study 1 results first established that one of our key assumptions regarding second generation immigrants was correct: although parents of our participants placed more emphasis on the natal culture than on US culture within the household, our sample still felt more assimilated into US culture. This is consistent with our expectation that although parents are trying to raise their children within the natal culture, in a sense their children are “already gone,” having been largely assimilated into the mainstream. Since the literature suggests that total assimilation into the dominant culture has negative

implications for ethnic minority individuals, the question becomes: what factors are associated with greater natal culture assimilation, and therefore a more bicultural ethnic identity?

Consistent with the proposals of self-determination theory, autonomy support was associated with greater assimilation into the native culture and also with greater subjective well-being. Thus, the paradox for first generation parents seems to be that they must let their children make their own choices about their ethnic identities, if their children are to maintain those identities. Counter to hypothesis 3, natal acculturation and internalization were unrelated to well-being despite reports of such an association in the literature (Harker, 2001; Farver et al., 2002a). Study 2 will again test this hypothesis using additional well-being measures.

Notably, only paternal autonomy support predicted native culture assimilation and well-being, whereas maternal autonomy support was not related to these variables. We did not expect this, and are reluctant to over-interpret the finding without replicating it (the primary purpose of Study 2). This finding may reflect the fact that fathers are more often viewed as “the head of the family” within more traditional family structures, and therefore paternal autonomy-support may feel more significant when it is granted. Similarly, mothers may be expected to be sensitive and nurturing within immigrant families, thus maternal autonomy support may not be as influential. It may also be that other unmeasured factors besides autonomy supportive or controlling parenting better explain the parental influence of first-generation mothers. These ideas are explored in greater detail later in the paper.

Study 2 Method

Participants

The first goal of Study 2 was to replicate the Study 1 findings with additional measures. Thus, methodologies utilized in Study 1 were again used in Study 2 to recruit second-generation immigrants from the introductory psychology subject pool one semester after Study 1 was conducted. Forty-six total participants completed the survey. Two of these participants reported being raised by someone other than their first-generation immigrant mother or father, so they were dropped from the analyses to ensure that all of our participants were raised in two-parent immigrant households. This procedure yielded forty-four participants. Of these, 59% were men and 41% were women. 11% were African-American, 46% were Asian-American, 4% were Hispanic-American, and 39% were Caucasian or European-American.

61% of the participants were born in the US and 39% migrated to the US before the age of 10. 25% of participants identified themselves as American, 23% identified themselves as belonging to their family's natal culture, and 48% identified themselves as both. When asked to categorize their parents, 5% identified their mother as American, 50% identified their mother as belonging to her natal culture, and 41% identified their mother as both. Similarly, 7% identified their fathers as American, 46% identified their father as belonging to his natal culture, and 43% identified their father as both.

Measures

Several new variables were assessed beyond those used in Study 1. First, in addition to evaluating ethnic culture internalization, we also assessed the degree of internalization of U.S. cultural activities. This was done so that both native and host

culture internalization could be examined via the PLOC methodology. Second, the domain specific autonomy support questions that were asked of both parents together in Study 1 were asked of the mother and father separately in Study 2. This allowed us to create separate domain specific autonomy support scores for mothers and fathers. Third, additional well-being measures assessing anxiety and depression were used in conjunction with the happiness and life satisfaction measures from Study 1. This allowed a more comprehensive summary of participants' positive and negative well-being. Alpha reliabilities for all measures repeated from Study 1 indicated that these scales were internally consistent (alphas ranged from .75-.90). Information about additional variables included in Study 2 are described below.

Distress. Anxious and depressive symptoms were assessed using the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) to give a measure of maladjustment (Derogatis, 1993). The 53-item, 4-point scale was shortened to items that only asked participants to endorse symptoms related to anxiety and depression. This yielded a 7-item anxiety subscale (e.g., nervousness or shakiness inside, trembling) and a 6-item depression subscale (e.g., feeling lonely, feeling blue). Mean scores for each subscale were calculated; higher scores indicated greater distress. In this sample, the alpha reliability for the anxiety subscale was .73, and for the depression subscale was .77.

Internalization of US cultural activities. The same adapted Perceived Locus of Causality scale (PLOC; Ryan & Connell, 1989) used to measure natal cultural internalization in Study 1 was used to assess how internally motivated participants were to participate in US cultural activities. Participants read: “When you are doing things to express US culture (i.e., participating in school activities or events, interacting with

American peers, eating American foods, etc.), why are you doing them?”, then rated their reasons in terms of 1) external motivation (“Because the situation makes me. Other people want me to do these cultural practices, or would disapprove of me if I didn’t”), 2) introjected motivation (“Because I make myself. I’d feel bad about myself, i.e. guilty and unworthy, if I didn’t do these cultural practices”), 3) identified motivation (“Because I want to. I fully identify with these cultural practices; they express my core values”) and 4) intrinsic motivation (“Because I like to. I fully enjoy these cultural practices; they are interesting and engaging in their own right”). All ratings were made on a 1 (not at all for this reason) to 5 (very much for this reason) scale. As in much prior research, ratings for external and introjected motivation were reverse coded and averaged with ratings of introjected and intrinsic motivation to obtain an aggregate “US culture internalization” score (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Deci & Ryan, 2000). In this sample, the alpha reliability for natal culture internalization was .60, and the alpha for US culture internalization was .54.

