

This is a repository copy of *Acculturation, Resilience and the Mental health of Migrant Youth:A Cross-Country Comparative Study*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/131412/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wu, Qiaobing, Ge, Ting, Emond, Alan et al. (8 more authors) (2018) Acculturation, Resilience and the Mental health of Migrant Youth:A Cross-Country Comparative Study. Public Health. pp. 63-70. ISSN 0033-3506

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2018.05.006>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Manuscript Number: PUHE-D-17-00643R1

Title: Acculturation, Resilience and the Mental Health of Migrant Youth:
A Cross-Country Comparative Study

Article Type: Original Research

Keywords: Acculturation; Mental Health; Migration; Resilience; Youth

Corresponding Author: Professor Qiaobing Wu, Ph.D.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Department of Applied Social
Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

First Author: Qiaobing Wu, Ph.D.

Order of Authors: Qiaobing Wu, Ph.D.; Ting Ge, MA; Alan Emond, MD; Kim
Foster, PhD; Justine Gatt, PhD; Kristin Hadfield, PhD; Amanda Mason-
Jones, PhD; Steve Reid, PhD; Linda Theron, PhD; Michael Ungar, PhD;
Trecia Wouldes, PhD

Abstract: Objectives: Using data from an international collaborative
research project on youth resilience in the context of migration, this
study aims to investigate how different acculturation patterns (i.e.,
integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization) influence the
mental health of migrant youth, and whether resilience might function as
a mediator in the association between acculturation and mental health.

Study Design: A cross-sectional pilot study conducted in six countries
employing a common survey questionnaire.

Methods: The study sample was 194 youths aged 10-17 years (Median=13.6)
from six countries (Australia, Canada, China, New Zealand, South Africa,
and United Kingdom), and included cross-border and internal migrants.
Mental health and well-being was measured by the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental
Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS). Resilience was measured by the Child and Youth
Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-28). Acculturation was assessed using the
Acculturation, Habits, and Interests Multicultural Scale for Adolescents
(AHIMSA). Multivariate regression and path analysis were performed to
examine the hypothesized mediation model.

Results: Resilience scores correlated strongly with mental health and
well-being. Acculturation exerted no significant direct effects on the
mental health of migrant youths. Nevertheless, compared to youths who
were integration-oriented, assimilation-oriented youths tended to exhibit
lower levels of resilience, resulting in poorer mental health. Compared
to youths from other countries, migrant youths from China also reported
lower levels of resilience, which led to poorer mental health outcome.

Conclusion: Acculturation plays a significant role in the mental health
of migrant youth, with different acculturative orientations exhibiting
different influences through the mediation effect of resilience.

Fostering resilience and facilitating integration-oriented acculturation are recommended public health strategies for migrant youth.

Response to Reviewers

We highly appreciate the comments and suggestions provided by the reviewers on the earlier version of our manuscript. Below please find our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments.

1. The sample is too small and spread out over too many migration/immigration ecosystems to justify the study's conclusions.

Response: We acknowledge in the discussion that the sample is small, and the findings will need to be replicated on a larger sample. However, the diversity of sites, and the mix of internal and international migrants, should also be considered a strength of the study. The relationships found across the different countries with the same age group of migrant youths suggest that there may be a consistent relationship between acculturation orientation, resilience and mental health. Therefore, this study would serve as a pioneer investigation that implies a promising direction for future large-scale comparative research.

2. The authors did not describe important details about the study sample, including the age of the respondents, and a description of differences between youth who participated in the study and those in the sampling frame who did not participate. Given that the study focuses on mental health and resilience, it is probable that the most resilient youth many have been recruited -which would skew results.

Response: We have now provided more details about the study sample (both the total sample and subsamples of each country) in Table 1. We have also added into the methods the way in which the sample was recruited in each country. We acknowledge that these are convenience samples in which selectivity bias might exist, and do not claim them to be representative of *all* migrant youth in each setting. However, the purpose of this pilot study is to test the feasibility of using the same questionnaire with migrant youth in diverse settings, and to demonstrate potential relationships between acculturation orientation, resilience and mental health. The value of this study is not about generalizing the findings to all migrant youth, but using highly comparable data across different settings of migration (which is rarely available in the extant literature) to test the hypothesis that acculturation orientation impacts on mental health in migrant youth through the potential mediating effect of resilience. Findings of this pilot study will need to be confirmed in future studies with larger and more representative samples, and will have valuable implications for public health intervention.

All revisions are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.

