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ABSTRACT

Given the rapid increase of refugee and immigrant students entering U.S. public schools, a clear understanding of student acculturation issues is needed in order to support this specialized, at-risk population. This mixed methods study examined the relationship between student acculturation, school support, and the emotional well-being of refugee and immigrant students and provided information for schools on how school supports affect categories of acculturation and emotional well-being of immigrant secondary students. Conducted at two high school newcomer centers within one suburban community with bordering districts in the Western U.S., this study answered the following questions: What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students? What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students? What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students? A 73-question survey was conducted with 75 high school newcomers, with follow-up semi-structured interviews with eight students and four counselors. The study describes acculturation preferences and how well newly arrived immigrant students adapt within school environments. Results of the study found students and counselors had different perspectives regarding the emotional well-being of refugee and immigrant students. Overall, students reported strong self-esteem and low degrees of discrimination, while counselors had a number of concerns for the students’ emotional well-being. The quantitative and qualitative findings are discussed and recommendations for government agencies and school professionals are included.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Newly arrived immigrants bring talent, skill, and rich cultural diversity to the United States, adding to its reputation as one of the most creative and innovative countries in the world (Florida, Mellaner, & Stolarick, 2011). Over the past 400 years, most of the immigration influx has had a European influence (James, 2010; Orozco, 2007). Within the past three decades, however, the diversity of the country’s population has widened, with languages other than English increasing at a rate of 148% from 1980 to 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Of this population, 11.8 million are students in U.S. schools, with 24% of the K-12 student population having at least one foreign-born parent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). With change in the country’s diversity, there is a need to have more complete understanding of student acculturation and how school support affects acculturation and emotional well-being of these students.

The current Eurocentric public school system, where 83.5% of teachers and administrators are White and middle-class (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2013), struggles to adjust to a growing multiethnic and multicultural student population. Some of the acculturation barriers newly immigrated students or newcomers face are learning a new language, entering the country with low academic skills, and having to cope with unaddressed trauma (Mollica, 2006; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytan, Bang, Pakes, & Rhodes, 2010). Although many educators understand immigrants arrive with complex issues, they seldom understand immigrant students’ needs and how to address them (Orozco, 2007).

When discussing the needs of students in schools, educators often use the term school support. Chu (2009) suggests strong support systems for immigrant students need to include group counseling, flexible scheduling and curricula, a high degree of importance on parent
involvement, and access to the students’ first language. Todorova, Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco (2008) concluded the lack of support from teachers not only leads to academic issues, but also has ramifications on the student’s psychological well-being. With increasing research on the well-being of immigrant students in schools, experts have expanded their definition of school support beyond academics to include social and emotional support (Chu, 2009).

Refugee and immigrant students’ emotional stress starts long before they arrive in the United States. Many students face numerous emotional experiences, which may include the death or separation of family members, persecution and prejudice in transition to the host country, and lack of time to prepare for the journey (Hodes, 2000). The journey itself may have been dangerous and filled with unexpected challenges. The psychological distress may not be the same for all children, but research suggests 45-60% of children who are exposed to traumatic events will go on to develop clinically diagnosed Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). These rates are higher in children than in adults (Perry, 2000). The emotional wounds immigrant students carry into their host country spill over into schools (Ellis et al., 2013).

The most common effects of trauma recognized by school staff are anxiety and depression (Hart, 2009). Students may also have additional untreated emotional issues that are not always as easily recognized such as difficulty with concentration, lapses of memory, difficulty developing relationships, and poor behavior (Mallon & Best, 1995). With schools being the place students predominantly acculturate to their host country (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Tadorova, 2008), school staff is seen as an essential emotional support for refugee and immigrant students (Mercuri, Freeman, & Freeman, 2010). The teacher’s relationship with his or her students is strongly linked to both the attitude of the student and the student’s sense of belonging (Chiu, Pong, Mori, & Chow, 2012; Georgiades, Boyle, & Fife, 2013).
Stress is just one aspect of the broader topic of student emotional well-being. With pre and post immigration stress factors, acculturation within a host country may be a challenge for many immigrant students. Current studies are needed to help guide school and district staff in support of students beyond academics in order to address cause impacting students’ acculturation and emotional well-being (Allard & Santoro, 2008; Boyden, de Berry, Feeny, & Hart, 2002; Xu, Bektishi, & Tran, 2010). This study researches students’ own perception of their emotional well-being and the impact school support has on emotional well-being. For the purpose of this paper, the definition of emotional well-being are, “peoples' cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives” (Diener, 2000, p. 34). Well-being is the complex mix of academic, social, and emotional experiences of refugee and immigrant students that provides the basis of the acculturation process within schools.

Statement of the Problem

The study of acculturation and the emotional well-being as it relates to students has been a relatively recent interest among researchers (Ellis et al., 2013). However, immigrants’ emotional health within various communities has been studied through the field of psychology for the past century. One of the first studies conducted with immigrants was by Thomas and Znaniecki (1918). Much of the current research supports the nearly 100-year-old studies, indicating mental health is tied to acculturative change (Bolea, Grant, Burgess, & Plasa, 2003; Mollica, 2006; Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Yoon, Lee, & Goh, 2008). Although the majority of studies relate acculturation with some degree of mental health concern, some researchers argue for the separation of acculturation and acculturative stress (Alidoost, 2011) while other researchers argue immigrants come to their host countries with strong mental wellness (Alba, Kasinitz, & Waters, 2011; Rudmin, 2009). Although there is some debate among
social scientists regarding levels of success for immigrants, the vast majority of research on acculturation and mental well-being of newcomers has determined many immigrants face downward mobility (Afolayan, 2011; Akresh, 2008; Gans, 2009; Portes & Rivas, 2011) and their children have poor overall results within school systems (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2012; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Onaga, & Lardemelle, 2010).

Acculturation for newly arrived refugee and immigrant students is complex, going beyond academic achievement into the social-emotional complexities that impact acculturation. To date, there is little known regarding the relationship between academic, social, and psychological support provided by staff at schools to refugee and immigrant students and with student acculturation. This gap in research for the fastest growing student population in the U.S. lends to the urgency of research in the field (Berry, 2005; Birman, 2005; Gaytan, Carhill, & Suárez-Orozco, 2007).

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to examine the relationship between students’ perceptions of acculturation and school support. Also investigated was whether school support had a significant impact on acculturation and the emotional well-being of newly arrived refugee and immigrant secondary students. This study adds to the body of work needed to support newcomers within the U.S. public school systems by providing suggestions from immigrant students and school counselors who have daily contact with newcomers. Besides informing school staff, this research may provide district leadership with the empirical data needed to help guide program decisions that have historically neglected social-emotional needs while focusing on academics.
Background to the Study

According to the Migration Policy Institute (2014), immigrants fall into five basic categories: naturalized citizen, permanent resident, refugees and asylees, persons on temporary visas, and persons unauthorized to be in the country (Nwosu, Batalova, & Auclair, 2014). Naturalization is the process by which U.S. citizenship is granted to a foreign citizen or national after he or she fulfills the requirements established by Congress in the Immigration and Nationality Act (USCIS, 2014). A lawful permanent resident is any person not a citizen of the United States who is residing the in the U.S. under legally recognized and lawfully recorded permanent residence as an immigrant. These individuals are also known as "Permanent Resident Alien," "Resident Alien Permit Holder," and "Green Card Holder" (USCIS, 2014).

Asylum seekers are generally included in the definition of refugees. Asylum seekers have applied for residency in a host country due to persecution in their home country but have not officially been declared a refugee by their host country. Once it has been determined by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) division of Homeland Security that the person meets the requirements, the asylum seeker receives refugee status (USCIS, 2013). Persons on temporary visas include temporary visitors, temporary workers, foreign nationals on temporary assignments, and temporary students (USCIS, 2013). Finally, unauthorized persons are any person who enters the United States without the appropriate visa (USCIS, 2013).

The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) takes an even broader view of immigrants as “any alien in the United States, except one legally admitted under specific nonimmigrant categories (INA § 101(a)(15)). An illegal alien who entered the United States without inspection, for example, would be strictly defined as an immigrant under the INA, but is not a permanent resident alien” (USCIS, 2013, p. 1). Rules and guidelines governing the various subgroups of
immigrants in the United States can often be confusing for members of society who work in various institutional settings. Immigration policy and education policy often conflict because public school systems cannot lawfully ask students and families about documented status. Existing education laws guarantee all immigrant and non-English speaking students a free public education from kindergarten through grade twelve, regardless of their status (Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202, 1982). Therefore, educators refer to all people born in another country (documented and undocumented) as immigrants. For the purpose of this study, two categories of immigrants will be discussed: refugees and immigrants who are not refugees. Also discussed is the process of acculturation.

**Refugees.** After World War II, there was a high need to find homes for displaced persons, especially persons from worn-torn countries in Europe. In 1951, the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees outlined who could be considered a refugee. Although the United States was represented at the 1951 convention, it was not one of the original signing parties. The United States became a signatory to the treaty at the 1967 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. The treaty was ratified November 1968 (UNHCR, 2011) at which time an amended definition of a refugee was adopted and still governs refugee policy today. The 1967 definition is:

A person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it. (UNHCR, 2011, p. 3)
The 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees also covers the legal status of refugees and a State’s obligation of hosting refugees. Although the UNHCR agency’s role is to protect refugees and to help find solutions, world events continue to affect policies of host countries and the reception of refugees by their citizens. Both the events of 9/11 and the recent Iraq wars have had a profound effect on the number of refugees being admitted to the United States. In 1991, the number of refugees admitted to the United States was 112,811. In 2002, after the events of 9/11, the number of refugees admitted to the United States dropped to 27,110. Although the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services has increased entry levels since 2002, refugee admittance in the United States is still significantly lower than those of the 1990s (Martin & Yankay, 2013).

The number and diversity of refugees who enter the U.S. changes annually depending on regional crises within the refugees’ home countries and the U.S. government’s response to global crisis. In 2012, there were a total of 58,238 refugees admitted to the U.S. from the following regions (in descending order): Near East and South Asia, East Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Europe and Central Asia (U.S. Department of State [USDS], 2014).

**Immigrants.** In 2014, there were 41 million immigrants reported living in the United States. Of the total immigrant population, 50% were Limited English Proficient (LEP) and 6%, or approximately 2,460,000, were children age 5 through 17 attending school (Migration Policy Institute [MPI], 2014). Immigrants share many of the same acculturation challenges as refugees such as trauma, poverty, and separation anxiety, but may also have additional stress factors such as fear of deportation or depression due to separation from relatives (Elizalde-Utnick, 2010).

**Acculturation.** With the rapid growth of diverse populations, educational researchers have begun to study factors impacting schools and researching the needs of newly arrived
refugees and immigrant students. Researchers have found these specialized groups of students face multiple challenges leading predominately to downward mobility (Akresh, 2008; Gans, 2009; Haller, Portes, & Lynch, 2011; Portes & Rivas, 2011). With social and economic challenges and the additional stress of acculturating to a new country, mental health issues are more likely to impact newly arrived immigrants (Fazel, Danesh, & Wheeler, 2005; Mollica, 2006). Educators and psychologists who work with culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD) students have studied various acculturation issues and have developed tools to assess acculturation (Berry, 1997, 2005; Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989; Collier, 2010) and have provided suggestions on specially designed programs (Custodio, 2011; Short & Boyson, 2004, 2012).

The majority of research on the needs of immigrant students has focused on academics, and schools have been slow to respond to the significant need for newly arrived students beyond modified instructional strategies. This lack of response has been attributed to the lack of understanding of what the needs are and how best to address newcomers (McNeely, Sprecher, & Bates, 2010). Further study is needed to understand how newcomer students acculturate within the school setting and how best to support the academic, as well as the social-emotional well-being of refugee and immigrant students through a more holistic approach.

Berry, one of the leading researchers on acculturation, defines acculturation as, “the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (Berry, 2005, p. 698). This research study was framed around Berry’s bidimensional (moving through multiple levels) model of acculturation (Berry, 1980, 1997, 2005). Berry divides acculturation into two areas: context, defined as understanding both or all cultures that members contact, and strategies, defined as the
variations in which members engage in a culture. Members within these societies react to each
other’s culture in both attitude and behaviors. Berry’s (1997) framework of acculturation states
the dominant society reacts to the immigrant populations by excluding, segregating, blending, or
embracing through multicultural practices. According to Berry, immigrants fall into one or more
of four categories: marginalized, separated, assimilated, or integrated. In all cases, both positive
and negative adjustments are made throughout the acculturating process. When members
experience difficulty, acculturative stress is prominent and may result in a less desirable result of
marginalization or separation. Less acculturation stress leads to integration (or biculturalism),
which Berry contends is the desired level of acculturation (Berry, 2005).

Within the acculturation process, immigrants have the choice to participate in the cultural
practices of their host country or maintain their own cultural practices, or a combination of the
two. Inclusion or exclusion of cultural practices places immigrants within one of Berry’s four
categories of acculturation. If immigrants both participate in the host country and maintain their
native culture, they would be placed in the integration category. If immigrants participate in the
host country’s cultural practices but reject their native culture, they would fall under
assimilation. Immigrants who choose to keep their own cultural practices and reject the host
country culture would be placed in the separation category. Immigrants who reject both the host
country and their own native cultural practices would be considered marginalized (Figure 1).
Berry’s acculturation framework provides an important structure for understanding acculturation categories but does not presume stagnant levels. Researchers who support Berry’s framework understand the model's multidimensional approach with subgroups within each category (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010; Schwartz & Zamboanaga, 2008). Berry encourages researchers to look at the categories not as stationary but as multidimensional and ever changing (Berry, 1997, 2005; Berry et al, 2006).
Although the theoretical discussion has highlighted the best way to examine and measure the complexities of acculturation, social issues within the multiple layers of acculturation are not the focus of this current study. The purpose of this current research is to gather broad acculturation perceptions from a multiethnic and multicultural group of students in order to examine the relationship between acculturation categories, school support, and emotional well-being. The research of Flannery, Reise, and Yu (2001) looked into multiple acculturation models and determined one was not necessarily better than the other, rather each research study should drive the decision of choice. Ozer (2013) suggests that using a mixed method’s approach might further advance Berry’s framework. This current study uses Berry’s bidimensional framework of individual and group processes which isn’t specific to any one ethnic group or social network through the gathering of quantitative and qualitative data.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study seeks to discover the relationship between school support and the acculturation preferences of secondary refugee and immigrant students and if school support and acculturation preferences associate with emotional well-being. Much of the current literature implies immigrant and refugee students struggle through school and experience downward mobility with post-secondary completion (Akresh, 2008; Haller et al., 2011). If certain support is found to lead to healthier acculturation, this information can guide teachers and counselors in providing specific support, which in turn should lead to stronger emotional well-being for secondary newcomer students. Current research is lacking in the area of student acculturation and the effects on schooling and overall well-being (McCarthy, 2014). It is the intention of this study to provide additional data from secondary students and secondary school counselors to help close the research gap.
Creswell (2012) asserts questions and statements are the key links, which focus the research and help readers better understand the results of the study. In a study conducted by a team at the University of Kentucky (Bradley, Royal, Cunningham, Weber, & Eli, 2008) the design of the questions were determined to be a major influencing factor to research methodology. This mixed methods research uses the questions to help determine the selection of survey subsections for the quantitative data and guide the interview design for the qualitative data. Yin (2009) supports mixed method designs, which address both external and internal validity. This study addresses three primary questions and hypotheses. The following questions provide the central idea of this study.

Question 1: What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?

Question 2: What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

Question 3: What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

For this study, three null hypotheses have been developed. These hypotheses build on Berry’s acculturation theory and attempt to build a bridge between theory and practice (Leshem & Trafford, 2007). The three null hypotheses for the current study are as follows:

H_01: There is no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students.

H_02: There is no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students.
H₀₃: There is no direct relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being for secondary refugee and immigrant students.

**Significance of the Study**

Addressing the needs of diverse student populations has become a major concern among educators in public schools (Goh, Whal, McDonald, Brissett, & Yoon, 2007; Orozco, 2007; Short & Boyson, 2004; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytan et al., 2010). Although researchers have begun to identify at-risk factors, few studies have focused on social and emotional support for newly arrived refugee and immigrant students within the school setting (Birman & Chan, 2008; Ellis et al., 2013; Fazel et al., 2005). The majority of educators have limited or no training on the process of acculturation, let alone guidance on understanding the impact acculturation has on the emotional well-being of students (Collier, 2010). Teachers continue to focus on instructional strategies without considering mental health and how students’ mental state might affect their learning (Gaytan et al., 2007). In addition, secondary school counselors maintain large caseloads with a primary focus on student graduation at the expense of students’ emotional needs. These same counselors tend to have limited training in cultural practices and seldom have culturally proficient knowledge or the time to meet the needs of newly arrived refugees and immigrants who arrive with complex issues (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999).

The possible benefits of a study focused on acculturation, school support and student well-being for newcomers include the influence it might provide on funding, hiring practices and professional development focused on cultural practices for teachers, counselors, and administrators. For government agencies, the information from the research may help guide state and district support of specially designed programs for newly arrived immigrant students. For districts, the data from the study may provide critical information to school staff on the
relationship between acculturation and school support and the impact culturally appropriate supports have on the mental health of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students.

With rapid changes in the demographics of public schools, it is imperative educators have a more in-depth understanding of how newly arrived students acculturate within schools and the relationship of school support for newcomers on acculturation in order to meet the needs of one of the most at-risk student populations. This study aims to provide information to educators and educational systems on the effects of acculturation on refugee and immigrant students within secondary schools.

**Overview of Research Methods**

This study involved a thorough review of research and practices to explore current literature in the area of acculturation in order to understand the gaps in student acculturation data, to explore support within and out of newcomer programs, and to review assessment instruments used in measuring students’ acculturation attitudes, perceived school support, and perceived emotional well-being. The study used an explanatory, correlational, mixed methods design that began with a quantitative survey to gather more generalized information and added qualitative interviews to explore survey responses. Conducting a study where the units of analysis were two secondary newcomer centers allowed the researcher to collect quantitative data from the student refugee and immigrant surveys and analyze the correlations between a number of constructs and additionally use the qualitative data to determine more specifically the meaning participants made of their experiences while in the newcomer programs.