Domain Specific Autonomy Support Maternal and Paternal Parenting. The same adapted 6-item short form of the Learning Climate Questionnaire (Williams et al., 1994) used in Study 1 was given to participants in Study 2, however, here participants were asked to assess their mother and father separately. Additionally, because friendship and romantic relationships were so highly correlated in Study 1 ($r = .88$), we collapsed these two domains and created a category that referred to participants’ social interactions as a whole (both romantic and friendship). Thus, participants assessed maternal and paternal autonomy support towards their social interactions, career paths, participation in natal cultural activities, and participation in US cultural activities by rating each domain with

the same six questions, creating 24 items in total. As in Study 1, each domain was highly correlated with the other domains, thus we collapsed across domains to create separate maternal and paternal autonomy support domain scores. In this sample, the alpha reliability for maternal domain specific autonomy support was .94, and for paternal autonomy support was .98.

Study 2 Results

Preliminary Analyses

Table 4 provides means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations between the main study variables. As in Study 1, participants again reported that their families exposed them more to natal culture than they did to U.S. culture ($t(43) = 3.52, p=.01$). They also reported greater immersion into American culture than their natal culture on both the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation measures ($t(43) = 6.77, p < .01$) and greater internalization of US culture on the PLOC measures ($t(43) = 2.53, p < .02$). These results suggest that similar to participants in Study 1, Study 2 participants are also more assimilated into US culture despite their parents' emphasis on the natal culture.

Consistent with Study 1, there was no difference between evaluations of maternal and paternal autonomy support on either the general autonomy support scale ($t(43) = .57, p > .60$), or the two domain specific autonomy support scales ($t(43) = 1.05, p > .3$). Additionally, paternal and maternal autonomy support were significantly correlated for the domain specific measure ($r = .49, p < .01$) and marginally correlated for the general measure ($r = .23, p = .09$), suggesting once again that parents converge in their supportive or controlling parenting styles. Both indices of paternal autonomy support were significantly correlated with each other ($r = .70, p < .001$), as were both indices of

maternal autonomy support ($r = .70, p < .001$) suggesting that general and domain-specific autonomy support measures were assessing similar parenting styles. All inter-correlations between well-being variables were significant in the appropriate directions, suggesting that they converge in their measurement of positive and negative well-being.

Hypothesis Tests

Intercorrelations. Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that parental autonomy-support would be associated with increased identification with the ethnic culture and greater well-being. Table 5 shows these intercorrelations. As was the case in Study 1, paternal, but not maternal, autonomy-support was highly correlated with all outcome variables. Paternal autonomy-support from both the general and domain-specific measures significantly predicted natal culture internalization ($r_s = .37$ and $.38$, respectively) and ethnic society acculturation ($r_s = .31$ and $.33$, respectively), but neither was associated with either measure of US cultural identity.

Additionally, general paternal autonomy-support was significantly associated with increased life satisfaction ($r = .40$) and happiness ($r = .41$), and reduced depression ($r_s = -.49$) and anxiety ($r_s = -.48$). Similarly, domain-specific paternal autonomy-support was significantly related to reduced anxiety ($r = -.44$) and depression ($r = -.38$) and marginally associated with improved life satisfaction ($r = .25; p < .10$) and happiness ($r = .24; p < .10$). Maternal autonomy support was not predictive of natal culture acculturation, host culture acculturation, or any well-being variables.

Hypothesis 3 predicted positive relationships between natal acculturation and multiple indices of well-being; these correlations are shown in Table 6. Contrary to Study 1, ethnic society immersion was significantly associated with increased happiness

($r=.39$) and life satisfaction ($r=.34$), and reduced anxiety ($r=-.39$) and depression ($r=-.37$). However, neither natal culture internalization nor dominant society acculturation or internalization significantly predicted any well-being variables.

Multiple Regressions. As in Study 1, our correlational analyses revealed partial support for our hypotheses. We again did not discover associations between both paternal and maternal autonomy-support and all study outcomes (only paternal support was significant), but we did observe a tentative relationship between natal acculturation and well-being. To assess whether or not these effects might be qualified by higher-order interactions, we entered all relevant interaction terms into the same series of regressions conducted in Study 1.

To assess the combined influence of maternal and paternal autonomy-support, we created interaction terms from both autonomy-support scales used in Study 2. Because two measures were used to gauge each parent's level of support, we were able to multiply the values of maternal and paternal autonomy-support from each measure to create two interactions indicative of general and domain-specific parental autonomy-support. Each interaction was entered into separate regression equations predicting ethnic society immersion, dominant society immersion, natal and host culture internalization, and all well-being variables. The results indicated that neither the general nor the domain-specific interaction between maternal and paternal autonomy-support meaningfully predicted any outcome.¹