Acculturation, Resilience and the Mental Health of Migrant Youth:

A Cross-Country Comparative Study

Qiaobing Wu¹, Ting Ge², Alan Emond³, Kim Foster⁴, Justine Gatt^{5,6}, Kristin Hadfield⁷,
Amanda Mason-Jones⁸, Steve Reid⁹, Linda Theron¹⁰, Michael Ungar¹¹, Trecia Wouldes¹²

¹ Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

² Department of Social Work, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

³ School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol

⁴ School of Nursing and Midwifery, Australian Catholic University

⁵ Neuroscience Research Australia

⁶ School of Psychology, University of New South Wales

⁷ School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London

⁸ Department of Health Sciences, University of York

⁹ Primary Health Care Directorate, University of Cape Town

¹⁰ Department of Educational Psychology, University of Pretoria

¹¹ Resilience Research Centre, Dalhousie University

¹² Department of Psychological Medicine, University of Auckland

Corresponding Author: Qiaobing Wu, PhD, MPH, Associate Professor, Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Tel: +852 34003676; Email: qiaobing.wu@gmail.com

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5
6
7
8

9 **Objectives:** Using data from an international collaborative research project on youth resilience
10 in the context of migration, this study aims to investigate how different acculturation patterns
11 (i.e., integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization) influence the mental health of
12 migrant youth, and whether resilience might function as a mediator in the association between
13 acculturation and mental health.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Study Design:** A cross-sectional pilot study conducted in six countries employing a common
24 survey questionnaire.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Methods:** The study sample was 194 youths aged 10-17 years (Median=13.6) from six countries
32 (Australia, Canada, China, New Zealand, South Africa, and United Kingdom), and included
33 cross-border and internal migrants. Mental health and well-being was measured by the Warwick-
34 Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS). Resilience was measured by the Child and
35 Youth Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-28). Acculturation was assessed using the Acculturation,
36 Habits, and Interests Multicultural Scale for Adolescents (AHIMSA). Multivariate regression and
37 path analysis were performed to examine the hypothesized mediation model.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Results:** Resilience scores correlated strongly with mental health and well-being. Acculturation
51 exerted no significant direct effects on the mental health of migrant youths. Nevertheless,
52 compared to youths who were integration-oriented, assimilation-oriented youths tended to
53 exhibit lower levels of resilience, resulting in poorer mental health. Compared to youths from
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 other countries, migrant youths from China also reported lower levels of resilience, which led to
5
6 poorer mental health outcome.
7
8
9

10
11 **Conclusion:** Acculturation plays a significant role in the mental health of migrant youth, with
12
13 different acculturative orientations exhibiting different influences through the mediation effect of
14
15 resilience. Fostering resilience and facilitating integration-oriented acculturation are
16
17 recommended public health strategies for migrant youth.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Keywords:** Acculturation; Mental Health; Migration; Resilience; Youth
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Acculturation, Resilience and the Mental Health of Migrant Youth:**
5
6
7 **A Cross-Country Comparative Study**
8
9

10
11 **Introduction**
12

13
14 It has been well documented that youths in the context of migration face more challenges
15 in maintaining mental health and well-being.¹⁻³ Acculturation is one distinct factor associated
16 with migration that contributes to a variety of mental health outcomes of migrant youth.⁴⁻⁷
17
18 According to Berry,⁸ acculturation refers to the process by which individuals from one culture
19 acquire the culture and code of behaviors of another culture through prolonged contact and
20 interactions between two or more cultural groups and their members. Acculturation occurs not
21 only in cross-country migration, but also within a country when people with certain sociocultural
22 background relocate to areas of different cultural beliefs and behavioral patterns.^{9,10} Building
23 upon Berry's¹¹ bi-dimensional model which recognizes the coexistence of maintaining/rejecting
24 one's original culture and adopting/rejecting the host culture, acculturation could have four
25 possible patterns: 1) integration—maintaining the original culture while embracing the host
26 culture; 2) assimilation—endorsing the host culture with little interest in maintaining the original
27 culture; 3) separation—holding firmly to the original culture while rejecting to adopt the host
28 culture; and 4) marginalization—keeping apart and becoming alienated from both the original
29 and host culture. Among these four orientations, integration has been considered the most
30 adaptive mode of acculturation and has been associated with positive mental health outcomes,⁶
31 while marginalization is more likely to be associated with poorer mental health indicators.¹²
32
33 Despite the numerous studies that have acknowledged the impact of acculturation on youth
34 development,¹³⁻¹⁵ it remains inconclusive as to which acculturation pattern tends to be associated
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 with more positive or negative mental health outcomes. Even less known is the underlying
5
6 mechanism as to how acculturation influences mental health.
7
8