The participants in the study were 75 high school refugee and immigrant students and four counselors at two separate secondary newcomer centers in two districts serving the same community. The student participants in the study had similar identifiable characteristics which
included at least three of the following: new to the country within three years, refugee status, limited or no formal education, beginning to intermediate English levels, or experiencing PTSD.

The four counselors in the study had current Student Pupil Personnel or Social Worker certificates. Two of the four counselors were assigned exclusively to the newcomer students at one of the participating newcomer centers. One of the counselors was assigned to one of the centers the previous three years and one counselor served newcomers along with general education students.

The first phase of the study involved distributing parts of the survey instrument, *The International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY) Survey* (Berry et al., 2006), (Appendix A) to the 75 refugee and immigrant secondary students in order to gather data on the students’ acculturation attitudes, perceptions of school support, and perceptions of emotional well-being. The researcher conducted the survey in the district in which she does not work. An English Language Instructional Coach with experience working with high school newcomers was recruited to administer the survey to the students in the newcomer center where the researcher had administrative responsibilities. The survey administrators at each of the newcomer centers gave students an opportunity to ask questions regarding the purpose of the study and clarified directions with the students. Each student refugee and immigrant group had the questions read to them aloud as they completed the survey. Results from the survey questions were analyzed in SPSS prior to conducting interviews.

In the second phase of this study, the researcher conducted one-on-one, semi-structured audio-recorded interviews (Appendices B & C) with two counselors and three students over the age of 18 from site one and two counselors and five students over the age of 18 from site two. Phase two interview questions were aligned with the student survey questions. Prior to finalizing
the themes, interview participants were asked to review the interview results and were allowed to make suggestions and correct any misunderstandings (Appendices D & E). The qualitative data was then coded for themes, and the quantitative and qualitative data was triangulated to gain deeper understanding of the relationships between acculturation, school support, and emotional well-being for secondary refugee and immigrant students.

With the use of participants from complex and varying societies, the use of mixed methods allowed the researcher to collect both quantitative and qualitative data to form a more complete picture (Creswell, 2012; Lund, 2012). In the literature review, the aspects of acculturation in general and specific student acculturation will be explored. In addition, what is known regarding support for newcomers in secondary schools and the students’ psychological well-being will be reviewed.

**Description of Terms**

The following definition of terms provides insight into complex cultural language, which often has multiple interpretations. The researcher developed all un-cited definitions based on general understandings in the field of education.

**Academic performance.** For the purposes of this study, academic performance is a measurement of grade point average (GPA).

**Acculturation.** “The dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (Berry, 2005, p. 698)

**Assimilation.** An acculturation category describing an immigrant who rejects their national origin culture and identifies with the host country culture (Berry, 1997).
**Asylum seeker.** An immigrant who has applied for residency in a host country due to persecution in his/her home country, but has not officially been declared a refugee by the host country.

**At-risk.** Students defined as at-risk usually have three or more of the following indicators: they come from single parent families, are from lower income homes, have older siblings who have dropped out of school, have parents who have not finished high-school, are not proficient in English, or are without three hours a day or more of home supervision (Green & Scott, 1995, p. 2). Many refugees and recently arrived immigrants are identified as at-risk and share additional factors which include trauma caused by experiences prior to coming to the U.S. and ethnic identity confusion (Collier, 2010; Fazel et al., 2005; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008).

**Bicultural.** A term used interchangeably with integration and refers to immigrants who move between national and host cultures equally (Berry, 1997). Acculturation researchers use the terms integration and biculturalism interchangeably (Berry, 1997; Portes & Rivas, 2011; Sam, 1994).

**Bidimensional acculturation.** Berry (2005) defines bidimensional acculturation as moving through multiple levels of acculturation.

**Caseload.** The number of students assigned to a teacher or counselor.

**Cross cultural.** A model which has cultural groups studied in relationship to each other, with neither being seen as superior (Berry, 1997).

**Cultural broker.** Cultural broker refers to an immigrant’s, usually a child’s, range of activity, including translating and negotiating services within the community on behalf of parents and other members of the family (Jones, Trickett, & Birman, 2012).
Cultural proficiency. “An inside-out approach to issues arising from diversity. It is a focus on learning about oneself and recognizing how one’s culture and one’s identity may affect others, not on learning about others” (Nuri-Robins, Lindsey, Lindsey, & Terrel, 2009, p. 15-16).

Culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD). CLD students are students with cultural backgrounds differing from the macro culture of the United States and students whose native language is other than English.

Downward mobility. Movement from one socio-economic level to another, less desirable level.

Emotional well-being. Emotional well-being includes “the presence of positive emotions and moods (e.g., contentment, happiness), the absence of negative emotions (e.g., depression, anxiety), satisfaction with life, fulfillment and positive functioning” (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDCP], 2013, para. 4)

Holistic education. A philosophy that education goes beyond academics in support of students’ social and emotional development in order to prepare students to meet the challenges in life (Forbes, 2003).

Immigrant students. For the purpose of this study, immigrant students are defined as individuals aged 3 to 21 who were not born in the United States and who have attended U.S. schools for less than three years (No Child Left Behind, 2002).

Integration. An acculturation category describing an immigrant who moves between national and host cultures equally, keeping their native cultural practices at the same time adopting those of the host country (Berry, 1997).

Limited formal schooling (LFS). Describes students who enter the country with missing or interrupted education.
Marginalization. An acculturation category describing an immigrant who shows little involvement in either the host country culture or national origin culture (Berry, 1997).

Newcomers. Newly arrived refugees or immigrants. Generally speaking, immigrants are only referred as newcomers for the first two or three years in a host country.

Non-traditional immigrant societies. An area of the country with a small number of culturally similar immigrants, often settled as placement from outside, federally funded agencies that place the strength of the economy over cultural considerations.

Permanent resident. A permanent resident is an immigrant who is an alien admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident (USCIS, 2013).

Plural societies. A term used when describing immigrants’ native home society and the host society into which they are transitioning.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). “Post-traumatic stress disorder is a mental health condition that is triggered by a terrifying event. Symptoms may include flashbacks, nightmares and severe anxiety, as well as uncontrollable thoughts about the event” (Mayo Clinic, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, 2014, para. 1).

Recently arrived. Families and students from foreign countries who are in the first few years in the U.S. Recently arrived can mean the first three years as with emergency immigrants or can be up to first generation. Experts on newcomers have varying opinions on the subject.

Refugee. “A refugee is someone who has been forced to flee his or her country because of persecution, war, or violence. A refugee has a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group” (UN High Commission for Refugees [UNHCR], 2011, p. 3).

School behavior. The expected student conduct outlined in a school’s student handbook.
Negative behavior may lead to school citations, in-school or out of school suspension, or in serious cases, expulsion from school.

**Separation.** An acculturation category describing an immigrant who participates in the national origin culture with little interaction in the host country culture (Berry, 1997).

**Trauma.** Trauma can be defined as, “Extreme stress that overwhelms a person's ability to cope” (Giller, 1999, para. 1).

**Truancy/Truant.** Intentional unauthorized absence from school.
Chapter II

Literature Review

Introduction

Percentages of foreign-born residents in the U.S. increased 31.6% between 2000-2009 to nearly 40 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) and are expected to grow an additional 41.2 million by 2050 making up 160 million first and second generation immigrants, 37% of the total U. S. population (PEW, 2013). Although the number of immigrants entering the U. S. is not nearly what it used to be with the all-time high of 8,795,000 individuals between 1901-1910 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), the number of immigrants, refugee, and asylum seeking applicants today are those in the most perilous situations, and thus, the most in need (UN High Commission of Refugees [UNHCR], 2010). The U.S. Department of State (2013) reported receiving a total of 69,926 refugees in 2013 of which there were 19,488 from Iraq, 16,299 from Burma, 9,134 from Bhutan and 14,155 from Somalia, the Dem. Rep. Congo, Eritrea, and Sudan, all of which are war-torn countries. These newly arrived immigrants share unique needs, issues, and barriers that affect their mental well-being and success in their new country (Mollica, 2006). Families that come from war-torn countries often face poverty, low literacy levels, limited English, and immigration issues which add to the stress of acculturating to a new country (Orozco, 2007).

In addition to refugees, immigrants arriving through the southern border of the U.S. are often fleeing extreme poverty and dangerous living conditions (PEW, 2009). The Immigration Division of Homeland Security estimated 11.7 million unauthorized immigrants lived in the U.S. in 2012. The top three countries contributing to this population were Mexico (59%), El Salvador (6%), and Guatemala (5%) (USCIS, 2014). With the U. S. deporting over 600,000
undocumented people each year (USCIS, 2014), unauthorized immigrants have additional fears of being separated from their families through deportation (Gonzales & Terriquez, 2013).

Refugees, undocumented immigrants, and documented immigrants all deal with many of the same stress factors of migrating to a host country, some of which include separation from family members, conflict within the family, and learning a new culture (Gaytan et al., 2007). Each family member will face these acculturation challenges differently (Gibson, 1997; Patil, McGowen, Nahayo, & Hadley, 2010; Segal & Mayadas, 2005), but those who are in their adolescent years are of particular concern due to their developmental stage (Katsiaficas, Suárez-Orozco, Sirin, & Gupta, 2013; Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008).

The research conducted for the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) by Boyden et al. (2002) spoke to the violent nature of the world affecting millions of children in conflict-torn countries by stating, “one in every 230 persons in the world is a child or adolescent who has been forced to flee his or her home” (p. 6). Boyden et al. (2002) noted the gap in research focusing on emotional well-being of children from war-torn countries and the importance of looking at the needs of these children in a holistic manner. Although additional research is beginning to address issues of emotional well-being (Xu et al., 2010), there is still a lack of information regarding the long-term effects for children who have been exposed to such extreme violence (Boyden et al., 2002). Since the Boyden report, exposure to violence has not subsided, but rather increased. In a December 8, 2014 press release Anthony Lake, UNICEF Executive Director reported, “This has been a devastating year for millions of children. Children have been killed while studying in the classroom and while sleeping in their beds; they have been orphaned, kidnapped, tortured, recruited, raped and even sold as slaves. Never in recent memory have so many children been subjected to such unspeakable brutality” (UNICEF, 2014).
Relevant to this study, acculturation stress and psychological disorders are often more profound in older youth who may experience substantial problems beyond that of their younger siblings or parents (Henley & Robinson, 2011). Some researchers have determined the developmental stage of adolescence where youth are trying to identify and discover who they really are, may contribute to additional negative acculturation experiences (Portes & Rumbaut, 2005). Support for newcomer youth is becoming a concern for school leaders as schools receive students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds at four times the rate of White mainstream American students (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012) and as the majority of adolescent newcomers’ acculturation to their host country will take place in public schools (Short & Boyson, 2012).

The educational statistics are not going unnoticed. Educational researchers and psychologists recognize school systems need to address issues beyond academics, if immigrant students are expected to find success in schools and post-high school (APA, 2000). In an education system where over 80% of teachers and administrators are White and middle class (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013), diverse cultures bring cultural misunderstandings and disconnect between school staff, students, and their families (Gay, 2000; Nuri-Robins et al., 2009). Multiple studies have emphasized the importance of cultural understanding and indicate immigrants are not receiving culturally proficient instruction and often feel isolated at school and in the community (Banks & Banks, 2010; Gay, 2000; Gaytan et al., 2007; Nuri-Robins et al., 2009). Although studies show newly arrived immigrant students have multiple stress issues (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001), schools continue to focus their attention on linguistics and academics with very little emphasis on mental well-being (Williams & Butler, 2003). With statistics indicating a widening success gap between White
mainstreamed and immigrant students in U.S. schools (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008), concern from leaders in the educational field have led to additional studies focused on immigrants within the school setting (Birman & Chan, 2008; Collier, 2010; Short & Boyson, 2004).

A few studies have focused on youth acculturation in recent years (Sam & Berry, 1995; Suárez-Oronzo et al., 2008) but the effects of school support on acculturation and the emotional well-being of refugee and immigrant students within a school setting is an emerging field (Birman, 2005). Studies on student acculturation indicate there are varying levels of acculturation and some categories of acculturation are healthier than others (Coatsworth et al., 2005; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991; Phinney, Horenezyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001; Van de Vijver, Helms-Lorenz, & Feltzer, 1999). Several researchers have suggested support for immigrants in the community (Simich, 2003; Stewart et al., 2008) and support within schools for immigrant children (Castillo & Phoummarath, 2006; Gaytan et al., 2007; Short & Boyson, 2004) positively influence levels of acculturation and emotional well-being.

This study reviews literature relating to acculturation, the effects of acculturation on immigrants’ well-being, and what is known about school support for refugee and immigrant students. This chapter is organized into four major sections. The first section discusses John W. Berry’s theory of acculturation, which serves as the theoretical foundation for this study. The second section of the literature focuses on acculturation issues within the greater community and how acculturation affects families and family members’ roles. The third section reviews what is known of student acculturation within schools. This topic is further broken down into academic, social, and emotional issues faced within schools. Finally, because this study was conducted within newcomer centers, the structure of newcomer centers and the role counselors’ hold within centers is reviewed.
Berry’s Theoretical Framework of Acculturation

Berry (2005) defines acculturation as, “the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (p. 698). Members within these societies react to each other’s culture in both attitude and behaviors (see Figure 2). In Berry’s framework of acculturation the dominant society reacts to the immigrant populations by excluding, segregating, blending (melting pot), or embracing through multicultural practices (Berry, 2005).

This theoretical concept of categories of acculturation within a two-dimensional process (maintaining aspects of one’s cultural heritage and adopting new host cultural practices), evolved from early social scientists that placed acculturation within a one-dimensional process (Hirsch, 1942; Park & Burgess, 1924; Simons, 1901; Whetten & Green, 1942). Early social scientists used the word assimilation to describe the process of what is now more commonly referred to as acculturation. Assimilation for these researchers was the process of becoming a community member (Hirsch, 1942). Simmons (1901) described an immigrant’s experience as either coercive-aristocratic, forced assimilation by dominant culture or tolerant-democratic, where the dominant culture is tolerant of immigrant cultural practices. These definitions gave credence to this one-dimensional process. One-dimensional definitions of assimilation continued in the early 1900s when psychologists accepted one of the most widely used definitions from Park and Burgess who claimed assimilation was a process of individuals and groups acquiring memories and attitudes of those with which they came in contact (Park & Burgess, 1924). As the study of immigrants evolved, definitions of assimilation began to vary with Stonequist (1935) claiming immigrants either assimilated to the host country or were marginalized by the host country.
The evolution of immigrant studies began to show marked differences in thinking around the middle of the 20th century when researchers reported additional factors of assimilation within the linear model. Hirsch (1942) described a process of assimilation that included immigrants’ life experiences, their situation at the time of migration, and the nature of the host community. Hirsch was but one psychologist to report cultural contacts that affected both the individual immigrants and the host community. Social scientists Whetten and Green (1942) acknowledged assimilation as both an individual and group process, but rejected Park and Burgess’s idea of assimilation as a formula in which immigrant societies fit. In a 1942 study with American Finnish and Yankee farmers (Whetten & Green) the scientists acknowledged the process of assimilation was far more complicated than previous scientists had reported and that

assimilation should be seen as an imprecise process. Whetten and Green (1942) came to the conclusion that the diversity of any culture and the multiple ways in which any one individual or group might integrate into a host culture did not allow for a formula of acculturation. Rather, individuals evolving within their own group’s culture and the acceptance of the host culture should be considered two different processes that follow their own time continuum (Whetten & Green, 1942). This new way of thinking about the process of assimilation also brought a change to the terminology by separating behavioral assimilation, defined as behavioral shifts when exposed to cultures, from segmented assimilation, categories describing the behavior (Sommerland & Berry, 1970).

The term acculturation may have preceded the term assimilation, as it is thought to have been first coined by Powell in 1880 and used as a way to describe inferior individuals who with exposure to more advanced societies made marked improvements (as cited in Rudmin, 2009). However, through a century of evolutionary changes social scientists and educators have developed the term acculturation to describe a complex process of living in and within dual societies which best fits Berry’s definition (LaFromboise et al., 1991; Coatsworth et al., 2005; Phinney et al., 2001; Van de Vijver et al., 1999). Researchers in the first half of the twentieth century and Berry’s own work in the second half of the century laid the groundwork for Berry’s two-dimensional process and acculturation definition that includes both the individual and those with whom the individual comes in contact (Berry, 1997).

To understand Berry’s conception of an acculturation framework, it is important to revisit his earlier writings on cross-cultural methods from which his theory of acculturation evolved. From 1975 to 1995 there was an explosion of research from social scientists who considered themselves cross-cultural researchers (Berry, 1979; Katz, 1985; Sue, 1981; Trickett, 1996). As
one of these cross-cultural scientists and active researchers, Berry emerged as a leader in support of cultural reform. During this time of multicultural revolution, two research models were seen as relevant: unicultural and cross-cultural (Berry, 1979). The unicultural model placed non-dominant cultures in comparison to the dominant culture. In this model, the non-dominant was often referred to as subcultural. The cross-cultural model placed cultural groups in relationship to each other where neither was seen as superior (Berry, 1997). Berry’s early studies laid out goals for cross-cultural psychology that were later embedded into his own framework. The first goal was to test cultural understandings in order to generalize cultural and social information to a greater population. The second goal was to discover behavioral variations in new cultures. The third goal was to use the new cultural understanding to attain a deeper understanding of human behavior (Berry, 1979).