When these interaction terms were dropped from the analyses, however, some significant main effects emerged. The general measure of paternal autonomy-support significantly predicted increased ethnic society immersion ($\beta = .41$, $t(43) = 2.79$, $p < .01$),

natal culture internalization ($\beta = .31, t(43) = 2.02, p = .05$), happiness ($\beta = .40, t(43) = 2.27, p = .01$), life satisfaction ($\beta = .36, t(43) = 2.47, p < .05$), and reduced anxiety ($\beta = -.51, t(43) = -3.64, p < .01$) and depression ($\beta = -.48, t(43) = -3.39, p < .01$) over and above the influence of maternal autonomy-support. Similarly, domain-specific paternal autonomy-support significantly predicted increased ethnic society immersion ($\beta = .45, t(43) = 2.71, p = .01$), increased happiness ($\beta = .34, t(43) = 1.99, p = .05$), decreased anxiety ($\beta = -.57, t(43) = -3.68, p < .01$), decreased depression ($\beta = -.62, t(43) = -4.16, p < .01$), and marginally predicted increased natal culture internalization ($\beta = .31, t(43) = 1.84, p = .073$), and life satisfaction ($\beta = .28, t(43) = 1.60, p = .12$) over and above the influence of maternal autonomy-support. Neither measure of maternal or paternal autonomy-support significantly predicted dominant society immersion or host culture internalization, as hypothesized. Following the pattern demonstrated in Study 1, these results provide further evidence that paternal autonomy-support exerts a unique influence on outcomes associated with positive functioning among second-generation immigrants.

Relationships between acculturation variables were also probed to assess potential interactive influences on well-being. The inclusion of natal and host culture internalization along with the SMAS assessments in Study 2 allowed us to calculate two interaction terms representative of the combined influence of natal and host acculturation. One interaction term was created by multiplying the ethnic society immersion and dominant society immersion scores together; the other was created by multiplying the scores from natal culture internalization and host culture internalization. The results demonstrated that neither of these interaction terms significantly predicted any well-being outcome. When this interaction term was removed from the model containing the SMAS

subscales, ethnic society immersion significantly predicted increased happiness ($\beta = .40$, $t(43) = 2.76$, $p < .01$) and life satisfaction ($\beta = .32$, $t(43) = 2.20$, $p < .05$), and decreased anxiety ($\beta = -.39$, $t(43) = -2.73$, $p < .01$) and depression ($\beta = -.37$, $t(43) = -2.54$, $p < .05$) over and above the influence of dominant society immersion. However, when the natal and host culture interaction term was dropped from analyses containing the PLOC subscales, neither natal nor host internalization significantly predicted variance in any outcome variable. Thus, although ethnic society immersion provides support for the notion that natal acculturation is associated with higher well-being, the failure to replicate this finding with the additional measure of natal acculturation in Study 2 and both measures of natal acculturation in Study 1 cautions that these results are only tentatively supportive of hypothesis 3. We will revisit this issue again in the combined analysis section, where greater power may aid in the detection of significant relationships between acculturation and well-being.

As in Study 1, potential participant gender and ethnicity effects were not investigated as the number of participants belonging to each gender or ethnic minority group was too small to make meaningful between-group comparisons. The influence of these demographic variables will be address in the combined analysis section, before the General Discussion.

Study 2 Discussion

The results from Study 2 replicated our primary findings from Study 1. Once again, despite their first-generation parents' emphasis on retaining the natal culture, second-generation children reported being more highly identified with US culture. Because the literature on second-generation immigrants suggests that rejecting one's

ethnic identity is generally negative for individual well-being, we sought to further investigate the relationship between parental autonomy support and natal culture endorsement among our second-generation immigrant sample.

Consistent with our Study 1 results, we discovered that paternal, but not maternal, autonomy support was predictive of higher and more internalized acculturation into the natal culture. These results are strengthened by the associations between the general and domain-specific autonomy support measures and both indices of natal cultural immersion. Maternal autonomy support once again was unrelated to natal or host acculturation.

As was the case in Study 1, only paternal autonomy support was related to well-being in Study 2. The replication of our Study 1 results were strengthened by our inclusion of both positive and negative well-being indices in Study 2, all of which showed strong associations with paternal autonomy support. It is somewhat surprising that maternal autonomy support again did not predict well-being, as we originally posited that parental autonomy support would yield elevated well-being regardless of which parent was providing the support. It is possible that the unique status of fathers within the immigrant household may have contributed to these findings, as well as the findings related to acculturation outcomes. This possibility is considered in greater detail in the general discussion.

Ethnic society immersion, one of our two natal acculturation measures in Study 2, was associated with multiple indices of well-being as hypothesized. This finding is potentially meaningful as previous literature has shown high levels of ethnic identification can yield sustained, positive well-being over time (Harker, 2001; Farver et

al., 2002a). However, natal cultural internalization, our second measure of ethnic acculturation based on SDT, was unrelated with well-being. And again, neither measure of natal acculturation in Study 1 was associated with well-being outcomes in any analysis. Because no consistent pattern of results emerged between acculturation and well-being across both studies, no strong inferences can be made about this relationship until further testing can be done.

Combined Method

Due to the overlap in measures used between Study 1 and Study 2, and the similarity of our sample across both studies, we chose to consolidate all participant responses into one combined database. We felt that this procedure would allow us to further investigate our stated hypothesis with greater power. Combining the samples in this way also increased our ability to detect potential gender and ethnic group-level differences in our data.

Recall that we included additional measures in Study 2 to assess our main study variables. Because these variables were not included in Study 1, we could not investigate them in the combined sample. Therefore, analyses in this section will focus on the relationships between constructs assessed in both studies: general maternal and paternal autonomy-support, ethnic and dominant society immersion (SMAS), natal culture internalization (PLOC) and happiness and life satisfaction.