9 Resilience is another powerful concept that has been widely applied and found to predict
10 youth mental health. Understood as a process, resilience refers to positive adaptation despite
11 exposure to significant risk and adversity.^{16,17} Resilience involves characteristics and
12 competencies possessed by children that allow them to maintain positive functioning and
13 develop successfully even in adverse circumstances, as well as access to resources in their
14 environment that provide support.^{18,19} In the context of migration, resilience involves positive
15 adaptation to the stressors and challenges encountered in a new environment through persistent
16 coping.²⁰ Numerous studies have demonstrated positive mental health as one of the main
17 resilience outcomes of youth.²¹ Higher levels of resilience have been found to result in enhanced
18 self-esteem,²² lower depression and anxiety,²³ and better psychological well-being²⁴. While
19 examining the resilience of migrant youth, recent studies have also paid attention to the effect of
20 acculturation. For example, Luna's²⁵ study with youths of Mexican origin in Oregon suggested
21 that more assimilated individuals would exhibit increased levels of resilience. This implies a
22 potential path that links acculturation to the mental health outcomes of migrant youth: resilience
23 could be considered either as the outcome of cultural adaptation, or a factor in the process chain
24 of acculturation, thus functioning as a mediator in the association between acculturation and the
25 mental health of migrant youth. However, this mechanism has been rarely tested in the existing
26 literature and warrants further examination in empirical studies.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Using data from an international collaborative research project on youth resilience, the
54 present study set out to test the hypothesis that acculturation pattern influences the mental health
55 of migrant youth through resilience. The study aimed to investigate how different acculturation
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 patterns (i.e., integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization) influence the mental
5
6 health of migrant youth both directly, and also indirectly through the mediating effect of
7
8 resilience. A secondary aim was to use cross-national data to explore how the context of
9
10 migration and acculturation might make a difference in the association among acculturation,
11
12 resilience and the mental health of migrant youth. The conceptual framework of the study is
13
14 presented in Figure 1.
15
16
17

18
19 **[Insert Figure 1 about here]**
20
21

22 23 24 **Methods**

25 26 **Participants and Procedure**

27
28 Data came from a pilot study on the resilience of migrant youth conducted by an
29
30 international collaborative team of researchers from six countries (Australia, Canada, China,
31
32 New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom). A standard survey questionnaire was
33
34 developed through several rounds of face-to-face and virtual team meetings at the preparatory
35
36 stage, and was administered in each study site. Migrant youths were recruited through
37
38 convenience sampling with the assistance of schools and community organizations, and a total of
39
40 194 participants (aged 10-17 years) from six countries completed the survey (25 from Australia,
41
42 21 from Canada, 77 from China, 33 from New Zealand, 28 from South Africa, and 10 from the
43
44 United Kingdom). The sample was derived from schools in China and the UK, from community
45
46 sampling in South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, and from a migrant center in Canada. Data
47
48 were collected in each country in 2015-2016, and the process of data collection in each site was
49
50 supervised by the team member(s) from that country. The study was approved and monitored by
51
52 the Research Ethics Committees of the authors' institutions in all six countries. Full descriptive
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 statistics of the total sample and subsamples in each country are presented in Table 1.
5
6

7 [Insert Table 1 about here]
8

9 **Measures**

10
11 *Mental health* was measured by the 14-item Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being
12 Scale (WEMWBS).²⁶ Respondents were asked to describe to what extent each item about
13 feelings and thoughts applied to them over the past 2 weeks, such as “I’ve been feeling
14 optimistic about the future”. Each item was responded to on a 5-point scale ranging from
15 “1=none of the time” to “5=all of the time”. The Cronbach's alpha of the WEMWBS in this study
16 was 0.898. The sum score of the 14 items was used in the study as an outcome variable.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Resilience* was assessed by the 28-item Child and Youth Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-
27 28).²⁷ On a 5-point scale ranging from “1=not at all” to “5=a lot”, participants were asked to
28 describe to what extent each item applied to them, such as “I have people I look up to”. The
29 Cronbach's alpha for the CYRM-28 in this study was 0.904. The sum score of the 28 items was
30 used in the study as an observed indicator to assess resilience.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Acculturation* was identified and differentiated the respondents into four categories:
39 assimilation-oriented, separation-oriented, integration-oriented and marginalization-oriented.
40 This categorical variable was created and coded based on the Acculturation, Habits, and Interests
41 Multicultural Scale for Adolescents (AHIMSA).²⁸ Respondents were asked to describe their
42 identity towards each item, such as “I am most comfortable being with people from...”. The
43 response categories were, “The country I am living right now (i.e. Britain)” (indicating
44 assimilation), “The country my family is from” (indicating separation), “Both” (indicating
45 integration), and “Neither” (indicating marginalization). Note that in the survey with Chinese
46 migrant youth, “country” in the response categories was replaced by “place”, given that the
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 internal migration in China is characterized by people moving from one place to another. These
5
6 responses thus generated four scores according to the categories above: 1) assimilation score was
7
8 represented by the total number of “The country I am living in right now” responses; 2)
9
10 separation score was assessed by the total number of “The country my family is from” responses;
11
12 3) integration score was measured by the total number of “Both” responses; 4) marginalization
13
14 score was rated by the total number of “Neither” responses. Based on the above scoring, we
15
16 defined youth whose assimilation score was the highest among these four scores as assimilation-
17
18 oriented; whose separation score was the highest as separation-oriented; whose integration score
19
20 was the highest as integration-oriented; and whose marginalization score was the highest as
21
22 marginalization-oriented. In data analysis, the group of integration-oriented youth was used as
23
24 the reference group.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Sociodemographic variables* controlled in this study included gender (1=male), age (in
32
33 years), whether or not living with both parents (1=yes), number of siblings living together,
34
35 number of bedrooms, and times of moving home in the past five years. Another variable being
36
37 controlled was the country or context of migration. Considering that internal (China) and
38
39 international (other countries) migration could have created different contexts of adaptation and
40
41 settlement, we created a country variable (1=China, 0=other countries) to test if differences
42
43 would appear in the examined relationship patterns as a consequence of migration context.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Analytical Plan**