The first studies Berry conducted to test his predictions of acculturation strategies were in Australia and New South Wales (Berry, 1970; Sommerland & Berry, 1970). Sommerland and Berry (1970) administered a Likert-like scale testing assimilation, integration, and separation attitudes of Aborigines toward the greater Australian society. At the time of the first study, Berry’s framework was not fully developed and marginalization was not used as a strategy. However, marginalization was tested in the following New South Wales project (Berry, 1970). Both studies showed the Aborigines fell within one of Berry’s four acculturation categories (Berry, 1970; Sommerland & Berry, 1970).

With data the researchers gathered in the earliest studies new acculturation scales were developed to measure the four acculturation attitudes. Berry conducted surveys with adapted ethnic group acculturation scales with four groups of immigrant Canadians: French, Portuguese, Korean, and Hungarian. The scales demonstrated moderate to strong reliability in all ethnic
groups. Subsections for each of the four acculturation categories, each with 16 subsets, indicated Cronbach alphas ranging from .68 to .90 (as reported in Berry et al., 1989). These early studies formed the foundation of Berry’s acculturation theory, and later, the 20-item Acculturation Attitudes Questionnaire (Berry, 2006) used in this study.

Berry’s theory of acculturation suggests immigrants perceive themselves in one or more of four categories: marginalization, showing little involvement in either the host country culture or national origin culture; separation, participating in national origin culture with little interaction in host country culture; assimilation, rejecting national origin culture and identifying with host country; or integration, moving between national and host cultures equally (Berry, 1980, 1997, 2001, 2005; Berry et al., 2006). In all cases, both positive and negative adjustments are made throughout the acculturating process. For example, when members experience difficulty acculturative stress is prominent and may result in the less desirable result of marginalization or separation. Berry contends less acculturation stress leads to integration or biculturalism which is the healthiest of the four forms of acculturation (Berry, 2005).

If some categories are presumed healthier than others, then it is also presumed that not all processes within acculturation need to be negatively perceived (Berry, 2001). Berry identifies three broad scenarios of psychological acculturation to help explain the acculturation process. The least stressful of cultural contacts within a host country is referred to as behavioral shifts. With behavioral shifts, immigrants learn cultural expectations and social norms from their host country. Where actual conflict exists between the two cultures immigrants may experience a second level of stress known as acculturative stress. Berry uses acculturative stress to describe immigrants who may have negative reactions from contact with another culture. The third and most concerning outcome for psychologists is the possibility of psychological disorders (Fazel et
al., 2005; Mollica, 2006; Phinney et al., 2001). Mental disease or clinically diagnosed psychological disorders may occur before, during, or after relocation due to extreme changes in cultural context and the lack of ability to cope within the host society (Berry, 1997). Understanding the three broader degrees of psychological acculturation brings a clearer understanding of Berry’s four categories of acculturation strategies, which lie along a continuum for both individuals and groups acculturating to a host country. Maintaining cultural heritage, whether by choice or default by residing in a community of multicultural acceptance, and the extent to which immigrants participate in the host country’s cultural practices are underlying concepts that influenced Berry’s categories of acculturation (Berry, 1997). Next, a review of studies focused on adolescents will provide a greater understanding of issues specific to immigrant youth.

**Immigrant youth.** Prior to the 1990s, large-scale acculturation studies had not been conducted on immigrant youth. The large international quantitative study of 7,997 immigrant and national youth conducted in 13 countries and spanning over a decade was first proposed by Berry who wanted to study whether a common set of cultural variables could be applied to his acculturation strategies universally. Beginning with a core team of international psychologists in 1992, Berry, Phinney, Sabatier, and Sam, surveyed a sample of youth within their own countries assessing acculturation, identity, and development. As additional international researchers were brought into the project, both the goals and acculturation measurement tool grew to match the various interests of the researchers. By the time data collection began in 1995, ICSEY measurement tool contained 17 subscales with a total of 144 questions.

In the study were three major questions. First, “how well do immigrant youth live within and between cultures?” Second, “how well do immigrant youth deal with their intercultural
situations?” Third, “are there patterns of relationships between how adolescents engage in their intercultural relations and how well they adapt?” (Berry et al., 2006, p. 2). The research team proposed the students would fall within one of Berry’s acculturation strategy levels. The youth were given the Acculturation Attitudes Questionnaire (AAQ) (Berry et al., 1989) containing five questions each for integration, separation, assimilation, and marginalization. Rather than using a statistical approach, the researchers used patterns of similarity with cluster analysis to identify patterns. The profile clusters were then named to fit with Berry’s acculturation strategies: ethnic profile (separation attitude), national profile (assimilation attitude), integration profile (integration attitude), and diffusion profile (a combination of separation, assimilation, and marginalization).

The study showed integration as the strongest preference at 36.4%, followed by a combination of separation and diffused (separation, assimilation and marginalization) nearly equal to 22.5% and 22.4% respectively. Assimilation was favored least at 18.7%. Breaking the profiles down by demographics, the researchers found significant differences in preferences between ethnic groups and between countries of origin. Countries having large populations of immigrants over time, the United States, Canada, and Australia for example had significantly higher levels of the integration profiles than did countries that had diverse immigrant settlers for less time, e.g. European countries (Berry et al., 2006).

The massive undertaking of the ICSEY project generated years of publications (Berry, 2005; Berry et al., 2006; Phinney et al., 2001; Sam, Vedder, Liebkind, Neto, & Virda, 2008; Van de Vijver & Phalet, 2004; Vedder, Sam, Liebkind, 2007) and provided a much needed focus on the acculturation of immigrant youth (Berry et al., 2006; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). As a part of the ISCEY study, Phinney (Berry et al., 2006) focused on the psychological adaptation of
immigrant youth acculturating to new environments. Their study largely supported previous research indicating acculturation is both the experiences in one’s environment and the formation of cultures within those plural societies (Berry & Sam, 1997; Katz, 1985; Sue, 1981). In contrast, the study indicated students who adapted to the assimilation acculturation model had the lowest levels of psychological well-being. This may suggest increased support for heritage culture maintenance and welcoming inclusionary policies which may help increase the psychological and sociocultural adjustment of immigrant students (Phinney et al., 2001).

Researchers conducting studies in reference to Berry’s multidimensional acculturation process have supported the idea of biculturalism increasing immigrants’ healthy adjustment to their host country (LaFromboise et al., 1991). Van de Vijver et al. (1999) tested Berry’s acculturation strategies to see if the strategies could be applied universally to Dutch migrant children and if there was a difference of acculturation strategies between first and second-generation children (Van de Vijver et al., 1999). With a sample of 118 children ages 7-12, the researchers used the Snijders-Oomen Nonverbal Intelligence Test (SON-R) with a reliability rating of .90 to help answer their research questions. Results from the test indicated children fell into one of Berry’s four acculturation categories with a clear preference for integration. The children in the integration category demonstrated higher degrees of cognitive abilities (Tellegen, Winkel, Wijnberg-Williams, & Laros, 1998).

Integration (biculturalism) has been tested using a number of instruments. Coatsworth et al. (2005) studied a sample of 315 Hispanic middle school youth to see if the theory was applicable across ethnicities. The researchers used the Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire (Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980) to test whether the youth were represented in one of four categories theorized by Berry, and if so, whether or not biculturalism indicated fewer
problems for the youth. Results from the study indicated three strong preferences aligned with Berry’s categories: Biculturalism/Integration, Separation, and Assimilation. The fourth category, Withdrawal, similar to Berry’s Marginalization, had some preference but showed the weakest results. The study also verified assimilated students have significantly more behavior problems than students who preferred biculturalism/integration and bicultural students have significantly higher levels of academic competence (Coatsworth et al., 2005).

Robinson (2009) further tested Berry’s acculturation strategies with 240 Indian and Pakistani adolescents in Britain using portions of the ICSEY questionnaire. The 20-item AAQ (Berry et al., 1989) was used without modifications. Although the students fell within all four categories, only Indian participants preferred integration with the Pakistani students indicating a preference for separation (Robinson, 2009). This study gives further evidence of immigrants falling into one of Berry’s four categories. However, it also indicates differences between ethnic groups.

With the increase in acculturation research there has also been an increase in challenges to Berry’s levels of acculturation strategies. Researchers Chia and Costigan (2006) studied Chinese-Canadian university students to determine if students would fall within one of the four levels and if so, which of the acculturated groups would have healthier adjustments. The study also analyzed the students’ background and language to further understand the group placements. The researchers reported the students fell into five groups, rather than four. Three of the acculturation categories, integration, separation, and assimilation, were consistent with Berry’s model of acculturation, but the researchers reported two additional groups which only partially aligned with Berry’s model. The fourth level indicated the students had characteristics of both integration and assimilation. The fifth group had characteristics of marginalization but
maintained a connection to the Chinese culture. Given that Berry emphasized acculturation levels are not meant to be stagnant and that immigrants may move between acculturation levels as part of the natural process of acculturation (Berry, 2005), the five levels found in the study could be considered variations of Berry’s four and not new categories. Similar to earlier studies (Phinney et al., 2001; Coatsworth et al., 2005), Chia and Costigan reported one of the least preferred acculturation levels with the Chinese university students was that of the assimilated group and the most desired was integrated. This study supports biculturalism as a healthy approach to acculturation and immigrants’ emotional well-being (Chia & Costigan, 2006).

Some researchers debated whether acculturation should or even can be measured and that acculturation theory has been dependent on contact causing stress for immigrants (Rudmin, 2009). Rudmin contended separating behavior (learning process) from stress and pathology (mental wellness) allows for a limited definition of acculturation thus, reducing the term to the individual and excluding the group cultural process. The researcher argued the idea of acculturation, including acculturation stress, presumes a level of poor mental health among immigrants. The author referred to multiple studies demonstrating minorities have excellent mental health and argued acculturation and acculturation stress should not be associated together, and a better solution would be to set categories of depression or illness, rather than stress. Rudmin suggested acculturation should be based on motivations, learning, changes, and ultimately consequences. He hypothesized the non-visible influences such as identity and attitudes might have greater influence on one’s acculturation than visible factors, such as dress and language (Rudmin, 2009).

Schwartz and Zamboanga (2008) also challenged Berry’s acculturation categories. The researchers conducted a study to determine if acculturation could indeed be categorized. Using
436 Hispanic university students in Miami, Florida participants were asked to provide information on orientation toward heritage and cultural practices. In addition, ethnic socialization, acculturative stress, and cultural identity were also assessed using latent class analysis to identify patterns in survey data. The study provided evidence of acculturation clusters indicating that they do indeed exist, but the researchers pointed out the clusters might not be as distinctly defined as Berry’s model and suggested layers within the clusters (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008).

In a research project two years after the Miami university student study, Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik (2010) expanded on their theory of a layered acculturation model. The 2010 study showed three out of the four themes, integration, separation, and assimilation, as strong categories and marginalization as a smaller category. They also determined a fifth category they defined as biculturalism, which indicated different characteristics than that of Berry’s integration. The researchers suggested a more multidimensional model was needed to look into practices, values, and identities of members. Rather than looking at the proposed model as new, the researchers suggested their model was an extension of Berry’s model but addressed a more complex acculturation process (Schwartz et al., 2010).

With the majority of studies on acculturation being conducted on diverse populations, Bakker tested Berry’s acculturation theory on like populations. The study consisted of a sample of 167 Dutch immigrants who were from either Canada, United States, Australia, Europe, New Zealand, or South Africa living in Holland (Bakker, van der Zee, & van Oudenhoven, 2006). Using a questionnaire, the participants were asked to answer scenario questions relating to one of Berry’s four acculturation strategies. The participants in the study showed a clear preference for the integration strategy which supported other studies (Coatsworth et al., 2005; Phinney et al.,
However, another important finding was that persons showing high degrees of flexibility were also those more open to integrating into the host society (Bakker et al., 2006).

This has been a brief review of Berry's research on acculturation. An EBSCO database search on John W. Berry found 337 peer reviewed publications either authored or coauthored by Berry on acculturation. Over the last two decades, researchers have tested Berry’s acculturation strategies (Chia & Costigan, 2006), expanded on the strategies (Cohen, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2010) and debated Berry’s theory of acculturation (Rudmin, 2009). Using Berry’s theory of acculturation for the current study provides a solid framework for the research on acculturation of secondary refugee and immigrant students. Next, family acculturation and how youth fit into acculturation within the family and within the school will be explored.

Family Acculturation

Immigrant youth migrating with their families to a new host country will acculturate within the family as an individual as well as be affected by the family’s acculturation experiences (Berry et al., 2006). These family situations add complexity for refugees and immigrants as they face many challenges adjusting to culture within a new country (Phillimore, 2014; Segal & Mayadas, 2005; Stevens et al., 2007). Although some immigrants come to the country on work or student visas and demonstrate early success (USCIS, 2014), the majority of refugee and immigrants migrate to the U.S. for economic or political reasons. Without well-paying jobs these individuals often face downward mobility (Akresh, 2008; Gans, 2009; Simich, Hamilton, & Baya, 2006). The additional economic pressures for immigrants add to acculturation stress, which can lead to physical and emotional health problems (Patil et al., 2010; Yoon, Jung, Lee, & Felix-Mora, 2012).
Not all immigrants face the same cultural issues (Sabatier & Berry, 2008). Immigrants who come from cultures similar to the dominant cultures of the host country may have fewer conflicts (Bakker et al., 2006). However, immigrants who have obvious cultural differences of race, dress, language, or religion often experience prejudice and discrimination, preventing them from acquiring better jobs (Allard & Santoro, 2008; Perreira, Fuligni, & Potochnick, 2010). First generation immigrants and refugees do not expect this downward mobility when they arrive in their host country (Gans, 2009). In order to change the trajectory for newly arriving immigrants, social scientists suggest immigrants must make a livable wage and be accepted into a welcoming society (Ellis et al., 2013; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008).

Some studies have shown that the circumstances in which immigrants arrive may contribute to cultural differences (Williams, 2010). The flight of the refugee is, at the very least, traumatic (Boehnlein & Kinzie, 1995; George, 2012; Mollica, 2006). Refugees have been forced out of their countries, in many cases under extreme situations, and must flee for their lives (Mollica, 2006). Leaving one’s home country often involves the separation from loved ones and possibly the death of family members and friends (Birman, 2005). After resettlement, many refugees spend a great deal of time trying to find out what happened to relatives and whether their family members are dead or alive (UNHCR, 2013). The worries of the refugee immigrants produce anxiety, depression, sleepless nights, and other forms of PTSD (Phillimore, 2014). Refugees expect to be received by a sympathetic community but soon discover many in the community are discriminatory and hateful (Ellis et al., 2013). A less than welcoming host country often compounds refugees’ mental health issues (George, 2012; Steel et al., 2011). Experts in the field of immigrant issues see the necessity of additional social-emotional supports
as well as economic supports in order for newcomers to thrive in U.S. society, however some
social scientists suggest where more is needed, less is provided (Brown & Scribner, 2014).

The U.S. government officials who participated in the convention on the status of
refugees in 1951 and 1967 saw the need to support global refugees (UNHCR, 2011). However,
as public sentiment began to erode over the years, so did the support of refugees within the U.S.
(Bruno, 2013). In addressing the eroding support for refugees, Representative Gary Condit (D-
CA) gave testimony of his concerns to the 1996 House Subcommittee on Immigration stating,
“despite the fact that in the past the Federal Government has made commitments to fully support
refugee resettlement, this commitment has not been met for many years…[it is] unconscionable
for the federal government to place refugees in communities without providing resources for
their resettlement” (as cited in Brown & Scribner, 2014, p. 110).

The passage of the Refugee Act of 1980 was to ensure a standardized system in support
of self-sufficiency for refugees admitted to the United States. The original act exempted refugees
from work registration for the first 60 days allowing for an adjustment period for the newly
arrived residents. By 1982, Congress eliminated this requirement with the intent of encouraging
refugees to find employment as quickly after entering the United States as possible. Additional
changes in the act included initial support from Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) and Refugee
Medical Assistance (RMA) to be provided by the federal government for refugees for 36 months.

By 1982, the assistance time was reduced to 18 months and reduced further in 1991 to
eight months, the current length of support allowed in 2015. The push for employment without
support has fed the perception of refugees as welfare recipients, rather than immigrants needing
support in transition to a new country (Brown & Scribner, 2014). In addition to the reduction of
support for refugees and non-profit agencies that support refugees, federal funding timelines to
support states’ social programs went from 31 months in 1986 to 0 by 1990, eliminating the ability for states to recover any money spent on refugee social programs (Brown & Scribner, 2014).

On the federal side, the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Assistance program supports refugees who have been admitted to the United States for six to eight months, depending on which federally funded program each state adopts (United States Government Accountability Office [USGAO], 2011). As an example from the state in which this study is being conducted, funding for a family of four equals a total of $450 per month for the first eight months or upon employment. After eight months, newcomers are left to their own means to find employment, housing (Bruno, 2011), and healthcare (Morris, Popper, Rodwell, Brodine, & Brouwer, 2009). An added burden to most refugee families is the U.S. government’s requirement to pay back any money the government spent on travel expenses to resettle the family starting at month 10 of resettlement (USGAO, 2011). These difficult financial situations add to an already challenging acculturation process (Segal & Mayadas, 2005).

**Downward mobility.** Economic hardship for immigrants is not a new phenomenon (Simich et al., 2006). What has changed for immigrants migrating to the U.S. is the level of education needed for jobs that pay a wage above the poverty level (Economic Policy Institute, 2010). Immigrants who have less education or no previous education struggle to find jobs which will pay living expenses in the U.S. and rely heavily on community members who know the American culture to help negotiate jobs (Roxas, 2008).