Combined Results

Participants

The combined sample contained responses from ninety-nine participants (55 from Study 1; 46 from Study 2). Of these, 54% were male and 46% were female. 11% were

African-American, 41% were Asian-American, 8% were Hispanic-American, 32% were Caucasian or European-American, and 8% did not ethnically identify themselves. These numbers indicated that the number of participants in each group were unequal, and in some cases was too small to make any meaningful group-level comparisons. Therefore, we decided to label all African-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic-American participants as 'non-European,' and all Caucasian or European participants as 'European.' This dichotomous variable was used to account for potential ethnic group-level differences in later analyses. This procedure is consistent with previous research that has shown differences in the way that Europeans and non-Europeans transition to a host country that is largely dominated by individuals of European descent (Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2005; Farver et al., 2002b). As a result of this procedure, 32% participants were identified as coming from European backgrounds, 60% were identified as coming from non-European backgrounds, and 8% could not be ethnically categorized.

Analyses

Preliminary Comparisons. Table 7 shows means and standard deviations of all major study variables in the combined analyses. Paired t-tests between maternal and paternal autonomy-support, ethnic and dominant society immersion, and happiness and life satisfaction revealed that there were no deviations from patterns exhibited in earlier studies. Participants reported receiving similar amounts of maternal and paternal autonomy-support, were equally happy and satisfied with their life, and were more acculturated into dominant society than they were into their ethnic society despite their parents' emphasis on the importance of their natal culture.

Intercorrelations. The correlational pattern exhibited in the combined sample closely mirrors the associations that were observed in study 1 and 2 (see Tables 8 and 9, addressing hypotheses 1 and 2). Paternal autonomy support was significantly positively correlated with ethnic society immersion ($r = .35$), internalization of natal cultural activities ($r = .31$), happiness ($r = .40$), and life satisfaction ($r = .33$). Again, maternal autonomy support was not significantly correlated with any of the culture or well-being variables, and neither maternal nor paternal autonomy support was associated with dominant society immersion.

Table 8 addressed hypothesis 3 in the combined sample by showing the intercorrelations between acculturation and happiness and life satisfaction. Somewhat consistent with the mixed results from the first two studies, only ethnic society immersion significantly predicted any well-being outcome—life satisfaction ($r = .22$). Natal culture internalization and dominant society immersion were unrelated to well-being. These relationships will be assessed in the following section.

Multiple Regressions. To further understand the hypothesized relationships between study variables in the combined samples, the main effects and interactions between relevant variables were entered into a series of regression equations. However, unlike previous analyses, all analyses accounted for the influence of gender and ethnicity on the results. Because we were primarily interested in investigating the interactions between main study variables on study outcomes, we did not hypothesize any interactions associated with these variables. Thus we opted to treat gender and ethnic identity as covariates rather than additional interaction terms in our models. This allowed us to

report the significance of our combined results over and above the influence of these demographics.

As before, the first sequence of regression analyses tested the potential interactive relationship between paternal and maternal autonomy-support. The effect of this interaction on all acculturation and well-being variables was not significant. However, paternal autonomy-support significantly predicted ethnic society immersion ($\beta = .35$, $t(90) = 3.44$, $p = .01$), natal culture internalization ($\beta = .30$, $t(90) = 2.87$, $p < .01$), happiness ($\beta = .39$, $t(90) = 3.77$, $p < .01$), and life satisfaction ($\beta = .28$, $t(90) = 2.71$, $p < .01$) over and above the influence of maternal autonomy-support, participant gender, and participant ethnic background. These results suggested that the initial patterns observed in Study 1 and Study 2 are again replicated here with more power. Paternal autonomy-support repeatedly demonstrates a unique influence over all study outcomes, even when maternal autonomy-support and participant gender and ethnic background are controlled for.

The potential interactive effects between the acculturation variables upon well-being were also modeled in similar regression equations. The interaction between ethnic and dominant society immersion did not significantly predict any well-being outcome. When the interaction term was removed from the model, ethnic society immersion significantly predicted life satisfaction over and above the effects of dominant society immersion, participant gender, and participant ethnic background ($\beta = .22$, $t(90) = 2.15$, $p < .05$). No such effect was found for happiness, and neither dominant society immersion nor natal culture internalization uniquely predicted life satisfaction or happiness. These results suggest that once again, the relationship between acculturation and well-being is

somewhat inconsistent. However, it is worth noting that only measures of natal acculturation (and not host acculturation) have uniquely predicted well-being, suggesting that it may play an important role. Further replication of this relationship will be needed to understand how these variables influence each other.

Supplementary Analyses. As previously stated, participants were included in all analyses if they were raised by immigrant parents, or if they were born in the US or came to live in the US before the age of ten. This definition was used to include as many second-generation individuals as possible, as many of our participants reported migrating to the US with their parents at a young age. However, some developmental psychologists have suggested that children who spend their formative years in one country, and then migrate to another, show signs of their natal and host culture influences well into adulthood (Farver (2002a; Padilla, 2006). To assess whether these potential developmental differences may have had an effect on our results, we removed all non-US born participants from both studies and combined all US-born participants into one database. This yielded sixty-eight total second-generation immigrants who were born in the US.