51
52
53 The analytical plan included two steps. First, multivariate regression modeling (nested
54
55 models) was performed using Stata 14²⁹ to preliminarily estimate the effects of acculturation on
56
57 youth’s mental health and resilience respectively. Second, based on the results of the regression
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 models, path analysis was conducted using Mplus 7.0³⁰ to test the hypothesized model of
5
6 mediation among acculturation, resilience, and the mental health of migrant youth. While testing
7
8 the path model, we used multiple indices to assess the model fit, including: 1) the likelihood ratio
9
10 test statistic (χ^2)—a non-significant χ^2 indicates the model’s closer fit to the perfect fit; 2) the
11
12 Comparative Fit Index (CFI)—values above 0.90 denote a good model fit; and 3) the Root Mean
13
14 Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)—values less than 0.05 indicate a good fit.³¹
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Results

22 23 24 Multivariate Regression Modeling

25
26 Table 2 presented the results from multivariate regression models predicting youths’
27
28 mental health. Model 1 was the baseline model with only control variables included. Among
29
30 these predictors, gender showed significant effects on mental health, with male youth exhibiting
31
32 better mental health than female youth ($\beta=3.384, p<0.05$). Model 2 was an additive model with
33
34 resilience and acculturation variables incorporated. It suggested that, controlling for other
35
36 variables, youths with higher resilience were significantly more likely to report better mental
37
38 well-being ($\beta=0.392, p<0.001$). Compared to integration-oriented youth, assimilation-oriented,
39
40 separation-oriented and marginalization-oriented youth did not show significant differences in
41
42 their mental health status. Model 3 is a nested model of Model 2 which added the country factor.
43
44 Youth from China and other countries did not differ significantly in their reports of mental well-
45
46 being, while the effects of resilience and acculturation variables on mental health remained
47
48 unchanged as in Model 2. The percentage of variance explained by the models (R^2) increased
49
50 from 5.5% in Model 1 to 47.5% in Model 3.
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 [Insert Table 2 about here]
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Table 3 presented the results from multivariate regression models predicting youth's
5
6 resilience. Still, Model 4 was the baseline model with control variables only. Gender, age and
7
8 number of siblings live together exerted significant effects on resilience. Being male ($\beta=8.604$,
9
10 $p<0.01$), at an older age ($\beta=2.577$, $p<0.01$), and living with more siblings ($\beta=2.425$, $p<0.01$)
11
12 were all associated with higher levels of resilience. Model 5 was an additive model with
13
14 acculturation patterns included. The results indicated that, compared to integration-oriented
15
16 youth, assimilation-oriented youth ($\beta=-6.305$, $p<0.05$) and marginalization-oriented youth ($\beta=-$
17
18 8.123 , $p<0.05$) exhibited significantly lower levels of resilience, holding constant all other
19
20 factors. Nevertheless, separation-oriented youth showed no significant differences from those
21
22 integration-oriented youth in terms of resilience. Model 6 was a nested model of Model 5 with
23
24 the country factor being introduced. The effect of the assimilation-oriented acculturation pattern
25
26 on youth mental health, as compared to integration-oriented, remained significant ($\beta=-5.994$,
27
28 $p<0.05$), controlling for other variables. However, the previously significant effect of
29
30 marginalization-oriented acculturation pattern on mental health became non-significant in this
31
32 model. In addition, migrant youth from China exhibited significantly lower levels of resilience
33
34 than youth from other countries ($\beta=-8.138$, $p<0.05$). The percentage of variance explained by the
35
36 models (R^2) increased from 13.6% in Model 4 to 24.2% in Model 6.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **[Insert Table 3 about here]**
48

49 Overall, results from the multivariate regression models suggested that resilience
50
51 presumably played a mediating role in the association between acculturation and youth's mental
52
53 health. However, the multivariate regression analysis itself cannot test the model as a whole and
54
55 estimate the relationships among all variables simultaneously. Therefore, based on the above
56
57 results, we further performed path analysis via Mplus 7.0 to examine the mediating effects of
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 resilience in the second step.
5
6
7

8 9 **Path Analysis**

10
11 The goodness-of-fit indices generated from the test of the structural model demonstrated
12 satisfying results ($\chi^2 = 3.857$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.277$; CFI= .990; RMSEA= 0.043). A total of 42.4
13
14 percent of the variance in the mental health of youth was explained by this model. The
15
16 standardized solution for the path model is presented in Figure 2. Bootstrapping method was
17
18 used to test the significance of the indirect effects of major predictor variables in the model. The
19
20 standardized direct, indirect and total effects were presented in Table 4.
21
22
23
24