Immigrants are reported to have the least education and lowest paying jobs in the United States (U. S. Census Bureau, 2012). However, not all immigrant groups are equal socioeconomically. In a report by Rumbaut and Komaie (2010), first generation Mexican
immigrants ages 18-34 were reported to have high school dropout rates of 61.4% and college
graduation rates of 4.2%. Wage earnings mirrored the education rates with 79.2% of Mexican
immigrants working low-wage jobs and 27.5% living below the poverty line. In stark contrast,
first-generation Indian immigrants ages 18-34 had high school dropout rates of 2% and a college
graduation rate of 88.4%. Education proved to be an economic factor with only 7.2% of Indian
immigrants in low-wage jobs and 8.2% below the poverty line (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010). The
way immigrants arrive in the country may contribute to the immigrants’ economic well-being as
well (Hoefer, Rytina, & Baker, 2011). Nearly 60% of unauthorized immigrants in the United
States are from Mexico, whereas undocumented Indian immigrants are estimated to be 2%
(Hoefer et al., 2011). Although education is seen as one of the highest hopes for immigrants’
upward mobility, education and legal barriers may challenge the access to post high school
education for most immigrant families especially those who are undocumented (Rumbaut &
Komaie, 2010).

The results of Afolayan’s (2011) study supported research on downward mobility of
immigrants, but unlike studies showing lower education levels contributing to decline (Chiswick
Lee, & Miller, 2006), Afolayan’s study indicated Nigerian immigrants’ downward mobility
occurred despite strong English skills and education levels higher than the U.S. average. Despite
high levels of education and training, 71% of Nigerians indicated their level of income
insufficiently covered their cost of living. In spite of many participants in the study holding
professional certificates from Nigeria the certificates were not recognized in the United States.
The lack of country-to-country transference of certificates and degrees was noted as the greatest
barrier among the Nigerians (Afolayan, 2011). This supports other studies that indicate
significant differences in race and cultural practices between host country and native country contribute to economic success or failure for immigrant groups (Portes & Rivas, 2011).

Country of origin differences can often affect job prospects for newly arriving immigrants (Afolayan, 2011; Connor, 2010). Lower paying jobs often take a high emotional toll when higher status immigrants and refugees settle for lower status jobs (Gans, 2009). The Office of Civil Rights and U. S. Immigration laws for documented workers make it easier for some immigrants and refugees. However, status decline still exists for most job-seeking immigrants (Gans, 2009). Immigrant professionals coming from developing countries have greater difficulty finding equal or comparable work when compared to immigrants coming from European and other developed countries. Newly arrived immigrants quickly realize they are members of a stigmatized population and may experience racial and status decline in the community (Gans, 2009).

Occupational trajectories can have profound impact on the mental well-being of immigrant and refugees (Phillimore, 2014). Akresh (2008) studied immigrants’ jobs in their native countries compared to their first and current job in the United States. In the study, both monetary and prestige changes were taken into consideration with four classes of immigrants and refugees emerging: Economic Immigrants who transferred to the U.S. for a similar job often with higher levels of education, Family Immigrants who were influenced by other relatives living in the host city and often with lower levels of education, Refugees who were forced out of native country due to persecution, and Diversity Immigrants who were admitted to the U.S. under a lottery system. Among all classes of immigrants, there existed a U-shaped pattern with a downward trend and then an upward trend with various degrees of success depending on the sub-group, educational level, and English ability (see Figure 3).
The pattern indicated the steepest drop in prestige from home country job to the first job in the U.S. The pattern continued with a slight increase in prestige from the first U.S. job to the current job in the U.S. In addition, the study examined gender noting women having lower occupational prestige scores than men and refugee women having the lowest scores overall. The study indicated most immigrant groups regardless of their subgroup were not able to regain the job status they had before coming to the U.S. (Akresh, 2008). Such downward mobility adds to the acculturation stress of newly arrived immigrants and may lead to more serious concerns of emotional well-being (Portes & Rivas, 2011).

**Family conflict.** Acculturation is reported as both an individual and group process (Berry, 2005; Berry et al., 2006; Rudmin, 2009; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). Family acculturation occurs differently for individual family members and at different times (Morrison & James, 2009), impacting family units in a variety of ways (Portes & Rivas, 2001). Berry states
that families will have, at the very least, behavioral changes and in other cases acculturation stress or psychological health issues (Berry, 1997). These various degrees of acculturation may cause conflict within family units (Moon, 2008). Some studies have shown a relationship between acculturation rates and family conflict where the less the family members acculturate within their host country the higher the level of family conflict (Sodowsky, Lai, & Plake, 1991). Morrison and James (2009) conducted qualitative research to examine the relationship between the rates of acculturation in families. Using a sample of 49 Portuguese immigrants in Canada, Morrison interviewed the participants to reveal their perspectives of the acculturation experience. Final themes pulled from the study indicated family members had varied acculturation rates resulting in a greater separation between children and parents. The cultural separation within families was seen as both a source of conflict and stress between family members (Morrison & James, 2009).

Multiple studies have documented acculturation gaps between immigrant family members (Boyden et al., 2002; Hynie, Guruge, & Shakya, 2012; Sabaitier & Berry, 2008; Titzmann, 2012). As adult refugees deal with overwhelming resettlement obstacles their children are provided some relief within schools (Trickett & Birman, 2005; Xu, 2007). Although children have their own difficulties with culturally insensitive staff and students (Lockwood, 2010), their cultural growth is much faster than their parents (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2011). While at school, children learn English and society’s cultural norms. As children become more culturally competent, refugee parents start to rely on their children to help understand cultural expectation and to help negotiate language and services in their new country (Jones & Trickett, 2005; Titzmann, 2012).
Not all acculturation studies point toward stress and conflict for immigrant families. Using a sample of 304 Korean American adolescents between the ages of 14-18, Moon (2008) used a battery of instruments including demographics, acculturation scale, social support scale, and family conflict scale to determine if higher acculturation levels decreased family conflict and whether or not outside social supports helped reduce family conflict. The results of Moon’s research indicated a significant connection between lack of social and emotional support from family and friends and family conflict, but the study also indicated variances between families. Some families had very little acculturation conflict. Moon’s research adds to studies which indicate family support reduces family conflict (Perez, Dawson, & Suárez-Orozco, 2001) and community support reduces stress within families (Portes & Rivas, 2011; Roxas, 2008; Smith, 2008).

The pressure family members put on each other for support is not always received positively and can often lead to family conflict (Qin, 2006; Stodolska, 2008). Conflict between parents and adolescents is not unique to immigrant populations. Research has concluded that family conflict has continued to increase overall in American society over the last few decades at the same time in which closeness between adolescents and parents has declined (Steinberg & Morris, 2001). Although the non-immigrant family conflict has its own implications for mental health issues, the immigrant adolescent differs in significant ways. Some of the differences include the adolescent taking on additional responsibilities for the family that would typically belong to parents of non-immigrant families. This parent role often elevates the status of the adolescent within the family, but at the expense of the immigrant adolescents’ own emotional well-being and often that of their parents (Hynie et al., 2012). Role reversals between parent and child can be seen as both a stress and a support (Corona et al., 2012).
**Role reversals.** Family adolescents often begin to take on responsibilities traditionally held by parents when they move to a new country (Boydon et al., 2002). It is estimated that 90% of immigrant children act as cultural brokers for their parents (Titzmann, 2012). Cultural brokering refers to a range of activities, including translating and negotiating services within the community on behalf of parents and other members of the family (Jones et al., 2012). Within families, acculturation gaps grow as children have more contact with the community, adjust faster, and learn English at a faster rate than their parents (Trickett & Jones, 2007). This acculturation gap can lead to role reversals as parents rely more on their children to act as cultural brokers (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008) and, at times, provide additional income for the family (Titzmann, 2012).

The most common brokering activity for immigrant children is that of language interpreter (Orellana, 2003). Studies have shown language interpreting has predicted family conflict and child distress among immigrant families (Corona et al., 2012; Jones et al., 2012). When children manage new roles formally performed by their parents while learning English and other cultural norms within their host community (Roxas, 2008) additional stress is added to the acculturation process (Phillimore, 2014). In a qualitative study conducted by Corona et al. (2012), 25 Latino adolescents and 29 of their parents were interviewed to determine both the negative and positive outcomes of language brokering. The youth in the study were mostly proud that they were able to help their families. Parents, too, were proud of their children’s bilingual ability. However parents, especially fathers, also felt ashamed and embarrassed that they needed to rely on their children. Some youth in the study also reported it was stressful when they had difficulty understanding terms and worried their interpretation might affect the family in a negative way (Corona et al., 2012). The results of the study support other research that claim
language brokering has both positive and negative results within families (Bauer, 2013; Jones et al., 2012).

Although much has been written about the negative effects of children acting as cultural brokers (Kam, 2011), there are also studies which indicate the effects of brokering are both individually and culturally driven (Titzmann, 2012). In some cases family support may be the single most important factor of the child’s emotional well-being, especially when they take on responsibilities traditionally held by their parents (Oznobishin & Kurman, 2009). In a study on parent and child roles within refugee families, Hynie et al., (2012) interviewed 70 newcomer youth ages 16-24 to explore whether role reversals within refugee families led to negative results. Some of the youth accepted the extra responsibility as the circumstance of the move while others saw their role as being important and leading to greater self-worth. However, in the same study acculturation changes were reported as further contributing to disconnect with parents due to less time with parents and conflict over personal freedom (Hynie et al., 2012).

This generational distance can be further compounded when the child also acts as wage earner for the family. In a report funded by the Urban Institute (2014), Enchautegui reported between 1994 and 2013 the immigrant youth labor force grew by 4.8%, whereas the non-immigrant youth labor force declined by 11.8%. Combining 2012 and 2013 data, 36% of all first generation immigrant youth ages 16-22 were employed. Breaking down ethnicity, Latinos were shown to have the highest first generation youth employment at 43%. With 35% of the youth in the same age category not having a high school diploma, many 16 to 22 year-olds were no longer in school. For those who were in school, 14% of all first generation immigrants managed both school and work. The number jumped to 21% for third generation immigrants. The percentages were even higher with immigrant youths’ contribution to household income.
Combining all immigrant racial and ethnic groups for 2012 and 2013, youth 16-22 provided 17% of the household income as first generation immigrants and by third generation, 24% of household income (Urban Institute, 2014).

Acculturation has been defined as complex and multi-dimensional (Berry, 2005; Berry et al., 2006) involving all members within families (Berry, 2005; Berry et al., 2006; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). Without community support families are left on their own to negotiate new cultural norms which often lead to lower paying jobs (Connor, 2010; Gans, 2009), isolation, and emotional stress (Mollica, 2006). Research studies have reported host communities who support the native culture of families (Portes & Rivas, 2011) and provide healthy acculturation strategies within the community (Katsiaficas et al., 2013) allow immigrants a greater chance of finding success academically, economically and emotionally. For immigrant children who have additional challenges within schools, educators are in a position to support immigrant students’ specialized needs, giving them a second chance to improve on their situations (McBrien, 2003).

**Student Acculturation**

Adolescents entering a new country experience many of the same acculturation difficulties as their parents (Berry et al., 2006; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008), but due to their youth, students face additional challenges within their school environment (Haller et al., 2011; Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007; Soltero, 2011). Educational and cultural experts often see these challenges as barriers (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008; Xu, 2007) which go beyond academics affecting immigrant students’ social and emotional health (Gaytan et al., 2007; Stein et al., 2002; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Although a select few immigrant populations are finding success within American schools (Rumbaut & Komaie, 2010), the majority of immigrant students struggle to keep up with their non-immigrant peers (Zhou, 1997).
**Academic barriers.** The number of immigrants reporting downward mobility in the U.S. is at an all-time high, indicating assimilating to American culture does not necessarily include earning a livable wage (Haller et al., 2011). For adolescents, this downward trend often starts in high school where record numbers of immigrants are dropping out (Portes & Rumbaut, 2005). Being at the lowest levels of education most often leads to poverty for immigrant students which is not proving to change over time (Chiswick et al., 2006; Economic Policy Institute, 2010). Many experts see education as the key to changing this social and economic trajectory for immigrants (Perreira, Harris, & Lee, 2006).

In a major research study on newcomer students, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2008) set out to determine existing opportunities and challenges for adolescent immigrants when it comes to academic achievement. The project, entitled Longitudinal Immigration Students Adaptation (LISA) study, was a 5-year longitudinal mixed methods study designed to identify academic trajectories among 407 recently arrived 9-14 year old immigrant youth. The sample students came from Central America, the Dominican Republic, China, Haiti, and Mexico and had been in the country no more than a third of their lives. By the end of the study, the students had dispersed to over 100 schools. Students were interviewed yearly using quantitative Likert-like scales and open-ended and fill in the blank questions. Parents of the students were interviewed in the first and last years of the study.

The results of the LISA study determined approximately 25% of students were high achievers during all five years (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). These students had the highest English skills of the group, attended schools that were the least segregated, and had low poverty rates. The study also identified 11% of the students as improvers. Many of these students started out slowly, but overcame initial transition stress through community supports and mentors. Most
of the improvers attended less problematic schools. The remainder of the students in the study, nearly two-thirds, declined in performance. These students attended lower-quality schools and had limited opportunities to gain adequate English skills. Issues within the schools included classes that passed the students without assessing their skills and enrolling students in classes that were far too difficult without appropriate language and instructional supports. Many of the students in the declining category reported psychological symptoms due to unaddressed premigratory issues, long separation from family members, and social isolation. For some of the students in the lower two-thirds group, the outcome was low GPA. For others in the group, dropping out of school and gaining employment was seen as a more positive option (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008).

The LISA study has several implications for the current study. Both studies included newcomers from diverse cultural groups and emotional support as part of the research. The LISA study did not include detailed background information on the students. The set of 10 demographic questions and the semi-structured interview questions in the current study provides a broader look at acculturation within cultural groups. Research studies stress the importance of the students’ background when evaluating academic success (Lockwood, 2010).

Acculturation and immigrant youth studies have documented families arriving with numerous educational backgrounds. For refugee students, the lack of presettlement education has reached an international crisis (PEW, 2013) affecting post settlement education. According to global reports on refugee students, only 36% attend secondary school prior to relocation and for those attending school there are far more boys than girls (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). Many of these same students receive their education in refugee camps that lack textbooks, supplies, and grade appropriate instruction (Custodio, 2011). A large number of refugee students arriving in the U.S.
are labeled limited formal schooling students (LFS) due to their missing or interrupted education (Custodio, 2011). Not all LFS students are refugees missing time in school due to war within their native countries. Some LFS students may be from rural areas lacking facilities or from families who migrate for either economic or political reasons (Freeman & Freeman, 2002). Whatever the situation of their arrival, students with limited formal schooling come to the U.S. with below grade level content knowledge, little to no English fluency, and most often low native-language literacy (Walsh, Shulman, Bar-on, & Tsur, 2006. These barriers are not only academic challenges for these students, but can take a toll emotionally as students’ struggles often cause low self-esteem (Freeman & Freeman, 2002).

Age also plays a part in students’ academic success, since many high school newcomers need more time to complete classes for graduation (Bridgeland et al., 2006). Students who are considered over-age may have various reasons for being so, including not passing classes at the grade level expected, having gaps of education within grade levels, or coming from a country without the required classes a district deems necessary to graduate (Rath, Swagerman, Krieger, Ludwinek, & Pickering, 2011). For newly arrived immigrants, the over-age issue becomes even more critical as students must put in double the time to help bridge academic and language gaps (Thomas, Collier, & National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1997).

As reported in the LISA study, the strength of students’ English skills is often a major factor in determining academic success (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Many educational researchers have reported a crisis across the country for immigrant students with low literacy and academic performance (Windle & Miller, 2012). These same educators stress the need for teachers to have rigorous expectations and include culturally sensitive instruction (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Bilingual instruction, which provides instruction in both English and the
students’ native language, has shown the most promising academic results and demonstrated both improvement in English skills and overall literacy growth (Portes & Rivas, 2011). However, in districts with large numbers of languages, there are often complex political and logistical obstacles in supporting multiple bilingual programs (Samson & Collins, 2012).

For newcomers coming with high native literacy skills, the process of acquiring a second or additional language is not as difficult (Schwartz, Geva, Share, & Leikin, 2007). However, for students with low literacy or no native literacy the process of reading and writing is a major challenge (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Studies have indicated there is a clear lack of understanding among most U.S. educators of the academic histories of refugee and immigrant students (Segal & Mayadas, 2005). Experts in the field suggest school staff begin by getting to know the literary backgrounds of the students before they provide interventions (Soltero, 2011; Woods, 2009). Most secondary teachers do not have the training to deliver pre-reading instruction. Professional development for school staff is needed in order to provide appropriate instruction at the various literacy levels of newcomers (Windle & Miller, 2012). Educators working with newcomers express the importance of providing low-literate secondary students explicit and intensive literacy programs based on early literacy development if the students are to make-up the significant gap in their education and reach their full English potential (Freeman & Freeman, 2002; Montero, Newmaster, & Ledger, 2014; Woods, 2009).

Not all immigrants come from such dire situations, yet students’ previous experiences from all parts of the globe greatly affect the way they perceive and respond to their U.S. schools (Sanatullov & Sanatullova-Allison, 2012). Students coming from schools with a different social and instructional structure do not always understand the expectations of American schools (Garrett, 2006). Students coming from strictly structured foreign schools often find U.S. schools
less challenging. The strictness of the teachers in their home country is often seen as a way to promote respect, even though many foreign teachers may also give physical punishment. Students from highly structured, authoritative systems also have difficulty adjusting to the informal behavior of the teachers in the U.S., and some students see this as permission to misbehave (Trickett & Birman, 2005). Studies on newcomers report the necessity of explicitly teaching the culture of schools to newly arriving immigrant students along with academics (Custodio, 2011).

Although policy set by districts in support of newcomer immigrants is essential for success (Soltero, 2011), teachers play the most critical role in students’ education (Peguero & Bondy, 2011). Many cultural experts report few teachers have adequate training to work with immigrants (Nuri-Robins et al., 2009; Orozco, 2007; Soltero, 2011) and that teachers approach immigrant students with a White, American-centered perspective. Many newcomer students perceive these attitudes as disengaging, since the students do not see themselves fitting into the Euro-centric profile (Choi, Lim, & An, 2011). Additional studies indicate teachers find refugee and immigrant students’ backgrounds inadequate to be successful in American schools and set lower expectations for newcomers (Gay, 2000; Nieto, 2010). Experts in the field stress the importance of keeping expectations high, using appropriate teaching strategies, and providing curriculum that culturally connects and engages students with their own learning (Suárez-Orozco & Sattin, 2007).