Table 10 shows the means and standard deviations of all major study variables. The results from paired t-tests between maternal and paternal autonomy-support, ethnic and dominant society immersion, and happiness and life satisfaction did not diverge from previously reported patterns between these variables, suggesting that there was no main effect of country of origin on outcomes associated with second-generation immigrants. Tables 11 and 12 show the intercorrelations between parental autonomy-support and acculturation and well-being, and between acculturation and well-being. The results

demonstrate the same pattern of simple correlations observed in every precedent analysis, and are largely supportive of our hypotheses. We believe that these findings provide enough support for including both US and non-US born second-generation immigrants in the same sample, provided that the participants came to live in the US at an age where they were still able to be influenced by socialization experiences during their development.

General Discussion

Children of immigrants face a complicated adolescence during which they are expected to be fluent in both their natal and host cultures. Developing a bicultural identity in this context can be difficult to the extent that these two cultures differ from one another. Indeed, second-generation immigrants seem to prioritize cultivating a positive relationship with the host culture, as most report a strong desire to assimilate to mainstream society even when members of the host culture exclude or discriminate against them (Cheryan & Monin, 2005). However, denial of one's ethnic culture is associated with a decline in self-esteem and well-being over time, demonstrating the importance of embracing one's differences especially when others can detect them (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Farver et al., 2002a). The tendency of second-generation immigrants to prefer host over natal assimilation was evidenced in our data, as participants reported greater immersion into US culture despite the emphasis placed on their natal culture during their development.

The pressure associated with being bicultural is often exacerbated by demands made by first-generation immigrant parents, in which their children are expected to minimize their endorsement of the host culture while increasing their affiliation with the

natal culture. This is problematic because children tend to rebel against non-autonomous parenting tactics by refusing to endorse the mandated behavior (Grolnick, 2003). Given the importance of accepting one's ethnic background, we sought to investigate whether perceptions of controlling or autonomy-supportive parents would influence natal acculturation among second-generation immigrants. Our belief was that controlling parents would hamper their children's ability to be biculturally competent, while autonomy-supportive parents would enhance their children's capability.

The results from our studies demonstrated that parental autonomy-support is indeed associated with increased natal culture endorsement among our participants. In particular, paternal, but not maternal, autonomy-support was related to increased natal culture internalization and immersion as well as elevated levels of well-being. While this research builds upon prior research showing the importance of family dynamics on second-generation acculturation patterns (Umana-Taylor, Bhanot, & Shin, 2006), the significance of paternal over maternal autonomy-support was unexpected. We did not predict these differential influences, since self-determination theory only posits that individuals benefit from autonomy-support in general and does not theorize which sources of autonomy-support are more beneficial than others. Although we cannot explain these discriminative patterns using our data, the broader research on family dynamics offer findings that may be useful in understanding these results.

Existing studies on family functioning have primarily adopted a functionalist approach to understanding maternal and paternal behavior. It appears that fathers and mothers uniquely contribute to their child's functioning by offering different resources to the child. Fathers tend to be instrumental caregivers, responsible for informing their

child of their role in society, encouraging them to achieve success, and disciplining them when they don't meet acceptable standards (Amato, 1998 in Booth & Crouter, 1998; Furstenberg, 1998 in Booth & Crouter, 1998; Younnis & Smaller, 1985). Fathers also tend to encourage independence in their children more frequently and at an earlier age than mothers do (Shulman & Ben-Artzi, 2003). In contrast, mothers are emotional caregivers; responsible for addressing the daily needs of their children, and providing consistent emotional support for all members of the family, but are generally not responsible for overall family functioning (Liu, Chen, Rubin, Zheng, Cui, Li, et al., 2005; Rudy & Grusec, 2006; Younnis & Smaller, 1985).

There is some evidence to suggest that these processes are especially true of immigrant families. Conventional parenting ideologies endorsed by mainstream US families tend to be magnified in immigrant families, as they are typically more traditional than their host culture peers (Dasgupta, 1998). In particular, immigrant behavior is largely defined by traditional gender roles carried over from the natal culture into the host culture (Dasgupta, 1998; Marin & Gamba, 2003 in Chun, Organista, & Marin, 2003). According to these gender roles, men are responsible for achieving competence in domains outside of the home (i.e. generating income, navigating social structures) whereas women are responsible for domains inside the home (i.e. childcare, household maintenance) (Santisteban & Mitrani, 2003 in Chun et al., 2003).

Family dynamics within the household are largely informed by these gender-based behavioral expectations. In traditional immigrant families, mothers assume most of the responsibility of childcare, leaving fathers less involved in daily family life than their native-born peers in the host (US) culture (Jain & Belsky, 1997; Santisteban &

Mitrani, 2003, in Chun et al., 2003). Fathers are primarily in charge of major-decision making, such as setting rules that dictate the child's behavior as they transition between developmental stages (i.e. dating, social interactions, etc.) (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004; Santisteban & Mitrani, 2003 in Chun et al., 2003). As a result, first-generation immigrant fathers are often seen as the authoritarian figure in the family, responsible for "setting the tone" for how individuals interact with each other and the outside world.