25
26 **[Insert Figure 2 and Table 4 about here]**
27

28
29 As hypothesized, effects of the various acculturation orientations on youth mental health
30
31 were mediated by the effect of resilience. Compared to those integration-oriented youths,
32
33 assimilation-oriented youths exhibited significantly lower levels of resilience ($\beta=-0.192$, $p<0.05$),
34
35 which, in turn, predicted worse mental well-being ($\beta=0.622$, $p<0.001$). However, neither
36
37 separation-oriented ($\beta=0.038$, $p>0.05$) nor marginalization-oriented acculturation pattern ($\beta=-$
38
39 0.067 , $p>0.05$) demonstrated significant influences on youth mental health through this indirect
40
41 pathway. In addition, the country context of migration also made a difference. Although living in
42
43 China or other countries did not show significant direct effect on youth's mental health ($\beta=-$
44
45 0.039 , $p>0.05$), migrant youths from China, as compared to those from other countries, tended to
46
47 have lower resilience level ($\beta=-0.242$, $p<0.05$), which predicted poorer mental health ($\beta=0.622$,
48
49 $p<0.001$). Moreover, to further test whether the country context might function as a moderator,
50
51 we also conducted a multiple-group comparison to examine whether the relationships among
52
53 acculturation, resilience and mental health would differ between the sample of youth from China
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and those from other countries. This additional analysis found no significant difference across
5
6 the two groups.
7

8
9 Of the sociodemographic variables, gender showed no significant direct effect on youth's
10
11 mental health ($\beta=0.085$, $p>0.05$), but being male was associated with higher resilience ($\beta=0.216$,
12
13 $p<0.01$), which led to more positive mental health ($\beta=0.622$, $p<0.001$). Other control variables
14
15 did not show similar results.
16
17

18 19 20 21 22 **Discussion**

23
24 Migration is a global phenomenon in the 21st century with longer stay and family
25
26 resettlement in the destination countries/regions being increasingly observed.³² Consequently, the
27
28 number of children and youths migrating with their parents is continuously growing. According
29
30 to the United Nations,³³ one in every six migrants is under the age of 20. Similar figures are also
31
32 reported in individual countries that have been popular destinations for migrants. As a critical
33
34 indicator of integration of migrants to the host society, the mental health of migrant youth has
35
36 been paid increasing attention by researchers, policy makers and service providers, all bearing a
37
38 strong commitment to promoting the mental well-being of this population. The present study
39
40 draws upon data from a pilot study conducted in six countries experiencing large waves of
41
42 migration, and contributes to the literature by illustrating how cultural adaptation, one inevitable
43
44 component associated with the process of migration, influences a resilient response to adversity
45
46 and impacts on the mental health of migrant youth.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Results of the multivariate regression and path analysis clearly suggest that, although
54
55 acculturation orientation did not affect mental well-being directly, there was evidence that
56
57 acculturation contributed to the mental health of migrant youth through promoting resilience.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Specifically, the study probes into the nuance of different acculturation orientations and
5
6 investigates which acculturation pattern is more likely to be associated with better mental well-
7
8 being. It is well acknowledged in the literature that the ability to retain one's original cultural
9
10 identity and at the same time striving to integrate into the new host culture, that is, integration-
11
12 orientated acculturation, is usually predictive of better mental health outcomes.³⁴ Therefore, in
13
14 our analysis, "integration-oriented" was used as the reference group while examining the effect
15
16 of acculturation. The research findings indicate that, although not showing any direct effect on
17
18 mental health, compared to those integration-oriented youths, assimilation-oriented youths tend
19
20 to experience poorer mental health as a result of lower resilience predicted by their acculturation
21
22 pattern. This echoes what has been documented in the literature that recognizes the advantage of
23
24 integration, and also supports the hypothesis of the current study that resilience functions as a
25
26 mediator to link the acculturation pattern of migrant youth to their mental health outcomes. The
27
28 results convey a message that, endorsing the new host culture of the destination country/place
29
30 could be more beneficial for the youth's mental health when it is accompanied by maintaining
31
32 interest in the original culture (integration) rather than by abandoning the original cultural
33
34 identity (assimilation). In other words, being able to balance one's original and new cultural
35
36 identity is a strength for migrant youth and a pathway to higher resilience and positive mental
37
38 health. Failure to detect any significant differences in mental health between youths who are
39
40 integration-oriented in their acculturation pattern and youths who are separation- or
41
42 marginalization-oriented is probably a consequence of the small sample size and the distribution
43
44 of the acculturation variable, with only about 3% being separation-orientated.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Another major finding of the research is the reaffirmed importance of resilience in youth
56
57 development. A large body of the literature has documented the positive association between
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 resilience and various developmental outcomes of youth.^{22,23,35} Children and youths with the
5
6 ability to adapt positively in the face of adversity are able to perform better at school and
7
8 experience less mental health difficulties. The present study has demonstrated the same
9
10 proposition. Moreover, in the particular context of migration that this study focuses on, our
11
12 findings highlight the role of resilience not only in promoting the mental health of youths
13
14 directly, but also bridging the process of cultural adaption to the maintenance of mental well-
15
16 being. It suggests that resilience is not an immutable personality trait but rather a systemic
17
18 response to the adversity of migration. For migrant youth, the level of resilience appears to vary
19
20 with their stage and orientation of cultural adaptation. Although previous studies have also
21
22 identified other factors that may mediate the effect of acculturation on the mental health of
23
24 migrant youth,³⁶ the fact that the model tested in the present study explains 42.4 percent of the
25
26 variance in mental health suggests that resilience is a uniquely important contributing factor for
27
28 youth mental well-being.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 The country context of migration also makes a difference. Compared to youths from
37
38 other countries, migrant youth from the China sample appears to have lower levels of resilience,
39
40 which leads to poorer mental well-being. This could be attributed to the difference between
41
42 internal (China) and predominantly international migration (other countries), or the cultural
43
44 differences between the eastern and western countries. Although migrating within the country,
45
46 the long enforced household registration system in China that creates a divide between rural and
47
48 urban citizens have generated many barriers for the adaptation of rural-urban migrants in the city.
49
50 This has made the acculturation of Chinese migrant youth even more complex and
51
52 challenging.^{37,9} More research is needed along this line of inquiry for cross-country and cross-
53
54 cultural comparison.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The study has several limitations, especially in terms of the study sample. Since it is only
5
6 a pilot study of an international collaborative research team, the sample size is fairly small in
7
8 each country, which constrains the possibility to perform more sophisticated analyses and might
9
10 have distorted some analysis results. In addition, participants of the pilot study are recruited
11
12 through convenience sampling, which limits the generalizability of the research findings.
13
14
15 Therefore, results of the study must be interpreted with caution, and will need to be replicated
16
17
18 with larger samples of migrant youth in future studies. However, the diversity of study sites and
19
20
21 the mix of internal and international migrants should also be considered a strength of the study,
22
23
24 given that similar kind of comparable datasets across multiple settings of migration are rarely
25
26
27 available in the existing literature. This study has served as a pioneer investigation that implies a
28
29
30 promising direction for future large-scale comparative research.