In 2008, the team of Echevarria, Short, and Powers reexamined a major study conducted by the researchers in 1996 through 2003 on the effects of sheltered instruction with non-native English speakers. The original project, funded by the U.S. Department of Education and conducted for the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE),
produced the most widely recognized sheltered instruction model, used in all 50 states and several foreign countries (CAL, 2014). The model, titled Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), lists 30 items clustered into eight components which the researchers contend makes content comprehensible for non-native English speakers. Although multiple studies have been conducted around the SIOP model (Guarino et al., 2001; Himmel, Short, Richards, & Echevarria, 2009; McIntyre, Kyle, Chen, Munoz, & Beldon, 2010), the research team wanted to further explore the original questions of whether sheltered instruction improved achievement in content areas and if there was a significant difference for student outcome when teachers did or did not use the SIOP model.

Participants in the study were 346 students in grades 6-8 from diverse backgrounds living either on the west or east coast of the U.S. The study used the Illinois Measurement of Annual Growth in English (IMAGE) to test the reading and writing skills of the participants before and after intervention. A test rater blind to the conditions of the study rated an excess of 640 writing samples. Results of the study indicated students who had teachers who implemented the SIOP model did significantly better on the writing samples than those who did not use the model. The researchers in the SIOP study stressed the importance of using systematic and consistent research based instructional models to support the academic needs of non-native English speakers (Echevarria et al., 2008).

**Social barriers.** Social scientists report students will face most of their acculturation challenges within school settings because students’ adjustment to school culture is considered the primary sociocultural task for adolescents (Phinney et al., 2001). These social acculturation processes are particularly important to newcomers, since newly arrived immigrants see schools as avenues to upward mobility (Berry et al., 2006). However, this can be an additional challenge
for immigrant students as they do not always feel welcome in school and often perceive the school climate as negative and hostile (Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007; Stodolska, 2008; Vang, 2005). Negative attitudes from teachers and peers often add to the difficulty and stress of social acculturation (Lockwood, 2010; Nieto, 2010).

Transitioning into a high school can be difficult for any student (Schmitz, Vazquez-Jacobus, Stakeman, Valenzuela, & Sprankel, 2003), but for immigrants who are also transitioning into a new society, high school entrance adds additional stressors (Stodolska, 2008). Roxas (2008) studied immigrant youths’ transition process during the 2005-2007 school years with eight Somali Bantu families in a non-traditional immigrant settlement. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews to determine the socio-cultural factors that influence success of Somali Bantu male high school students relocating from Kenya. As shown in previous studies (Boyden et al., 2002; Hynie et al., 2012; Roxas, 2008; Trickett & Jones, 2007), the students’ parents heavily relied on their children to act as translator, make educational decisions for younger siblings, and in many cases, provide extra income to sustain the family. The dual role of student and family support added to the stress of the Somali Bantu students. Students relied heavily on relationships with other refugees to help them with the increased expectations and difficult transition into American society (Roxas, 2008).

Berry suggested social support is a protective factor against acculturation stress (Berry, 1997). For most immigrant students, social support starts with a sense of belonging that mostly takes place in schools (Georgiades et al., 2013; Perreiva et al., 2010; Soltero, 2011). In a study to address school belonging and its relationship to mental health, researchers Kia-Keating and Ellis (2007) conducted a mixed methods study to determine if exposure to adversities was associated with greater degrees of depression and PTSD and whether a lower sense of school belonging was
associated with higher levels of depression and PTSD. The participants in the study were 76 Somali refugees ages 12-19 living in Portland, Maine or the Boston, Massachusetts areas. Five rating scales measured war trauma, sense of school membership, PTSD, depression, and self-efficacy.

Results of the study indicated sense of school belonging affected depression and self-efficacy positively, explaining 19% of the variance for depression symptoms and 27% of the variance for self-efficacy. The more attachment and involvement the students had with their school, the higher their levels of self-efficacy. Levels of school belonging did not moderate levels of PTSD, suggesting PTSD manifest differently. In the Kia-Keating and Ellis 2007 study, exposure to war, violence, and displacement were associated with increased levels of both depression and PTSD. This study spoke to the importance of school social support and inclusion for refugee students who enter the country with additional challenges (Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007).

Traditionally, immigrants had each other to rely on as they learned the social norms of a new community (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008; Xu et al., 2010). However, recent studies indicate immigrants are not settling in traditional immigrant areas with large numbers of like cultures. This adds to the fear and uncertainty of host country expectations (Brown & Scribner, 2014). These non-traditional immigrant areas have provided the opportunity for researchers to study the acculturation of newly arrived youth in emerging immigrant settlements (Roxas, 2011; Short & Boyson, 2012). Perreira et al. (2010) recruited 459 Latino ninth graders from three high schools in California with traditionally high populations of Latino students and nine high schools in North Carolina who had only recently received Latino immigrants to evaluate the adolescents’ beliefs and values motivating academic achievement. The participants were given a survey to
record their perceptions on values of education, social acceptance, discrimination, ethnic identification, and family obligation. In addition, the students were asked to keep a two-week diary checklist to help determine stressors, time spent on school and work, and other social factors. Results of the study indicated the North Carolina students had the highest degree of motivation, despite the higher levels of concern with discrimination in the community.

With higher levels of foreign-born youth in North Carolina, the study supports earlier studies indicating first generation immigrants have higher degrees of motivation and resiliency than generations of immigrants with longer experience in the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Two additional findings from the study showed North Carolina students’ positive experiences with peers and teachers acted as a buffer against discrimination and school climate directly affected academic achievement and motivation for students for both the traditional Latino and recently settled Latino youth (Perreira et al., 2010).

With school climate shown to have significant impact on students, educators viewing immigrants as incapable has adverse effects on the progress of newcomers (Nieto & Bode, 2008). Nieto (2010) stresses that students do not need to be fixed; they need to be supported. Other cultural educators support Nieto, suggesting school climate starts with accepting cultural diversity within schools and creating a welcoming climate for immigrants—not just within the English language (EL) classroom and with a select few specialists, but throughout the school (Commins & Miramontes, 2005).

The researchers who support Berry’s acculturation theory have determined integration is the healthiest of the acculturation categories (Coastworth, 2005; Phinney et al., 2001). With this belief, maintenance of one’s culture becomes essential to emotional well-being (Banks & Banks, 2010; Telles, 2003). Negative views by school staff can cause students to abandon native culture,
alienating themselves from families who are trying to hold onto traditional family practices (Delgado-Gaitan, Trueba, & Trueba, 1991). Therefore, social scientists encourage the maintenance of a strong ethnic identity while adapting to new cultural norms for healthy psychological development (Berry, 1997, 2001, 2005; Berry et al., 2006; Phinney et al., 2001).

Phinney et al. (2001) explains that social identity for immigrant adolescents may include ethnic, cultural, or national identity. This involves examining values, beliefs, and practices within ethnic communities and relating them to the larger society (Berry et al., 2006). In the ISCEY study, Phinney and colleagues measured adolescents’ sense of belonging to the ethnic and national groups using identity scales with 12 Likert-like questions on ethnic and national perceptions. The results indicated psychological adaptation of youth was dependent on their sociocultural adaptation and ethnic orientation contributed to the greatest adaptation (Berry et al., 2006).

Other cultural experts support ethnic identity as essential for increasing positive self-esteem for ethnic minority youth (Robinson, 2009). In many cultures outside of the United States, family is central and family attachment and shared responsibility is seen as a critical part of individual identity (Steidel & Contreras, 2003). Connection with family plays a vital role in the educational process of young immigrants, because assimilation practices have shown to slow down the academic achievement of students when compared to those students who keep a strong bond with family and native culture (Nieto, 2010). James (2010) suggests ideas of assimilation need to be replaced with acceptance of cultural differences and opportunities to contribute to a new school system, where all cultures are respected, and accommodations made within the system in response to a more diverse cultural society. Additional experts verify the need for educators to demonstrate a respect for the students’ culture and encourage students to keep
strong bonds with family, stating family connections are indicators of academic success (Vang, 2005).

In a 2011 study conducted by Alidoost with 81 Chinese immigrant youth, the researcher set out to discover if acculturation, acculturative stress, locus of control, and perceived social support were factors in the youth’s mental well-being. Results of the study indicated adolescents who had strong social support from parents and peers were those who demonstrated internal versus external locus of control. Therefore, these students were seen as having fewer emotional well-being issues. Consequently, the Chinese immigrant youth perceived social support as the greatest indicator of mental well-being (Alidoost, 2011). Family advocates suggest involving culturally diverse parents in school and providing support through reciprocal partnerships demonstrates respect for a family’s cultural differences and contributions and adds to the academic as well as social-emotional support (Allen, 2007; Henderson, Mapp, Johnson, & Davies, 2006).

**Emotional well-being.** Adolescence is a crucial time of human development (Katsiaficas et al., 2013; Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). For immigrants, there is an additional process involving exploration of one’s identity within plural societies (Berry, 2005). Studies have shown the exploration for immigrant youth has the potential to take two different paths. Interpersonal contacts between immigrants and host country groups may reduce stereotypes and prejudice (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Mähönen, & Ketokivi, 2012) or increase negative effects on students’ self-esteem and emotional well-being (Gay, 2000) depending on support or lack of support within families and communities. Berry’s acculturation framework bases integration on equitable relationships between immigrant and host cultures (Berry, 1997). In contrast, marginalization is seen as the least desirable and in several studies prejudice and
discrimination have been shown to contribute to marginalization (Ellis et al., 2013; Nieto, 2010; Sabatier & Berry, 2008; Stodolska, 2008) potentially increasing mental stress.

Researchers Tummala-Narra and Claudius (2013) explored the relationship between peer and adult discrimination and depressive symptoms and whether ethnic identity and social support played a protective role against depressive symptoms. Ninety-five secondary students ages 13-19 participated in the study, with 49 of the participants being born outside the U.S. and 46 of the students born inside the U.S. All students had immigrant parents who came from a number of countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The participants were given Likert-like scales with 21 items assessing adult discrimination and 21 items assessing peer discrimination. Results indicated ethnic and racial discrimination had a significant impact on the adolescents’ stress (Tummala-Narra & Claudius, 2013). This study adds to the research on the effects of prejudice and discrimination towards refugee and immigrants (Ellis, MacDonald, Lincoln, & Cabral, 2008; Portes & Rivas, 2011; Rumbaut, 1994).

In a 2011 study, Duongtran found a clear link between depression and stress with 70 Southeast Asian adolescents. Although acculturation events did not indicate higher levels of depression with the Asian youth, the process of cultural change was indicated in the depressed group (Duongtran, 2011). In the same study, girls reported they were more stressed than boys even though the study did not show more exposure to stress. Duongtran speculates the gender difference may be due to the differing social structure of girls versus boys when it comes to friendships. Girls tend to rely on social friendships and are affected by stresses within those friendships. Although there were generalities reported within the various Asian adolescents, coping responses were experienced differently among ethnicity subgroups with Cambodian
adolescents reporting overall lower stress and Hmong youth having a more positive attitude towards stress, which allowed them to cope better in stressful situations (Duongtran, 2011).

Current research has shown students in secondary school experience significantly more stress than their younger siblings due to the overall expectation for older teens to take on adult responsibilities (Hynie et al., 2012; Roxas, 2008; Trickett & Jones, 2007). Some studies indicate students with the lowest levels of stress belong to families that have been in the U.S. longer, have higher levels of English, and have balanced bicultural competencies having developed the cultural characteristics of two cultures (Yeh, 2003). However, for immigrant adolescents who are new to the country, additional stress factors may be compounded by the exposure to violence and other traumatic experiences prior to migration (Mollica, 2006).

The team of Ellis et al. (2008) examined the lives of 135 Somali adolescents to determine whether the number of traumatic events prior to resettlement corresponded to the number of stress factors post-resettlement and whether perceived discrimination were factors associated with higher levels of PTSD. The study conducted in three New England cities measured acculturative stress, post-resettlement stress, and perceived discrimination. Results indicated cumulative trauma was a strong indicator of PTSD. Perceived discrimination increased levels of PTSD, which indicated environmental conditions for refugees have significant impact on youth’s mental health. An additional finding in the study found perceived discrimination had the greatest impact on depressive symptoms for newcomers (Ellis et al., 2008).

Additional studies have been able to link families’ pre-migratory experiences to PTSD (Berman, 2001; Ehntholt & Yule, 2006; Heptinstall, Sethna, & Taylor, 2004). Berman (2001) found premigratory exposure to murder, death, torture, and deploring conditions in refugee camps all led to symptoms of PTSD. Other researchers have found similar results from the
effects of pre-migratory experiences. Heptinstall et al. (2004) assessed both PTSD and
depression using self-rating scales with 40 children ages eight to 16 that had been in the country
no longer than five years. The children had been exposed to multiple pre-migration experiences
including 60% who had seen murder or death due to war or political unrest and 22% who had left
either a parent or sibling in the home country. Of the students who completed the survey, 63%
had a high probability of PTSD and 31.3% fell into the depressed group (Heptinstall et al., 2004).

Betancourt et al. (2012) also assessed refugee children affected by war. Using the
database of National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN), the researchers chose 60
children from the database who had all been exposed to war or political violence. Common
trauma exposure included: war, terrorism or political violence, traumatic loss, forced
displacement, and domestic violence. The results of the UCLA PTSD-RI scale used in the study
indicated 30.4% probable PTSD, 26.4% generalized anxiety, 26.8% somatization, and 21.4 %
traumatic grief and behavior problems. In addition, 54% of the children also had academic
problems.

Psychiatrists working with trauma survivors share the stories of refugee trauma
experiences are complex (Mollica, 2006) and often under diagnosed. Many trauma survivors go
untreated due to poor access to mental health treatment and need support in a variety of settings
to increase care opportunities (Ellis et al., 2013). Some researchers are challenging schools to
adapt services for newcomers in order to provide the needed mental health support (Hart, 2009).
Trauma therapy has shown to increase children’s positive self-perception (Sutton, Robbins,
Senior, & Gordon, 2006) and provide children the ability to respond positively to new situations
(Garmezy, 1983 as cited in Berman, 2001). PTSD and other trauma related health concerns have
been found to persist over many years (Fazel, Doll, & Stein, 2009), with symptoms not always
apparent. A common response to trauma is to repress painful memories and try and cope (Berman, 2001). This positive external presentation can often seem as if students have strong mental health, but does not always reflect the internal distress of the trauma sufferer (Sutton et al., 2006).

Although there has been emerging research on the emotional effects of acculturation and premigratory trauma on immigrant youth in the last two decades (Gaytan et al., 2007; Stein et al., 2002), educators are still focusing primarily on English instruction and other academics, rarely addressing psychological challenges of newcomers. Boden, Sherman, Usry, & Cellitti (2009) state, “psychological intervention is often overlooked for the ELL and immigrant population because the students appear to be adjusting” (p. 188-189). Experts stress that in order for students to reach their full potential school systems must begin to address immigrant and refugee students' emotional needs along with their academic needs (Katsiaficas et al., 2013; Perreira et al., 2010; Simich et al., 2006).

**Cultural Proficiency**

Given that schools are one of the first and most influential public services immigrant youth will encounter in the United States (McBrien, 2003), individual and group interventions for newly arrived students are seen as necessary support in schools (Akinsulue-Smith, 2009). Although multicultural education has been a part of schools since the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the inclusion of multicultural materials and instruction has been slow to make its way into U.S. schools (Banks & Banks, 2010). Although necessary, most cultural educators believe curriculum and materials are not sufficient and suggest providing students with culturally proficient educators (Banks & Banks, 2010; Gay, 2000; Nieto & Bode 2008; Nuri-Robbins et al., 2009). In order for educators to be culturally proficient, multicultural training on educators’ self-perception
and observed practice is essential (Banks & Banks, 2010). Many cultural educators also believe cultural proficiency is only possible when educators have a clear understanding of their own biases (Nuri-Robbins et al., 2009) and know the background of specific cultural groups and individuals (Banks & Banks, 2010; Gay, 2000). Cultural proficiency training is not only seen as beneficial for teachers (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999; Nuri-Robins et al., 2009), but some in the field suggest culturally proficient school counselors are necessary to meet the critical social-emotional needs of immigrant students (Constantine & Gushue, 2003).

As research emerges on school support for immigrant youth (Birman, 2005; Gaytan et al., 2007; Lockwood, 2010), experts in the field are providing additional information to school counselors. Orozco (2007) suggests counselors need to address the importance of: (a) relationship building coming from the perspective of strengths versus deficit and understanding students’ histories, cultures, and traditions, (b) respecting and developing students’ cultural backgrounds by encouraging the students’ native language and culture, and (c) helping students become leaders in their community by providing programs with cultural mentors and encouragement of traditional practices (Orozco, 2007). Both Orozco’s recommendations and Berry’s integration category (Berry, 1997, 2001, 2005, Berry et al., 2006) maintain immigrants' cultural practices in order to promote healthy acculturation.

Goh et al. (2007) addressed the need for counselors to be cultural advocates within their schools and help bridge cultural gaps, which often occur between school staff and students and families of recently arrived refugees and immigrants. The study described how the current educational system lacks cultural awareness and suggested counselors may need to take the lead in educating teachers and administrators in order to address issues from a multicultural view. The study also suggested counselors help educate teachers and administrators by providing cultural
awareness training while working with students individually or within small cultural groups. Lastly, the researchers indicated a need to bring family and community members into the school to support a long-term cross-cultural plan rather than relying on activities alone (Goh et al., 2007).