Some evidence suggests that due to the high status of fathers within the family, children modify some of their behavior in accordance with their father's, but not their mother's, directives. In studies where both maternal and paternal influences are controlled for, increased paternal supervision has been related to higher grades, better school attendance, higher graduations rates, and less substance abuse among adolescents and young-adults (Amato, 1998 in Booth & Crouter, 1998; Browne & Rife, 1991; Roberts, 1987). Interestingly, paternal involvement tends to yield the most beneficial outcomes when fathers assist their children during a stressful event or transition (Amato, 1998 in Booth & Crouter, 1998). For example, research has shown that the negative effects of frequent relocations or upheavals in the child's life can be greatly lessened by increased paternal involvement, even when maternal support is accounted for (Hagan, Macmillan, & Wheaton, 1996). It appears that children use supportive paternal relationship to help them through important times in their lives, especially when these times are stressful.

These findings may explain the importance of paternal support in our data. The majority of our participants are first and second semester college freshman who have only recently moved out of their parents' homes and are transitioning between

adolescence and adulthood. This transition can be difficult for many young adults, but it can be especially so for second-generation immigrants belonging to a natal culture that might be unsupported by the new environment (Farver et al., 2002a; Lay & Safdar, 2003). Our data suggests that the presence of an involved and caring father allows these individuals to build resources necessary to thrive in such a situation, as autonomy-supportive paternal relationships are linked with higher endorsement and internalization of the natal culture. In contrast, controlling and non-understanding fathers may have measurable negative influences upon these freshman students' ability to explore their identity as they adjust to collegiate life.

It seems that the father's high status within the immigrant households is positively influential when the father is willing to break gender and parenting norms by adopting a supportive and accepting stance towards their child. In contrast, the father's decision to assume a rigid and controlling stance towards his children is associated with a decline in the child's well-being and his or her readiness to connect with the family's natal culture. Similar levels of maternal autonomy-support may not be as influential because mothers are already expected to care for all of their children's needs, and thus this support may not feel as uniquely meaningful for the child.

It is important to remember that some of our explanations are only speculative because we did not directly measure perceptions of the mother and father's position within the family or parental gender role endorsement. Also, our constructs were measured only by self-report; replicating the patterns using observer-report or parent-report methodologies would strengthen the picture. Furthermore, our results are only correlational, and thus causal relations cannot be assumed. However, our initial results

are promising in that they appear to be relevant for all second-generation immigrants regardless of sex or ethnicity. Future studies in this area should include measures that assess these areas as they may illuminate more mechanisms by which second-generation immigrants acculturate themselves towards their natal and host cultures. Future studies should also strive to increase the diversity of their sample by including participants from as many ethnicities as possible, and from other regions and populations within the U.S.

Overall, our studies corroborate previous research showing that familial socialization processes are important mechanisms by which primarily assimilated second-generation immigrants establish their relationship with their natal culture. In particular, positive paternal relationships appear to be especially important for second-generation immigrants to incorporate their natal culture into their identity and experience positive well-being. It may be that paternal autonomy support is representative of a broader family interaction style that encourages the child to explore novel environments, including new cultures. Our data suggest that second-generation immigrants use these freedoms to develop tools through which they merge seemingly disparate parts of their identity into a coherent whole. While these initial results are promising, further research should be done to discover the ways in which maternal and paternal autonomy support work together and separately to predict positive second-generation immigrant functioning.

Footnotes

¹Two of the sixteen analyses investigating the combined influence of maternal and paternal autonomy-support revealed significant interaction terms. The interaction term created from the general autonomy-support scale significantly predicted dominant society immersion ($\beta = 2.38$, $t(43) = 2.71$, $p = .01$), and the interaction term created from the domain-specific autonomy-support scale significantly predicted life satisfaction ($\beta = 3.52$, $t(43) = 2.42$, $p < .05$). When plotted, these statistics suggested that when both maternal and paternal autonomy-support are high, dominant society immersion and life satisfaction scores are lower. We could find no theoretical reason to support these patterns. Furthermore, because these results were not observed in the previous study and were also inconsistent with other results from Study 2, we decided not to expand on the implications of these effects despite their significance.

Tables

Table 1

Study 1 Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.
1. Exposure to Natal Culture	4.15	1.03
2. Exposure to US culture	3.36	1.14
3. Happiness	3.77	.76
4. Life Satisfaction	3.59	.73
5. Dominant Society Immersion (DSI)	3.52	.30
6. Ethnic Society Immersion (ESI)	2.78	.67
7. Natal Culture Internalization	3.63	.85
8. Maternal Autonomy-Support	5.20	1.16
9. Paternal Autonomy-Support	5.07	1.18
10. Domain Specific Parental Autonomy-Support	3.88	.74

(n=55)

Table 2

Study 1 Intercorrelations between Parental Autonomy-Support (AS) and Acculturation, WB

Variable	DSI	ESI	Natal Culture Internalization	Happiness	Life Satisfaction
Maternal AS	.02	.07	.14	.08	.15
Paternal AS	.09	.33*	.31*	.40*	.29*
Parental Domain AS	.19	.23	.13	.35**	.41**

(n=55)

Table 3

Study 1 Intercorrelations between Acculturation and WB

Variable	Happiness	Life Satisfaction
DSI	.18	.18
ESI	-.02	.14
Natal Culture Internalization	-.08	-.04

(n=55)