31
32 Despite the aforementioned limitations, this study advances the extant knowledge and
33
34 illustrates the relationship between the mental health of migrant youth and the larger process of
35
36 cultural adaptation and resilience building. The findings could have important implications for
37
38 public health intervention in two directions. On the one hand, given the significance of resilience
39
40 in promoting youth mental health, resilience building would still be a recommended strategy to
41
42 improve the mental well-being of migrant youth. On the other hand, considering that specific
43
44 patterns of acculturation do contribute to the resilience of youth, and indirectly to youth mental
45
46 health, in different ways, some culturally sensitive and appropriate components could be built
47
48 into the public health intervention programs in an effort to facilitate the integration-oriented
49
50 acculturation that is shown to benefit mental health. Support programs should aim to motivate
51
52 migrant youths to acknowledge the value of their original culture as well as to enhance their
53
54 appreciation of the host culture, thus amplifying the advantage of integration to foster resilience
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and to promote mental health.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1. Belhadj Kouider E, Koglin U, Petermann F. Emotional and behavioral problems in migrant children and adolescents in Europe: a systematic review. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2014;23(6):373-91.
2. Belhadj Kouider E, Koglin U, Petermann F. Emotional and Behavioral Problems in Migrant Children and Adolescents in American Countries: A Systematic Review. *J Immigr Minor Health*. 2015;17(4):1240-58.
3. Frankenberg E, Kupper K, Wagner R, Bongard S. Immigrant youth in Germany: Psychological and sociocultural adaptation. *Eur Psychol*. 2013;18(3):158.
4. Farver JA, Narang SK, Bhadha BR. East meets west: ethnic identity, acculturation, and conflict in Asian Indian families. *J Fam Psychol*. 2002;16(3):338-50.
5. Lawton KE, Gerdes AC. Acculturation and Latino adolescent mental health: integration of individual, environmental, and family influences. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev*. 2014;17(4):385-98.
6. Lo Y. The impact of the acculturation process on Asian American youth's psychological well-being. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs*. 2010;23(2):84-91.
7. Nguyen HH, Messé LA, Stollak GE. Toward a more complex understanding of acculturation and adjustment cultural involvements and psychosocial functioning in Vietnamese youth. *J Cross Cult Psychol*. 1999;30(1):5-31.
8. Berry JW. Acculturation as varieties of adaptations. In: Padilla A, editor. *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*. Boulder, CO: Westview; 1980. p. 9-25.
9. Fang L, Sun RC, Yuen M. Development and preliminary validation of an acculturation scale for China's rural to urban migrant children. *Int J Intercult Relat*. 2017;58:1-11.