The work of Chen, Budianto, and Wong (2010) pointed to the value of school counselors for academic and social-emotional support of undocumented students. The experts suggested that with the lack of available therapy in schools for this increasing population, counselors might be able to fill the service gap. Chen et al. (2010) encouraged counselors to assure school leadership that additional work with undocumented students will increase achievement and help prevent dropout. The authors recommended counselors assist in removing barriers by setting up immigrants in work groups that help inform students on the state and federal laws for undocumented persons. The authors also suggested these groups may provide an outlet for students to discuss and support each other with the many issues surrounding undocumented status (Chen et al., 2010). Cultural experts contend that if school counselors and educators are to be advocates for culturally and linguistically diverse students, they need to have the support from administrators in creating more equitable schools (Lindsey, Roberts, & Campbell-Jones, 2005). Providing cultural proficiency training is one way to support this initiative throughout schools (Nuri-Robins et al., 2009).

**Newcomer Centers**

The low performance of secondary newcomers has prompted educational researchers to identify specific needs and programs that might address support for newly arrived immigrants (Short & Boyson, 2004). A national research project funded by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) was conducted to identify secondary newcomer programs across the United
States and to find evidence of the ways in which centers support newcomers (Short & Boyson, 2004). The researchers defined newcomer programs as, “A program that, in a special academic environment for a limited period of time, educates recent immigrant students who have no or very limited English language proficiency and who may have had limited formal education in their native countries” (Short & Boyson, 2004, p. 8). At the conclusion of the study in 2001, the authors reported there were 115 programs at 196 sites across 29 states. Of these programs, most served high school students in urban areas (76%), with a few suburban (17%) and rural (7%) schools. The components of newcomer centers included multiple sources of data to evaluate and drive program decisions, specialized courses with scaffolding strategies, hiring of highly qualified teachers with language acquisition backgrounds, assessments that provided information on literacy levels of both the first language and English, and a balanced class schedule for students that included classes and programs outside of the English language development program (Short & Boyson, 2004).

Ten years later, the Carnegie Corporation funded a second research project through CAL (Short & Boyson, 2012). The researchers returned to the field to revisit centers that took part in the first study and conduct a new survey to gather demographic information on current centers. The study found over half of the original newcomer centers were no longer in existence 10 years later. Some states reported the students in the previous programs could not make the state-mandated adequate yearly progress (AYP) goals, which affected closures. Other major states such as California, Arizona, and Massachusetts reported reduced support time for ELL students in specialized programs due to increased inclusion programs. The 2008-2011 newcomer center data reported 63 programs in 24 states, as compared to 115 programs in 29 states in the 2004 study. New York and Texas had the highest concentrations of immigrants, accounting for 28% of
the programs. Changes over time included a reduction of newcomer centers, a shift in demographics with more centers reported in non-traditional immigrant states, and an increase of 23% of programs found in suburban and rural areas. In addition, 60% of the programs were programs within schools.

It is important to point out that not all states reported data in the second newcomer center research study (Short & Boyson, 2012), including the state for this current study. The researchers of the 2008-2011 project acknowledged that their study did not represent all newcomer centers, but was representative of programs across the nation. Although the sites for this current study were not in the Short and Boyson 2012 study, the fact that the newcomer programs are within suburban high schools in a non-traditional immigrant state reflect the trend of current newcomer centers across the nation.

Despite the decline in the number or newcomer programs, the reason for the decline has been reported to be more fiscal than academic. The Harvard Law Review (2007) explained that newcomer centers have been hindered not due to ineffectiveness but due to inadequate funding. The authors call newcomer centers, “a promising initiative that deserves increased federal attention” (p. 799) and laid out compelling reasons the federal government should supplement the funding of centers for states.

Federal lawmakers should adopt a two-part initiative to help states and localities address the school failure of low-literacy and LEP immigrant students by implementing newcomer programs. First, Congress should authorize federal funding to assist with the creation and maintenance of newcomer schools. Second, it should commission reliable quantitative research on newcomer schools. (Harvard Law Review, 2007, p. 817)

Roxas (2010, 2011) conducted qualitative research to get the perspective of teachers
working with newcomers and how they met the challenges of an unsupportive system. Roxas summarized one teacher’s experiences from a larger study conducted in the 2009-2010 school year where he administered 20 semi-structured interviews with staff working in urban newcomer centers in the Western United States. Roxas acknowledged the small amount of research focused on student refugee school experience and even fewer studies conducted on the teacher’s perspective working with newcomers. The overarching theme that emerged from the interviews in the newcomer classroom was the importance of building community with students and their families. Roxas reported the major components of building community in the newcomer classroom were addressing the lived realities of the students, providing support needed to help solve students problems in and out of school, bringing members of the local community into the classroom, and providing opportunities for students to serve out in the community (Roxas, 2011).

Through the focus efforts of one newcomer teacher, Roxas was able to emphasis the importance of building a sense of belonging in order for refugee and immigrant students to connect to their school and community.

**Conclusion**

The concerning statistics regarding academic and economic success of refugees and immigrants has heightened the need for further research with regard to success factors for newcomers (Gans, 2009; Gaytan, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytan et al., 2010). A few researchers have begun to focus on immigrant students and provide some positive suggestions when building partnerships with families and responding to specific cultural needs (Roxas, 2010, 2011; Short & Boyson, 2004; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Literature on educators’ cultural proficiency has also pointed out the necessity of addressing the mental health needs of newly arrived refugee and immigrant youth (Akinsulure-Smith, 2009; Castillo & Phoummarath, 2006; Ellis et al., 2013).
With children spending the majority of time in school, support from school staff is seen as one way to address the social-emotional needs of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students. The lack of research on the impact of school support on the acculturation for recently arrived refugee and immigrant students has determined the need for further study. This current study assessed acculturation categories of recently arrived refugee and immigrants within secondary newcomer centers and tested whether school support affected acculturation attitudes and whether there was a significant relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being.

Culturally and linguistically diverse student populations are on the rise in the U. S. (Custodio, 2011; MPI, 2014; PEW, 2013; Suárez-Orozco & Sattin, 2007; USCB, 2010; USCIS, 2014; USDS, 2014), and additional research on the acculturation of newcomers is seen as a necessity (Suárez-Orozco, Onaga et al., 2010). Due to the limited studies conducted on student acculturation within schools, it is yet to be determined whether school support has a positive effect on acculturation and emotional well-being of newly arrived refugees and immigrants (Gaytan et al., 2007; Roxas, 2008; Vang, 2005). Consequently, this study adds to the body of research conducted on newcomers and addresses culturally relevant issues for educators working with newly arrived refugee and immigrant secondary students.
Chapter III

Design and Methodology

Introduction

Berry’s et al. (1989) theory of acculturation claims people who live within a host country will fall within one of four acculturation categories: biculturalism, separation, assimilation, or marginalization. There is some evidence that outside influences affect the categories of acculturation and that various acculturation categories help determine adjustment to the host country (Berry et al., 2006; Sam et al., 2013). The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between acculturation attitudes and perceived school support, the relationship between acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being, and the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students. Due to the limited research connecting school support and emotional well-being for refugee and immigrant students, this current study will help inform educators regarding connections between secondary newcomers’ perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived school support and emotional well-being. In addition, this study has the potential to inform educators and educational systems in regards to effective school support practices for newcomers and help establish effective support systems within districts. With rapid changes in the demographics of public schools, it is imperative educators have a more in-depth understanding of the acculturation of newcomer students.

This chapter begins by providing a detailed look at the participants in the study and desegregation of the student demographics. Next, the survey instrument and interview questions used in the study are described, and the use of surveys and interviews are justified through previous studies and validity tests. This chapter outlines the step-by-step procedure of the
analytical methods, providing information on how data was collected, by whom, and the procedure for analysis. Ethical and human rights issues are addressed in the chapter as well.

**Research Design**

This study used an explanatory, correlational, mixed methods design to cluster the perceptions of secondary refugee and immigrant students into acculturation categories and to determine if acculturation categories have a relationship to the students’ perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being. The study was conducted in two distinct stages: the collection of quantitative survey data and open-ended questions from students to gather generalized information and student and counselor qualitative interviews to help explain survey responses. The collection of multiple pieces of complementary evidence achieved a balanced research method (Morse & Chung, 2003; Morse & Niehaus, 2009).

With the diverse group of participants in the study, it was important to draw from their experiences to contextualize the information and provide a more complete picture of the acculturation process. The in-depth interviews administered in the second phase of the study allowed the researcher to analyze responses beyond the generalized questions of students and additionally provided perceptions from counselors working with students. Both the initial survey questions and the in-depth interviews were structured to attain multiple real-life perspectives from various cultural influences as suggested by Turner (2007). With the complex subject of acculturation, this mixed methods approach allowed for the quantitative data to drive the qualitative portions of the study (Morse & Niehaus, 2009). In addition, triangulating the data between quantitative and qualitative methods increased the reliability of findings, adding a deeper understanding of the information (Creswell, Fetters, & Ivankova, 2004) and contributing to the legitimacy of using mixed methods with the diverse student population (Lund, 2012).
**Research questions.** Three central research questions drove the survey and interview questions:

- **Question 1:** What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?
- **Question 2:** What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?
- **Question 3:** What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

The three hypotheses for the current study were as follows:

- **H₀₁:** There is no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students.
- **H₀₂:** There is no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students.
- **H₀₃:** There is no direct relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being for secondary refugee and immigrant students.

**Participants**

The sample in the study was a purposeful, convenient sample of four school counselors and 75 secondary students who qualified as refugees or immigrants based on documentation upon enrollment. The participants attended or worked in one of two newcomer programs in bordering districts, within a suburban community in the Western United States. The school districts had a combined population of 62,089 (Idaho State Department of Education [IDSDE] 2014). Each program was located in a high school with enrollments of 1675 and 1701 respectively. The refugee and immigrant students were 14-20 years of age, born outside the U.S,
and had English language levels between advanced-beginning and early fluent, as determined by
the state’s annual English Language Assessment Test or the incoming English Placement Test.

The four participating counselors held either a Social Worker or Pupil Personnel Services
certificate. Of the four full-time counselors, one had a caseload of 93 high school newcomer and
EL students, and one had a caseload of 90 newcomers at the high school level and 55 additional
newcomers at the junior high level. The third counselor worked with both newcomers and
general education students with a caseload of 450, and the fourth counselor had a caseload of
650 general education students, but worked with newcomers the previous three years. It is
important to note the caseloads of the newcomer counselors were significantly lower than the
general education counselors in the same school system. All counselors had some degree of
multicultural training, with one counselor having an English as a New Language (ENL) Masters
(see Table 1).

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Years in Counseling</th>
<th>Years with Newcomers</th>
<th>Certification/Endorsements</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services/K-12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services/Secondary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student participants in the study had similar identifiable characteristics, which included at
least three of the following: new to the U. S. within three years, refugee or immigrant status,
limited or no formal education, beginning to intermediate English levels, or clinical PTSD. The
average age of the students at the time of U.S. arrival was 14.73, the average current age was 16.92, and the average grade was 10.51. Students came from 21 countries, spoke 15 languages, not including English, and identified with five religions: Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Juase, with two students not identifying with any religion. Of the respondents to the survey 43% were boys and 57% were girls (see Table 2). The overall ethnicity breakdown was African 34%, Asian 18%, Middle Eastern 37%, and Latin America 11%. There were no students from Europe or North America. Students who were a part of the newcomer centers, but did not fit the selection criteria, were not asked to participate in the study.

Table 2

*Student Survey Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Age at Arrival</th>
<th>Current Age</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Years in Country</th>
<th>Major Religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>32 (M)</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

At the time of the study, the state in which the research was conducted had only three high school newcomer programs. Although attempts were made to access the third high school newcomer site, emails and phone calls were not returned to the researcher, thus the researcher made the decision to use the two most accessible sites.

The research study was conducted between the months of September 2014 and April 2015 at two secondary newcomer centers. Both centers had been in operation for three and a half years, however site one had a newcomer program in a stand-alone building for six years previous to moving the program to the current high school site. The two centers provided specially
designed English Language Development (ELD) classes taught by certified English Language (EL) teachers, additional support for general education classes, some degree of extended tutoring, and were located within the high school whose students it served. With a total of 145 newcomer students between the two districts (.0031% of total student population) the small population of participants also led naturally to convenience sampling (Creswell, 2012).

Parent consent forms translated in three of the most prevalent languages, Arabic, Spanish and Swahili (Appendix F), were sent home explaining the study for those students between the ages of 15 and 17. For 18 languages that were not translated, a note in the student’s native language was included with the English form stating, “This is important, please have it translated,” or for students who spoke languages that did not have any translation, contact information leading to the access of interpreters was provided. All translators signed confidentiality forms (Appendix G) prior to translation work and contact with parents. In addition, all student participants were read the assent form on the electronic survey (Appendix H) and asked to mark “Yes, I agree to take part in the survey” or “No, I do not agree to take part of the survey.” The assent form clearly stated that participation was optional and the student had the right to withdrawal from the study at any time. Students between the ages of 18 and 20 were allowed to sign their own form (Appendix F) given their age, as designed by the federal guidelines for conducting research. However, due to their language levels, the consent form was read to them prior to signing.

**Instruments**

**Quantitative.** The original ICSEY survey included 144 questions, of which there were subsections on acculturation attitudes, school perceptions and emotional well-being perceptions. These subsets provided the basis for the 73 questions used in the current survey. The original
The survey was designed and first used by a team of international psychologists and researchers to further explore how immigrant youth live within and between two cultures, which made the survey an appropriate instrument for the current study. Permission was gained (Appendix I) to use the ICSEY survey prior to any data collection.

Part one of the survey asked ten demographic questions to gain a deeper understanding of the student population. The second part of the survey used a 5-point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” for all 20 acculturation questions. The emotional well-being, part three section included 20 5-point Likert scale questions from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” and four 5-point Likert scale questions using “never” to “always.” Part four, school support section included six 5-point Likert scale questions “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree,” three multiple choice questions, seven Likert scale questions from “never” to “very often,” and three open-ended questions, for a total of 73 student survey questions.

The first part of the survey asked eight out of the original 15 demographic questions from the ICSEY survey. The eight questions that came directly from the original survey included age, gender, grade, birth country, citizenship, religion, age when arrived in the United States, and ethnic background. Questions on the demographics regarding the mother and father were dropped from the ICSEY survey since parent perspectives were not part of the current study and the researcher added language to get a deeper understanding of student demographics.

Part two of the survey, The Acculturation Attitudes Questionnaire (AAQ) (Berry et al., 2006) from the ICSEY survey, was kept completely intact to ensure reliability of Berry’s original bidimensional acculturation model (Berry et al., 1989). The 20-question survey measured four acculturation levels: marginalization, separation, assimilation, and integration. The survey
contained questions on language, cultural traditions, social activities, friends, and marriage. The participants responded to each of the 20 questions using a 5-point Likert scale.

Part three of the survey focused on the students’ emotional well-being. The first section asked nine questions from the original survey on discrimination using a 5-scale Likert-type scale (Rosenberg, 1965) where questions included, “I feel Americans have something against me” or “I have been threatened or attacked because of my ethnic background.” The second section of emotional well-being contained five questions on Life Satisfaction (Diener, Emmos, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Questions in this section ranged from “On the whole, I am satisfied with my life,” to “At times I think I am no good at all.” The last section of emotional well-being addressed self-esteem where examples of questions were, “I wish I could have more respect for myself” and “The conditions of life are excellent.”

Section one in the fourth part of the survey contained nine questions addressing school adjustment from the original ICSEY study. The researchers contributing to the survey’s first nine questions were, Anderson (1981), Moos (1989), Sam (1994), Samdal (1998), and Wold (1995). Sample questions included, “At present I like school” and “I wish I could quit school for good” (Berry et al., 2006). The researcher added seven additional questions on school personnel and program support and three open-ended questions to the fourth part of the survey to solicit specific qualitative feedback on school support (see Table 3). The ten questions added by the researcher were validated through a panel of eight EL experts and piloted with three students at a high school within the second district site.
Table 3.

*Student Survey Format*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Survey Format</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong> (part 1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multiple-choice</td>
<td>Choose an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill in the blank</td>
<td>One-word student response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong> (part 2)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Strongly disagree to Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Adaptation</strong> (part 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Strongly agree to Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Never to always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Strongly agree to Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Strongly agree to Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Support</strong> (part 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Adjustment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Strongly disagree to Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multiple-choice</td>
<td>Choose an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel and Program Support (added by researcher)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5-point Likert-scale</td>
<td>Never to always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Support (added by researcher)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td>Student narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey validation. The first phase of the study began in September 2014 with the validation and piloting of 10 questions created by the researcher and added to the student part four survey taken from the original ICSEY instrument (Appendix J) (Berry et al., 2006).

Ten EL content experts were selected by the researcher due to their expertise in the field of multicultural education and experience working with English learners. Each member of the panel was sent an email explaining the purpose of the research and an invitation to participate (Appendix K). Attached to the email was a synopsis of the study (Appendix L) and a spreadsheet to record survey results (Appendix M). Out of the original 10 experts, eight educators volunteered to participate. These experts included four district EL academic coaches, one district EL consultant, two EL teachers, and one college EL instructor. The EL experts had combined classroom experience of 177 years with 139 years working with EL students (see Table 4).

The first part of the validation process checked for content validity to verify whether the questions addressed the intended topic. Although content validity relies on judgment, the efforts by the researcher to first carefully conceptualize the questions and then have the questions rated by the panel of experts increased the chances of the survey being deemed valid (Polit & Beck, 2006). The researcher-created survey questions included seven multiple-choice questions and three open-ended questions regarding school support for newcomer students. The experts were asked to mark relevancy for each of the questions on a Likert-like scale with “4” being very relevant, “3” quite relevant, “2” somewhat relevant, or “1” not relevant. In addition, there was a comment box for the content experts to write suggestions. Of the eight participating experts, seven fully completed the rating scale and one expert partially completed the rating scale. The one expert who answered only five out of ten questions was removed from the rating. All rating scales were returned to the researcher electronically.
An item content validity index (I-CVI) was conducted for each item in the survey and a mean score for the overall scale was obtained (see Table 5). The researcher included both 3 (quite relevant) and 4 (very relevant) as agreement to the relevancy of the questions. Two questions received ratings of 2 (somewhat relevant) from one of the experts and were marked as not relevant. The researcher used the widely excepted .80 mean (Polit & Beck, 2006) to accept
each question’s validity. The experts were in total agreement for eight out of the ten questions and partial agreement on two of the questions. All 10 school support questions were deemed valid and included in the survey.