Table 4

Study 2 Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.
Exposure to Natal Culture	4.18	.86
Exposure to US culture	3.52	1.21
Happiness	3.85	.63
Life Satisfaction	3.78	.75
Anxiety	1.44	.39
Depression	1.49	.46
Dominant Society Immersion	3.53	.34
Ethnic Society Immersion	2.78	.68
US Culture Internalization	3.94	.83
Natal Culture Internalization	3.62	.87
Maternal AS-General	5.04	1.24
Paternal AS-General	4.91	1.52
Maternal AS-Domain	3.89	.79
Paternal AS-Domain	3.74	1.03

(n=44)

Table 5

Study 2 Intercorrelations between Parental Autonomy-Support and Acculturation, WB

Variable	DSI	ESI	US Culture Internalization	Natal Culture Internalization	Happy	Life Sat.	Anx.	Dep.
Maternal AS	-.16	-.07	-.14	.08	.14	.24	-.01	-.16
Paternal AS	.25	.37*	.19	.31*	.41**	.40**	-.48**	-.49**
Maternal AS Domain	.15	.09	-.18	.19	-.04	.09	.12	.08
Paternal AS Domain	.14	.38*	-.01	.33*	.24 (p<.10)	.25 (p<.10)	-.38**	-.44**

(n=44)

Table 6

Study 2 Intercorrelations between Acculturation, WB

Variable	Happiness	Life Sat.	Anx.	Dep.
DSI	-.03	.17	.01	.06
ESI	.39**	.34*	-.39**	-.37*
US Culture Internalization	.13	-.16	.06	-.01
Natal Culture Internalization	.10	-.01	-.04	.00

(n=44)

Table 7

Combined Analyses Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.
Happiness	3.80	.70
Life Satisfaction	3.67	.74
Dominant Society Immersion	3.52	.32
Ethnic Society Immersion	2.78	.68
Natal Culture Internalization	3.62	.86
Maternal Autonomy-Support	5.13	1.20
Paternal Autonomy-Support	5.00	1.28

(n=99)

Table 8

Combined Analyses: Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB

Variable	DSI	ESI	Natal Culture Internalization	Happiness	Life Sat.
Maternal AS	-.07	.01	.10	.10	.18
Paternal AS (n=99)	.17	.35**	.31**	.40**	.33**

Table 9

Combined Analyses: Intercorrelations between Acculturation, WB

Variable	Happiness	Life Sat.
1. DSI	.11	.17
2. ESI	.10	.22**
3. Natal Culture Int.	-.07	-.03
(n=99)		

Table 10

Combined Analyses Means and Standard Deviations: US-Born

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.
Happiness	3.80	.74
Life Satisfaction	3.64	.82
Dominant Society Immersion	3.53	.34
Ethnic Society Immersion	2.76	.72
Natal Culture Internalization	3.72	.82
Maternal Autonomy-Support	5.22	1.20
Paternal Autonomy-Support	4.95	1.23
(n=68)		

Table 11

Combined: Intercorrelations between Parental AS and Acculturation, WB: US-Born

Variable	DSI	ESI	Natal Culture Internalization	Happiness	Life Sat.
Maternal AS	-.06	.05	.08	.12	.23
Paternal AS	.25*	.34**	.25*	.40**	.36**

(n=68)

Table 12

Combined: Intercorrelations between Acculturation, WB: US-Born

Variable	Happiness	Life Sat.
1. DSI	.10	.18
2. ESI	.19	.34**
3. Natal Culture Int.	-.07	-.03

(n=68)

References

- Abouguendia, M., & Noels, K.A. (2001). General and acculturation-related daily hassles and psychological adjustment in first-and second-generation South Asian immigrants to Canada. *International Journal of Psychology, 36*, 163-173.
- Amato, P. (1998). More than Money? Men's Contributions to Their Children's Lives. In A. Booth & A.C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in Families* (pp. 241-278). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Atzaba-Poria, N., & Pike, A. (2005). Why do ethnic minority (Indian) children living in Britain display more internalizing problems than their English peers? The role of social support and parental style as mediators. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 532-540.
- Berry, J.W. (2001). A Psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 615-631.
- Castillo, L., Conoley, C.W., & Brossart, D.F. (2004). Acculturation, White Marginalization, and Family Support as Predictors of Perceived Distress in Mexican American Female College Students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 151-157.
- Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). "Where are you *really* from?": Asian Americans and Identity Denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 717-730.
- Dasgupta, S.D. (1998). Gender Roles and Cultural Continuity in the Asian Indian Immigrant Community in the U.S. *Sex Roles, 38*, 953-974.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Publishing Co.

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.
- Derogatis, L. R (1993). Brief Symptom Inventory: Administration, Scoring and Procedures Manual. National Computer Systems. New York.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larson, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.
- Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Abouserie, R., & Farah, A. (2006). Parenting Styles, Individuation, and Mental Health of Arab Adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, 262-272.
- Farver, J.M., Bakhtawar, R.B., & Narang, S.K. (2002a). Acculturation and Psychological Functioning in Asian Indian Adolescents. *Social Development, 11*, 11-28.
- Farver, J.A., Narang, S.K., & Bhada, B.R. (2002b). East Meets West: Ethnic Identity, Acculturation, and Conflict in Asian Indian Families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*, 338-350.
- Furstenberg, F.F. (1998). Social Capital and the Role of Fathers in the Family. In A. Booth & A.C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in Families* (pp. 295-302). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalization within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In J. E. Grusec & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 135-161). New York: Wiley.