- 1
2
3
4 10. Ozer S, Schwartz SJ. Measuring globalization-based acculturation in Ladakh: Investigating
5 possible advantages of a tridimensional acculturation scale. *Int J Intercult Relat.* 2016;53:1-
6
7 15.
8
- 9
10
11 11. Berry JW. Immigrant acculturation: Psychological and social adaptations. In: Azzi AE,
12 Chrysochoou X, Klandermans B, Simon B, editors. *Identity and participation in culturally*
13
14 *diverse societies.* West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons; 2010. p. 279-95.
15
16
- 17
18 12. Berry JW, Sabatier C. Acculturation, discrimination, and adaptation among second
19 generation immigrant youth in Montreal and Paris. *Int J Intercult Relat.* 2010;34(3):191-207.
20
21
- 22
23 13. Berry JW. Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *Int J Intercult Relat.*
24
25 2005;29(6):697-712.
26
27
- 28
29 14. Kim SY, Chen Q, Li J, Huang X, Moon UJ. Parent-child acculturation, parenting, and
30 adolescent depressive symptoms in Chinese immigrant families. *J Fam Psychol.*
31
32 2009;23(3):426-37.
33
34
- 35
36 15. Yeh CJ. Age, acculturation, cultural adjustment, and mental health symptoms of Chinese,
37 Korean, and Japanese immigrant youths. *Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol.* 2003;9(1):34-
38
39 48.
40
41
- 42
43 16. Luthar SS. *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities.*
44
45 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003.
46
47
- 48
49 17. Masten AS. Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Dev.*
50
51 2014;85(1):6-20.
52
- 53
54 18. Kirby LD, Fraser MW. Risk and resilience in childhood. In: Fraser MW, editor. *Risk and*
55
56 *resilience in childhood: An ecological perspective.* Washington, DC: NASW Press; 1997. p.
57
58 10-33.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 19. Ungar M. Resilience across cultures. *Br J Soc Work*. 2006;38(2):218-35.
- 5
6
7 20. Castro FG, Murray KE. Cultural adaptation and resilience: Controversies, issues, and
8
9 emerging models. In: Reich JW, Zautra AJ, Hall JS, editors. *Handbook of adult resilience*.
10
11 New York: Guilford Press; 2010. p. 375-403.
- 12
13
14 21. Masten AS, Best KM, Garmezy N. Resilience and development: Contributions from the
15
16 study of children who overcome adversity. *Dev Psychopathol*. 1990;2(04):425-44.
- 17
18
19 22. Benetti C, Kambouropoulos N. Affect-regulated indirect effects of trait anxiety and trait
20
21 resilience on self-esteem. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2006;41(2):341-52.
- 22
23
24 23. Haddadi P, Besharat MA. Resilience, vulnerability and mental health. *Procedia Soc Behav*
25
26 *Sci*. 2010;5:639-42.
- 27
28
29 24. Sagone E, De Caroli ME. Relationships between psychological well-being and resilience in
30
31 middle and late adolescents. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci*. 2014;141:881-7.
- 32
33
34 25. Luna LE. *Language brokers: the relationship of acculturation, shame, hope, and resilience in*
35
36 *Latinos of Mexican descent*: George Fox University; 2013.
- 37
38
39 26. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh
40
41 *Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation*. *Health Qual Life*
42
43 *Outcomes*. 2007;5:63.
- 44
45
46 27. Ungar M, Liebenberg L. Assessing resilience across cultures using mixed methods:
47
48 *Construction of the child and youth resilience measure*. *J Mix Methods Res*. 2011;5(2):126-
49
50 49.
- 51
52
53 28. Unger JB, Gallaher P, Shakib S, Ritt-Olson A, Palmer PH, Johnson CA. The AHIMSA
54
55 *acculturation scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society*.
56
57 *J Early Adolesc*. 2002;22(3):225-51.
- 58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 29. StataCorp. Stata: Release 14. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2015.
- 5
- 6
- 7 30. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. Mplus User's Guide. Seventh ed. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén &
- 8 Muthén; 2012.
- 9
- 10
- 11 31. Kline RB. Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. 2nd ed. New York, NY:
- 12 The Guilford Press; 2005.
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16 32. Cortina J, Taran P, Raphael A. Migration and youth: Challenges and opportunities. New
- 17 York, NY: UNICEF; 2014.
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 33. UN. International migrant stock 2015 New York. NY: United Nations; 2015 [Available from:
- 22 [http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/da](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml)
- 23 [ta/estimates2/estimates15.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml)].
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29 34. Berry JW. Acculturation and adaptation of immigrant youth. *Can Divers*. 2008;6(2):50-3.
- 30
- 31 35. Wu Q, Tsang B, Ming H. Social capital, family support, resilience and educational outcomes
- 32 of Chinese migrant children. *Br J Soc Work*. 2012;44(3):636-56.
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36 36. Gonzales NA, Deardorff J, Formoso D, Barr A, Barrera M. Family mediators of the relation
- 37 between acculturation and adolescent mental health. *Fam Relat*. 2006;55(3):318-30.
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41 37. Fang L, Sun RC, Yuen M. Acculturation, economic stress, social relationships and school
- 42 satisfaction among migrant children in urban China. *J Happiness Stud*. 2016;17(2):507-31.
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