Table 5

*Ratings on a 10-Item Scale by Eight Experts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expert 1</th>
<th>Expert 2</th>
<th>Expert 3</th>
<th>Expert 4</th>
<th>Expert 5</th>
<th>Expert 6</th>
<th>Expert 7</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>CVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion Relevant 1.0 .75 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 Mean .96

*Note.* I-CVI, item-level content validity index

Following expert validation, a pilot was conducted for the researcher added questions with three seniors from a high school in the same district as site two. The three students were in an English language program, all over the age of 18, and were born outside of the United States. The researcher formatted the survey questions in Qualtrics prior to administering the on-line survey in order to test any electronic issues as well as the validity of the questions. Prior to contact with the students, the purpose of the study and arrangements to conduct the surveys was
discussed with the students’ EL teacher. The day of the pilot the survey link was emailed to the EL teacher and the teacher emailed the link to each of the students’ personal school email account. Prior to taking the survey, the students were given an overview of the research project and the option to opt out of the pilot. All three students agreed to participate and signed an electronic consent form (Appendix N). The researcher conducted the pilot survey in two, back-to-back sessions in a conference room arranged by the students’ EL teacher.

In the first session there was one student and in the second session two students. Each of the students brought a laptop assigned to the EL classroom to complete the survey. In the researcher-created pilot survey, students were asked to answer seven multiple choice and three open-ended questions on school personnel and program supports and provide additional feedback by answering three open-ended questions on the design of the survey which read, “What terminology or vocabulary were you uncertain of?” What statements if any were unclear?” and “Please provide any additional feedback that would help improve the design of the survey questions” (Appendix O). On the first two feedback questions there were no suggestions. Comments included, “It was all good,” “nothing.” “Nothing, everything was clear.” There were two suggestions from the third question which included, “If there were questions of what we would like more help in” and another comment unrelated to the design of the survey stating the student would like more help from tutors and teacher assistants.

The researcher reworded one of the survey questions to accommodate the first suggestion. The time it took the students to complete the pilot was from 9.8 to 15.38 minutes. The complete 73-question revised student survey, including questions from ICSEY (Berry et al., 2006) and the ten added school support questions, were entered into the Qualtrics on-line survey program by the researcher.
Survey administration. Permission was gained from each of the school districts (Appendices P & Q) as well as from the principal at site two (Appendix R) to conduct the current study. At the time of the study request, the principal at site one retired and a new principal had not been selected. The researcher met with the new site one principal to explain the research project once the school-year began. The student survey was administered at the two sites after adequate time to conduct the surveys was arranged between the researcher and the students’ primary EL teachers, as approved by building administration. To increase comprehension for the newcomer participants, the researcher met with the primary EL newcomer teachers at each site and provided them with a list of survey vocabulary words that the students might not fully comprehend (Appendix S). In addition, a practice test was entered into Qualtrics by the researcher to use as a demonstration for the students (Appendix T). The practice survey and vocabulary words were added to increase students’ background knowledge and understanding of completing a survey instrument.

At site one, it was determined by the primary newcomer EL teacher that the surveys would be conducted during the students’ computer lab time and over multiple periods. Due to the number of sessions needed, the research requested the help of two additional EL coaches to help oversee the various sessions. Each EL coach signed a confidentiality form prior to contact with students (Appendix U). The researcher and two additional EL coaches administered the survey at the first site where no previous contact had been made between the researcher or coaches and students. An EL instructional coach, without regular contact and undue influence, administered the survey at the second site. The researcher formatted the adapted ISCEY survey in Qualtrics in English and included standard instructions. In addition, due to the low levels of English, the survey administrators read the survey aloud to all students. A verbatim transcript was used at the
two sites to ensure consistency and reliability of the survey (Appendix V). During the administration of the survey, EL classroom teachers were present to provide a familiar presence, to help students track along with the survey administrator, and reread the questions if necessary.

Surveys were conducted in a computer lab at the first site, which proved difficult for the students. Some issues included not being able to log-in either due to not having working email sites or not having the skills to navigate the computer. In addition, students at the first site took the survey in two parts and not all students completed the second part of the survey or entered the number given to them by the survey administrator to connect the two surveys. Any participant who did not complete both parts of the survey or did not have a number to connect the two surveys was removed from the data. At the first site 20 surveys were invalid, leaving 45 validated surveys.

Due to the difficulty at the first site with the students taking the survey on the computer, the second site used a printed copy of the Qualtrics survey where students completed the survey pencil to paper. The Qualtrics survey responses were then entered into the on-line program by the researcher. No survey issues were apparent with the paper version. Prior to administering the survey, all students were informed that participation was voluntary, had no influence on classroom grade, and information would remain confidential.

Qualitative

In addition to the three open-ended questions that were added to part four of the student survey, a sample of four counselors and eight students were interviewed. The design of the interview questions aligned to the survey questionnaire in order to gather the same information, but from the perspective of the participating students and counselors being interviewed and included school personnel support, school program support, and emotional well-being questions.
One questionnaire was developed for students and a second questionnaire with the same questions from the perspective of counselors was developed. The interview questionnaires were validated through a panel of six of the original eight EL experts in September 2014 (see Table 5) who included two EL teachers and four EL instructional coaches. Each of the experts was given the opportunity to rate the validity of the interview questions using a 4-point scale, which included: 1-not relevant, 2-somewhat relevant, 3-quite relevant, and 4-highly relevant (Appendices W and X). Each question was then calculated using the content validity index (I-CVI). All questions received above the recommended .80 mean, allowing for ten reliable interview questions with a compiled mean of .98 (Appendix Y and Z).

Prior to interviewing counselors and students, the researcher asked the principals of each school to review the purpose of the study and propose time frames for interviews. The counselors at each of the sites were conveniently chosen, two of who were the assigned counselors at each of the sites for the newcomer students, one who was the previously assigned counselor at one of the sites for newcomers and one general education counselor who worked with newcomers.

Students interviewed at the first site were over the age of 18 and were first asked by their EL teacher if they were interested in participating in a one-on-one interview. The researcher then randomly chose three students from the list of interested students provided. The researcher randomly chose the students at the second site from all the students over the age of 18 who also took the paper-pencil survey. The random selection of students and the criteria of over the age of 18 did not allow for mirrored representation of the student interviewees, nevertheless the mix was characteristic of the larger group including both boys and girls in the highest population subgroups of Iraqi and DRC, additional countries (Columbia and Nepal), and a close representation of religious preference with 50% of participants identifying as Muslim compared
to 40% of total participants. Both the counselors and students were given a review of the intent of the study and opportunity to opt out of the interviews. All participants signed an informed consent form prior to the interview. Once all permission forms were secured, the researcher conducted the audio-recorded interviews one-on-one in a secure school location. The 8 student and four counselor interviews were conducted between November 2014 and December 2014.

Researchers stress the importance of using member checks to validate the appropriateness of field questions (Creswell, 2012 Marshall & Rossman, 2010), so member checks were conducted with counselors and students in January and February 2015 prior to finalizing themes. The researcher sent out a member checking email allowing all participants to make suggestions and clarify misunderstandings (Appendices D & E). Due to the level of the students’ English and limited knowledge of research processes, the students were referred to their newcomer counselor to answer any questions on the purpose and process of member checking, as was prearranged by the researcher. From the counselors there was only one response. Two clarifications were made on the level of English classes provided by the program and a comment on the opportunities for students to attend post-high school education. There were no responses from students. The researcher contacted the newcomer counselors through email to verify the students did not have any questions, concerns, or changes to their transcripts. Each counselor verified no students had questions or concerns.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants and sites during the study, sites were identified as numbers and students and teachers had pseudonyms. Interviews with students and counselors were audio recorded one-on-one by the researcher and transcribed by a professional transcriptionist. The transcriptionist did not have access to participants or sites and did not know from which site information originated. In addition, the transcriptionist signed a confidentiality
form prior to access of data (Appendix AA). Recordings were deleted from the hard drive once transcriptions were completed and all notes were password protected to ensure only the researcher had access.

As a further precaution for students, school counselors were made aware of the interviews and were available for students if needed, with the slight possibility that the subject matter of the interviews could lead to emotional distress for students. All participants were given the right to withdraw at any time during the study. The Human Rights Research Committee (Institutional Review Board) at Northwest Nazarene University provided final approval for this study on April 28, 2014 protocol number 142014.

**Analytical Methods**

**Quantitative analysis.** The researcher used IBM SPSS, and Microsoft Excel, and Microsoft Word to organize and analyze the data. Each subset of the revised ICSEY was first recorded in Excel. Descriptive analysis was run on the first survey subset, Student Demographics, which had both nominal and ordinal data consisting of ten questions. Subsets 2-4 consisted of 67 ordinal, 5-scale Likert-like questions, three multiple choice and three open-ended questions. All data from student responses were recorded in Excel under each subset. In subset 2, each level of acculturation was determined with five questions (20 in all). Student acculturation categories were determined using cluster analysis, placing each of the students in one of the four levels of acculturation as per Berry’s (Berry et al., 1989) model. The Spearman Rho test was used to determine the relationship between acculturation attitude levels and perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being. Being a nonparametric procedure, Spearman Rho was an appropriate statistical fit for the ordinal data of the Likert-like survey (Tanner, 2012).
**Qualitative analysis.** The researcher used Bryman’s (2009) four stages of qualitative analysis to determine codes and themes from the raw data of the open-ended and interview questions. First, the researcher read the text to determine major themes and then put the themes in categories. Next, the text was reread and words and phrases were color-coded and like codes were determined. The third stage began by labeling codes and organizing them into broad themes. Finally, the researcher placed themes with their codes under each research question to help describe the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). Further discussion on the broad themes from the interviews will be discussed under results in Chapter 4 of the study.

This exploratory, mixed methods design study conducted non-experimental research using correlational data to explain the associations between variables (Creswell, 2012). Descriptive statistical analyses were performed on the sample groups to develop a detailed understanding of the participants. Using both the survey and interview data, bivariate correlational analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between student acculturation, school support and emotional well-being.

**Role of the Researcher**

The researcher worked with newly arrived refugee and immigrant students for 11 years prior to the research study, the last seven years specifically as an administrator, including four years over one of the two high school newcomer programs in the study. This contact in itself may lend to bias, however the newcomer experience may have also provided additional insight into the design of the questions and the analysis of the data collected. The researcher’s prior experience working with newcomers provided insight into the level of questioning newcomers would be able to comprehend. In addition, the researcher’s experience may have provided a deeper understanding of the analysis of the qualitative data due to the researcher’s own
experience with students who have been exposed to premigratory trauma and other emotional well-being issues. Qualitative studies see the researcher as an added asset to the study due to the researcher’s insider understanding of the population being studied (Creswell, 2012; Yin, 2009). The steps that were put into place to reduce the influence on student surveys and counselors’ interview responses included: having an EL academic coach administer the survey at the one site the researcher had regular contact and having an administrator other than the researcher conduct the annual evaluation for the counselor being interviewed. It is the researcher’s ultimate goal to provide information to colleagues, which potentially could have a positive impact on the development of the country’s newly arrived refugee and immigrant students.

**Limitations**

The small number of student newcomers and high school newcomer centers within the state that the study was conducted, naturally led to smaller sample size. The intent of the research design was to use all three major high school newcomer centers in the state, however with one of the sites being unresponsive, the third site needed to be removed. With additional time to collect data, expanding the study to multiple states would allow for a broader picture of newcomers’ acculturation. In addition to the number of newcomer centers, adding sites with newcomers at traditional high schools without newcomer programs would allow for an experimental model to help determine the effects of student acculturation outside specially designed programs.

An additional limitation of the study was the removal of one of the EL expert’s rating due to the expert only answering five out of ten questions. Although the rater was removed, it did not affect the validity of the questionnaire or the study.
Delimitations

Acculturation is a complex subject, with multiple interpretations (Berry et al., 1989; Collier, 2010; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Studying a group of students from multiple countries, ethnicities, and thus backgrounds, makes the accuracy in generalizing data an additional concern. Conducting a mixed-method study allowed for follow-up interviews and member checking in order to provide further validity. However, when working with refugee and immigrant students, one must have a heightened awareness to ensure accuracy in reporting acculturation perceptions from this vulnerable population (Dickson-Swift, James, Kippen, & Liamputrong, 2008). The researchers’ years of experience working with newcomers may have provided an additional filter when generalizing the data.

Working with students with low levels of English has additional challenges. Providing language support in the way of trained specialists, as well as translated documents, addressed some of the issues of language barrier. There is always an additional possibility those being surveyed might misinterpret questions due to English not being their primary language. Due to this concern, several precautionary measures were put into place to help support the students and their families. First, translated copies of the explanation of the study were provided in three of the most prevalent languages. Arabic, Swahili and Spanish. For the majority of the families who did not have a translated consent form, a note in the students’ primary language stating, “This is important, please have it interpreted” was provided. For all students contact information was provided to interpreters for both students and their parents. To support language during the administration of the survey, the researcher and EL academic coaches read each question aloud and clarified in English any vocabulary students may have not understood due to language barrier.
Another delimitation in the study was the convenient sampling. Due to the unique characteristics and small size of the secondary newcomer programs in the districts studied, it was necessary to ask all those within the subpopulation to participate. This also limited the student interview participants, since it was determined students over the age of 18 would provide the most feedback. Limiting the number of interviews with students and counselors made the collection of data feasible within the school-year timeframe of the study. Additional studies could include student interviews with those who have graduated out of newcomer support and who have transitioned into general education classrooms or with students who have already completed high school. With time and distance from newcomers programs, the students may develop a deeper understanding of what was supportive and a greater comfort with sharing emotional well-being concerns, which are not always addressed in the first few years in a host country.
Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

In Chapters I, II, and III, an introduction, purpose of the study, overview of the literature, and explanation of the methodology were presented to help explain acculturation and to explain how this study will explore the relationships between acculturation, school support, and emotional well-being for secondary refugee and immigrant newcomers. Chapter IV examines the results of analyzing both quantitative and qualitative student data using descriptive statistics for participants, statistical analyses for each of the survey sub-sections, Spearman Rho correlations among subsections of the survey, and coding analyses of the open-ended questions in the survey and the interview questions with students and counselors. The current study used a mix-methods approach to triangulate surveys, open-ended questions, and interviews in order to gain a deeper understanding of how secondary refugee and immigrant students perceive their own acculturation and how the support from school personnel and school programs affected their acculturation and emotional well-being.

Description of Participants

Participants in the study were conveniently selected from two secondary newcomer programs within adjoining school districts in a suburban area in the Western United States. Between the two centers, there were 134 secondary newcomer students. At the first site, 84 students were invited to participate with 67 consent forms returned. Two parents declined their children’s participation, leaving 65 (77%) students participating at the first site. Administration of the surveys at the first site took place in multiple small group settings and began October 14, 2015. Administration of the surveys at site one proved to have two major challenges. First, the
students had difficulty with the on-line survey format due to emails that were not working or low levels of computer skills. The survey administrator gave the students a general email site address to compensate for individual email issues. However, the two email addresses allowed several students to log in more than once using the general survey link, as well as their email, which gave some of the participants more than one survey. Prior to any analysis by the researcher, surveys having duplicate student numbers, not having correct part one and part two student numbers, or participants who didn’t answer the majority of the questions, were eliminated. Overall, 20 survey entries at site one were deleted, leaving 45 (69%) out of the 65 surveys completed.

At site two, 35 out of 50 students were invited to participate in the study. The 15 students not invited had language levels too low to be included. Out of the 35 invited students at site two, 31 students returned consent forms. One student was removed from the final data analysis when it was discovered through his survey answers that he arrived in the country at age two and did not meet at least three of the five newcomer criteria, which left 30 (86%) qualified newcomers at site two. Due to the difficulty at site one using the electronic survey, students at site two answered surveys using pencil and paper with no challenges or issues detected. All the students at site two finished the surveys in multiple small group settings within one class period, with an approximate time of 60 minutes to complete the survey.

As shown in Table 6, the immigrant students who participated in the study were 57% girls ($N = 43$) and 43% boys ($N = 32$). The age range of the students was 14 through 20 years, with a mean of 16.92 years ($SD = 1.41$). Of the total participation from both sites, one student was 14 and three students were 20. The average age at arrival for students was 14.73 years old, leaving the average time in the country 2.19 years. Participants originated from 21 countries with
the two largest populations coming from Iraq \((N = 21)\) and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) \((N = 13)\). All of the Iraqi students spoke Arabic as their primary language in contrast to the DRC students who listed six primary languages (Swahili, French, Bembe, Kirundi, Kinyarwanda, and Portuguese). The five religions reported between all the participants were typical of the students’ ethnic origins with students in Latin America identifying with Christianity, Asians with Hindu, Buddhist, Christian or none; Africans selecting Christianity or Muslim; and 19 out of the 21 Middle Easterners’ choosing Muslim, with one student from Iraq identifying with Christianity and one with Juase (see Table 6).
### Table 6

**Survey Student Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Average Age at Arrival</th>
<th>Average Current Age</th>
<th>Average Grade</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(M) 3 (F) 1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ethiopian, French, Swahili, Bembe, Kirundi, Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.R. Congo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(M) 8</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>Swahili, French, Bembe, Kirundi, Kinyarwanda, Portuguese</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tigrinya</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arabic, Farsi</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(M) 11 (F) 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>19 Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1 Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3 Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(F) 4</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Christian, 1 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(M) 2 (F) 3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>3 Hindu, 2 Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kirundi</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>1 Christian, 1 Juase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(F) 5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3 Christian, 1 Buddhist, 1 None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Not reported
The two larger student groups, Iraqi and DRC, reflect current global conflict, with refugees arriving from the aftermath of the last Gulf War and on-going internal fighting in the DRC. Many Iraqi students have been put in harm’s way due to the fact their families have assisted U.S. forces. Iraqi families often qualify for fast tracking, which places families in the U.S. much sooner than is typical for refugees (U.S. Embassy, n.d.). As another country with long term fighting, the DRC has experienced major conflict for decades, claiming up to six million lives due to multiple African countries fighting over a claim to the country’s rich natural resources. Although the U.N. secured a regional agreement in 2013, conflict in the region continues leaving countless Congolese as refugees (UNHCR, 2015).