- Grolnick, W. (2003). *The Psychology of Parental Control*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hagan, J., MacMillan, R., & Wheaton, B. (1996). New Kid in Town: Social Capital and the Life Course Effects of Family Migration on Children. *American Sociological Review, 61*, 368-385.
- Harker, K. (2001). Immigrant Generation, Assimilation, and Adolescent Psychological Well-Being. *Social Forces, 79*, 969-1004.
- Jain, A & Belsky, J. (1997). Fathering and Acculturation: Immigrant Indian Families with Young Children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59*, 873-883.
- Jambunathan, S., & Counselman, K.P. (2004). Perception of self-competence among Asian Indian preschoolers living in the USA and India. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 12*, 17-23.
- Joussemet, M., Koestner, R., Lekes, N., & Landry, R. (2005). A Longitudinal Study of the Relationship of Maternal Autonomy Support to Children's Adjustment and Achievement in School. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 1215-1235.
- Killian, C. & Hegtvedt, K.A. (2003). The Role of Parents in the Maintenance of Second Generation Vietnamese Cultural Behaviors. *Sociological Spectrum, 23*, 213-245.
- Lay, C.H., & Safdar, F.S. (2003). Daily Hassles and Distress among College Students in Relation to Immigrant and Minority Status. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 22*, 3-22.
- Liu, M., Chen, X., Rubin, K.H., Zhen, S., Cui, L., Li, D., et al. (2005). Autonomy- vs. connectedness-oriented parenting behaviors in Chinese and Canadian mothers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 29*, 489-495.

- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 137-155.
- Marin, K.M. & Gamba, R.J. (2003). Acculturation and Changes in Cultural Values. In K. Chun, P.B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* (pp. 83-94). Washington, D.C.: APA.
- Padilla, A. (2006). Bicultural Social Development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 467-497.
- Phinney, J.S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156-176.
- Phinney, J.S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural Values and Intergeneration Value Discrepancies in Immigrant and Non-Immigrant Families. *Child Development*, 71, 528-539.
- Raffaelli, M. & Ontai, L.L. (2004). Gender Socialization in Latino/a Families: Results From Two Retrospective Studies. *Sex Roles*, 50, 287-299.
- Robbins, R. J. (1994). *An assessment of perceptions of parental autonomy support and control: Child and parent correlates*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Rochester, 1994.
- Rudy, D., & Grusec, J.E. (2006). Authoritarian Parenting in Individualist and Collectivist Groups: Associations with Maternal Emotion and Cognition and Children's Self-Esteem. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 68-78.

- Rudy, D., & Grusec, J.E. (2001). Correlates of Authoritarian Parenting in Individualist and Collectivist Cultures and Implications for Understanding the Transmission of Values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 202-212.
- Ruggiero, K.M., Taylor, D.M., & Lambert, W.E. (1996). A Model of Heritage Culture Maintenance: The Role of Discrimination. *International Journal of Intercultural Relationships, 20*, 47-67.
- Ryan, J.M., & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived Locus of Internalization and Causality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 749-761.
- Santisteban, D.A & Mitrani, V.B. (2003). The Influence of Acculturation Processes on the Family. In K. Chun, P.B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* (pp. 121-136). Washington, D.C.: APA.
- Sam, D.L., & Berry, J.W. (1995). Acculturative stress among young immigrants in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 36*, 10-24.
- Sam, D.L., & Oppedal, B. (2002). Acculturation as a developmental pathway. In W.J. Lonner, D.L., Dinnel, S.A. Hayes, & D.N. Sattler (Eds.), *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* (Unit 8, Chapter 6), (<http://www.wvu.edu/~culture>), Center for Cross-Cultural Research, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington USA.
- Schwartz, S.J., & Montgomery, M.J. (2002). Similarities or Differences in Identity Development? The Impact of Acculturation and Gender on Identity Process and Outcome. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*, 359-372.
- Sheldon, K. M. & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need-satisfaction, and longitudinal

- well-being: The Self-Concordance Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 482-497.
- Shulman, S., & Ben-Artzi, E. (2003). Age-Related Differences in the Transition from Adolescence to Adulthood and Link with Family Relationships. *Journal of Adult Development*, 10, 217-226.
- Sorkhabi, N. (2005). Applicability of Baumrind's parent typology to collective cultures: Analysis of cultural explanations of parent socialization effects. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29, 552-263.
- Stephenson, Margaret. (2000). Development and validation of the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS). *Psychological Assessment*, 12, 77-88.
- Umana-Taylor, A., Bhanot, R., & Shin, N. (2006). Ethnic Identity Formation During Adolescence: The Critical Role of Families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 390-414.
- Unger, J.B., Gallagher, P., Sakhil, S., Ritt-Olson, A., Palmer, P.; & Johnson, A. (2002). The AHIMSA Acculturation Scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22, 225-251.
- Watson D, Clark LA, & Tellegen A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 1063–1070.
- Williams, G. C., Wiener, M. W., Markakis, K. M., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (1994).

Medical student motivation for internal medicine. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 9, 327-333.

Ye, J. (2006). An examination of acculturative stress, interpersonal social support, and use of online ethnic social groups among Chinese international students. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 17, 1-20.

Youniss, J. & Smollar, J. (1985). *Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zhou, M. (1997). Growing up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 63-95.