Table1 Descriptive statistics of the study sample

Variables	Means/Percent (%)						
	Total	Australia	Canada	China	New Zealand	South Africa	UK
Male (%)	53.2	68.0	38.1	57.1	27.3	67.9	40.0
Age	13.88 (1.360)	13.28 (0.614)	14.05 (0.970)	13.23 (0.959)	15.25 (1.107)	13.77 (1.583)	15.70 (1.252)
Living with parents (%)	77.0	96.0	76.2	94.6	72.7	17.9	80.0
Number of siblings living with	1.58 (1.509)	1.72 (1.021)	2.20 (1.576)	1.23 (0.958)	1.48 (1.004)	2.00 (2.884)	1.80 (1.751)
Number of bedrooms	3.34 (2.035)	4.52 (2.502)	3.62 (0.973)	2.63 (0.830)	3.48 (0.834)	3.78 (4.200)	3.50 (0.972)
Times of moving home	1.48 (1.700)	0.76 (1.128)	3.80 (2.353)	1.13 (1.128)	1.12 (1.244)	2.15 (2.070)	0.80 (0.919)
Resilience	112.8 (15.92)	116.24 (10.026)	122.15 (14.241)	107.84 (17.359)	116.33 (16.628)	115.50 (15.706)	105.60 (6.275)
Acculturation orientation (%)							
-Assimilation-oriented	41.4	69.6	70.6	31.3	51.6	18.5	22.2
-Separation-oriented	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	6.5	7.4	0.0
-Integration-oriented	35.1	17.4	17.6	22.4	41.9	70.4	77.8
-Marginalization-oriented	20.7	13.0	11.8	44.8	0.0	3.7	0.0

Notes: Figures in parentheses are standard deviations for continuous variables.

Table 2 Multivariate regression models predicting youths' mental health

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Male	3.384* (1.492)	2.994* (1.416)	3.052* (1.431)
Age	-0.317 (0.555)	-0.768 (0.514)	-0.820 (0.538)
Living with parents	-1.748 (1.819)	-2.176 (1.790)	-2.101 (1.810)
Number of siblings live with	0.610 (0.478)	0.266 (0.520)	0.257 (0.522)
Number of bedrooms	-0.008 (0.355)	-0.120 (0.460)	-0.169 (0.483)
Times of moving home	0.108 (0.415)	0.291 (0.431)	0.267 (0.438)
Resilience		0.392*** (0.047)	0.389*** (0.048)
<i>Acculturation (reference: integration-oriented)</i>			
Assimilation-oriented		2.077 (1.560)	2.083 (1.566)
Separation-oriented		-3.825 (4.106)	-3.700 (4.137)
Marginalization-oriented		-0.062 (1.980)	0.201 (2.126)
China			-0.639 (1.836)
Constant	57.64*** (8.431)	20.07* (8.957)	21.44* (9.810)
<i>N</i>	167	128	128
<i>R</i> ²	0.055	0.474	0.475

Notes: Figures in parentheses are standard errors

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 3 Multivariate regression models predicting youths' resilience

Variables	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Male	8.604** (2.620)	8.570** (2.721)	8.912** (2.678)
Age	2.577** (0.967)	2.198* (0.998)	1.395 (1.041)
Living with parents	-3.060 (3.330)	-3.250 (3.585)	-2.138 (3.556)
Number of siblings live with	2.425** (0.904)	2.987** (0.964)	2.733** (0.953)
Number of bedrooms	0.215 (0.600)	-0.548 (0.909)	-1.161 (0.932)
Times of moving home	-0.005 (0.794)	-0.561 (0.852)	-0.853 (0.847)
<i>Acculturation (reference: integration-oriented)</i>			
Assimilation-oriented		-6.305* (3.029)	-5.994* (2.980)
Separation-oriented		5.724 (8.244)	7.065 (8.122)
Marginalization-oriented		-8.123* (3.842)	-4.547 (4.081)
China			-8.138* (3.523)
Constant	70.27*** (14.91)	81.92*** (15.62)	96.93*** (16.66)
<i>N</i>	146	132	132
<i>R</i> ²	0.136	0.209	0.242


Notes: Figures in parentheses are standard errors

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 4 Standardized direct, indirect and total effects of major predictor variables on youths' mental health

Major predictor variables	Mental health		
	Direct	Indirect	Total
Assimilation-oriented	— —	-0.119*	-0.119
Separation-oriented	— —	0.038	0.038
Marginalization-oriented	— —	-0.067	-0.067
Male	0.085	0.134	0.219
China	-0.039	-0.151*	-0.190

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.



Note: Integration-oriented used as the reference group

Figure 1 Hypothesized model of acculturation, resilience and youths' mental health.




Figure 2 Standardized solutions for the structural model of acculturation, resilience and mental health

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Highlights

- Acculturation is predictive of the mental health of migrant youths, with different acculturation patterns and orientations showing different effects
- Resilience functions as a mediator in the association between acculturation and youths' mental health
- The country context of migration is influential for the resilience and mental health of migrant youths