Of the 75 students who took part in the survey, three willing participants at site one and five willing participants at site two participated in one-on-one audiotaped interviews. At site one, students over the age of 18 were presented the idea of interviewing by their EL teacher. The researcher was given names of four students and randomly chose three of the four to interview. The four names provided to the researcher by the EL teacher were students the researcher was familiar with from conducting the on-site student surveys and concluded the students were at the lower end of the language benchmark set as advanced beginning language students. The researcher removed one of the students from the list randomly and made the decision to add an additional student from site two, to make up the total of eight students. At site two, all the names of students over the age of 18 were separated from the total participants and five students were randomly chosen from the group. Date, time, and locations to conduct the interviews were arranged with the students’ EL teachers. On the day of the scheduled interviews, all eight students were asked a second time by the researcher if they agreed to be interviewed. All eight students agreed to participate in the interviews and signed consent forms. Interviews were
recorded using a digital recorder as well as either an iPhone or iPad for backup. Student interviews lasted between 19 to 37 minutes. The first student interview took place on November 20 and the last interview on December 8, 2014. Student demographic data came from their newcomer counselor at site one and from the EL department database at site two.

The students participating in the interviews came from three countries (50% from Iraq), spoke a total of five languages, and seven out of the eight students were seniors. The average age for students was 18, with most participants in the U. S. for less than two years. It is important to note that site two participants reported time in the country in months, but two of the participants at site one provided only the year, which may have skewed the time in the country downward. In addition, one student was over the three-year period typical for students to be in the newcomers program, but qualified for the program by meeting three out of the five criteria to remain in the newcomers program (See Table 7).
Table 7

*Student Interviewed Demographic Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Age at Arrival</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male/ Female</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Years in Country</th>
<th>Major Religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Swahili/French</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. DRC, Democratic Republic of Congo*

In addition, four counselors who have worked with newcomers were asked to participate answering the same interview questions posed to the students, but from the counselor’s perspective. Interview questions were validated through a panel of EL experts prior to conducting interviews. Counselor interviews were administered in each of the counselor’s offices at a mutually agreed upon time with the researcher between the days of November 17 and December 3, 2015. Interviews were recorded using a digital recorder as well as either an iPhone or iPad for backup and lasted anywhere from 29 to 44 minutes. There were two men and two women who were invited to participate, with a total of 54 years of counseling service between them, making their average experience 13.5 years. Time specifically working with newcomers was a total of 18.5 years, with two of the counselors currently working directly with newcomers,
one counselor working the previous three years at one of the two participating newcomer centers, and one counselor working with newcomers along with other general education students at one of the sites. Counselors working exclusively with newcomers or EL students had significantly lower caseloads than the counselors working with general education students, providing the newcomer counselors more time to work with refugee and immigrant students on complex issues (Table 1). In addition, all counselors had either a Pupil Personnel Services or Social Worker certificate, but it is important to note that the two current newcomer counselors had the Social Worker certificates, which gave the newcomer counselors additional training in dealing with social issues.

**Quantitative Measures**

The survey questionnaire used in the current study was originally developed by the ICSEY research team to assess immigrant and national youths’ cultural transitions within 13 countries (Berry et al., 2006). The original survey contained 144 questions with 23 variable subscales. In the current study, the researcher kept all of the student demographic questions, adding one question on religious preference, but removed demographic questions referring to mother, father, and neighbors. The current study kept all the questions from five subsections of the original survey: acculturation attitudes, school adjustment, life satisfaction, self-esteem, and discrimination. Added to the current survey were seven Likert scale and three open-ended questions on school support, which were developed and validated by the researcher. The ten added questions were reviewed by an EL expert group and piloted at a separate high school with three immigrant students. Prior to administration of the survey to students, the survey was adapted as per expert and student input. One open-ended question was adapted to read “What would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country with?” as
per student request and one question had the wording changed from “extracurricular” to “clubs” as per expert input.

**Reliability of survey instrument.** The researcher ran Cronbach’s Alpha using SPSS software to determine the reliability of the responses in each subsection of the survey. The expectation that Berry’s (Berry et al., 2006) acculturation questions would prove to have higher levels of reliability when used with a small group of newcomers in contrast to a large population of long-term student immigrants and nationals was not realized. Overall, the results from the Cronbach Alpha analysis in the acculturation categories were lower for the current research, averaging .47, than that of the ICSEY study where Alphas averaged .56. The only acculturation category in the current study that met the widely used reliability level of .70 was assimilation. The additional five survey subsection alphas had mixed results. In the emotional well-being category, Self-esteem ($\alpha = .71$) and discrimination ($\alpha = .79$), although exceeding the .70 benchmark, had lower alphas than the ICSEY survey, which had .75 and .83 consecutively. In the emotional well-being subsections, Life Satisfaction ($\alpha = .67$) and School Adjustment ($\alpha = .58$) were both below the recommended acceptable alpha of .70. Neither Life Satisfaction nor the School Adjustment sections were included in the Spearman’s correlations due to low reliability. The researcher’s added school personnel and program support questions met the reliability test at .79 (see Table 8). Although both the Berry and current study demonstrated the lowest alpha in the integration category, the current study was still considerably lower with a .16 alpha. The one question that most influenced the alpha level was, “I would be just as willing to marry an American than someone from my culture.” If the marriage question were to be removed, the alpha would be .51, similar to the Berry study.
Table 8

*Reliability Data of Survey Instrument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Researcher</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha ICSEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong> (part 1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ICSEY (adapted)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong> (part 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Berry, Kim, Power, Young, &amp; Bujaki (1989)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Well-being</strong> (part 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diener, Emmos, Larsen, &amp; Griffin (1985)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ICSEY</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rosenberg, (1965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Support</strong> (part 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel and Programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended Questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Measures**

Three open-ended questions were added by the researcher to the student survey to gather additional data on students’ perceptions of school supports. The three questions were: (a) what do teachers do to help you the most in class? (b) what do counselors do to help you the most?
and, (c) what would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country with? In addition, two, ten question semi-structured interview questionnaires were developed by the researcher to explore the students and counselors’ perceptions of school personnel and services and the emotional well-being of secondary newcomers.

**Reliability and validity of open-ended and interview questions.** Prior to administering the student survey, the three open-ended questions added to the student survey under the subsection School Personnel and Program Support were validated by a panel of EL experts and piloted with three EL students at a neighboring high school. In addition, there were two sets of interview questions, one for students and one for counselors that were validated by a panel of EL experts. The interview questions were aligned to solicit the same information, but written to get the perspective of each group of participants. The open-ended questions and the interview questions were also aligned, with the open-ended questions soliciting broad information such as, “What do your teachers do to help you the most?” and the interview questions requesting more detail such as, “Has it ever been difficult for you to understand information in class?” and if so, “What do you think made it difficult for you to understand the information?” To ensure validity of the interview responses, member checking was used with counselors and students.

Once the interviews were completed, the participating counselors were individually emailed copies of their transcribed interview and the codes and themes pulled from both the student and counselor interviews. The participating students were emailed a copy of their transcribed interview. Added to the email was a comment to see their EL counselor if they had questions about the purpose or process of responding, as was prearranged by the researcher and counselors. Both member-checking emails included a request to check for accuracy and an invitation to provide feedback. In addition, the researcher explained that some of the comments
might be used in the results or conclusion sections of the study and their quotes may be edited for grammar if needed for clarity. One counselor made two minor changes to his transcript, whereas the other three counselors verified the original transcripts. No students made comments or changes to their transcripts. Member checking was conducted by email as requested by counselors, due to email being the primary source of communication in schools and email was chosen for students as a learned and practiced method EL teachers and counselors had established with students.

**Codes and themes for qualitative measures.** In order to reduce and analyze the open-ended questions and interview data, Bryman’s (2009) four stages of qualitative analysis were used. In stage one, the researcher read the text as whole, determined major themes, and grouped ideas into categories. In stage two, the researcher highlighted keywords through color-coding and made marginal annotations. Stage three began by combining similar codes and organizing the codes into broad themes. Under the theme “EL Newcomer Teacher Support,” the students listed what teachers did most to help as: Help explain information, assist with homework, teach the students English, support in classes by reading text, and encouraging students in class. Students reported the newcomer counselor support as being: Scheduling classes, providing help within the class by giving direct support or meeting with teachers, talking through personal problems, generally everything, and explaining graduation and college requirements. Students also had several requests from all staff which included: provide more English classes, explain more by giving examples, listen to students and try to understand what students are saying, explain cultural expectations, provide appropriate level classes, provide assistants for classes, be more welcoming to newcomers, provide more translations, help the students make friends, and support the students’ self-esteem. The fourth stage is presented under each research question, where the
researcher relates the codes to the research questions and interprets the data. The following tables layout the broad themes and specific codes from the responses and indicate whether the responses support question one in the academic area, or question two in the emotional well-being area. Since question three deals with both academics and emotional well-being, all the codes support the third research question. Frequencies from the open-ended questions and quotes from the interviews will be presented and discussed under each of the research questions.

Table 9

*Frequencies of Codes for Open Ended Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(%f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL Newcomer Teacher Support</td>
<td>Explain/Help Understand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading/Read to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouragement/Self-esteem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Counselor Support</td>
<td>Scheduling Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help with Classes/Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally Everything</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation/College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Student Requests</td>
<td>Additional English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain/Give</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples/Talk Slow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be Understood/Listen To</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain Cultural Expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate Classes/Assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcoming/Open</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Translations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help make friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help with Self-esteem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher administered the semi-structured interviews one-on-one and audio recorded using a digital recorder as well as an iPhone or iPad for backup. The first five interviews were given to a professional transcriptionist by handing over the digital recorder after the interviews had been conducted and having her download the audio portions using voice recognition software. It was determined by the researcher and agreed upon by the transcriptionist that the remaining seven interviews would be sent to Dropbox. Dropbox was used both for security and due to the fact that attachments to email did not have enough data storage for large audio files. The emails accompanying the audio files identified the files as either student or counselor with an assigned number, for example, “Counselor 4.” The transcriptionist also signed a confidentiality agreement (Appendix AA) and was requested to erase all audio and Word files once the data was received and verified, so that only the researcher would have access to original and transcribed files.

The codes and themes from the student and counselor interviews were similar to that of the open-ended question responses, however there were codes in the interviews that crossed between themes, allowing for additional codes to emerge. In the interviews, school personnel and counselor support were dominant themes, but a third category “Challenges to Educational Access,” with ten major concerns being addressed by students and counselors, had the highest frequency. Some of the student challenges interview participants spoke to included: Not having enough English (Lack of English), being unaware of school or program information (Unaware of programs or school information), information from teachers not made clear (Communicating information), student being older than typical student in the grade (Age of student), inappropriate level of classes being provided (Types/Levels of classes), missing education prior to coming to the United States (Gap in education), not enough native language translations (Lack of
translations), students’ work obligations outside of school (Work obligations), lack of transportation (Transportation), lack of money to participate in sports or clubs (Money).

The interviews also had clear division between academic and emotional well-being support. The two overall academic and emotional well-being categories helped distinguish the final seven themes: school personnel support-academic, additional services and support, challenges to educational access, students’ strengths-academic, school personnel support-emotional well-being, challenges to emotional well-being, and students’ strengths-emotional. As in Table 9, each code is matched with the research question, with the understanding question three addressed both academic and emotional well-being support (see Table 10). In addition, Table 10 highlights the similarities and differences between student and counselor perceptions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Student$f$</th>
<th>Counselor$f$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel Supports</td>
<td>EL Teachers/Paraprofessional help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Counseling Services-Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Teachers/Accommodations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Personnel and</td>
<td>Extended day/year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>Support for families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to Educational</td>
<td>Lack of English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Unaware of programs or school information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating Information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types/Levels of Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap in Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Translations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Obligations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Strengths</td>
<td>Love for school/learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Student to Student Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel Support</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Well-being</td>
<td>Personal Counseling Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring Relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges to Emotional</td>
<td>Different cultural background/experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>Lack of friends/social</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trauma/Health Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Emotional Strengths</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

These findings will be thoroughly discussed in the next few sections, by first examining the acculturation preferences of students overall through demographic statistics. Additional discussion will look into how students’ responded to the remaining subsections: school personnel and programs, discrimination, and self-esteem. Using SPSS software, statistical data for each question was determined and is presented in table form. Finally, findings are presented under each research question using Spearman Rho correlations in the quantitative sections and in-depth discussions from both students and counselors in the qualitative sections.

Perceived acculturation attitude categories. This current research study used Berry’s definition of acculturation, “The dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (Berry, 2005, p. 698). The term “acculturation attitude” has grown from nearly five decades of work (Berry, 1966, 1980, 1997, 2005, 2011) and addresses the two-dimensional view of acculturation (Berry, 2005). Berry’s acculturation categories have helped organize the acculturation attitudes among the individual immigrants in this current study using mean scores. The 20-item scale developed by the ICSEY researchers (Berry et al., 2006) assessed the attitudes of the immigrants using a question from one of five social domains: traditions, marriage, language preference, friends, and social activities. The five-point Likert scale rating begins with strongly disagree and ends with strongly agree, providing a clear indication of where the students’ acculturation attitudes lie.

In the following sections the researcher presents descriptive results for each of the acculturation attitude categories and the student preference to categories presented in means. Using means data for each acculturation category is similar to the reporting in Berry et al. (2006)
where countries are shown individually (Appendix BB), however in the current study mean results are also shown related to each acculturation question as presented in the tables below.

**Assimilation.** Assimilation attitudes had an overall mean of 2.54 on the 5-point Likert scale (Table 11), which indicated that the students were divided in their responses, landing somewhere in the middle when asked if their preferences leaned toward American cultural domains. When asked to rate, “It is more important to me to be fluent in English than in my own language,” 31 out of 74 (44%) of students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, supporting the qualitative data that indicates the importance students put on English fluency. Students agreeing to questions in the assimilation category are rejecting their national origin culture in favor of their host country culture (Berry, 1997).

Table 11

*Assimilation Category Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of their own.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would rather marry an American than someone from my own culture.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is more important to me to be fluent in English than in my own language.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I prefer to have only American Friends.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I prefer social activities that involve only Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Separation. Separation attitudes had an overall mean of 2.51 (see Table 12), which mirrored the mean of assimilation, however the cultural domains of marriage, traditions, language, friends and social activities indicated variances. When asked to respond to, “It is more important to me to be fluent in my own language than in English,” only 18 out of 75 (26%) students took a more separatist view and either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. In addition, 19 of 72 (28%) students stated they would rather marry someone from their own culture than an American. Preference of only native cultural friends or social activities was reported the least preferable with averages of 7% and 6% consecutively. Students choosing questions in the separation category prefer to participate in their national origin culture, with little interaction in their host country (Berry, 1997).

Table 12

Separation Category Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I would rather marry someone from my own culture than an American.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Agree or Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel that I should maintain my own cultural traditions and not adapt to those of America.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It is more important to me to be fluent in my own language than in English.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I prefer to have only friends from my own culture.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I prefer social activities that involve people from my own culture only.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 2.51
**Integration.** Integration attitudes had the strongest overall mean of 3.84 (see Table 13), indicating that the majority of the students perceived integration, both keeping traditions and gaining new American traditions, as being preferable. Sixty-eight (94%) of students chose the option of being fluent in both their own native language and English by agreeing or strongly agreeing. A close second response was having friends from both cultures with 66 (92%) responses agreeing or strongly agreeing. The preference of integration among the students supports the open-ended and interview responses, where overall the students preferred to be bicultural.

Table 13

**Integration Category Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>$%$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel that my culture should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adapt to those of America.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would be just as willing to marry an American than someone from my culture.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is important to me to be fluent in both my own language and in English.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I prefer social activities that involve both Americans and people from my own culture.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I prefer to have both friends from my own culture and American friends.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Marginalization.** Marginalization was the least preferred of the four acculturation categories with a mean of 1.98. There were 15 responses (21%) not wanting to maintain their own traditions or American traditions and only one participant preferring not to have American friends or own cultural friends or not wanting to attend activities from either group (Table 14). Students agreeing with the separation questions show little interest in associating themselves with either their national origin culture or host country culture (Berry, 1997).

Table 14

*Marginalization Category Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel it is not important to maintain my own cultural traditions or to adapt to American traditions.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I would not like to marry someone from my own culture or an American.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is not important to me to be fluent either in my own language or English.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I don’t want to attend either American activities or activities from my own culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I don’t want to have either American friends or friends from my own culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 1.98
The results from the surveys at the acculturation sublevels provided a broad understanding of student attitudes with integration being preferred ($M = 3.84$ on a 5-point scale). Additionally, responses in assimilation and separation indicated students had somewhat neutral attitudes in these categories, with half the students choosing to either assimilate ($M = 2.54$) or separate ($M = 2.51$). The responses on marginalization had little support with a mean of 1.98, signifying at least some cultural contact is preferable. At the question level, the mean scores provide additional insight. In the assimilation category, nearly half of the students decided it was more important to be fluent in English than their own native language (44%) and 28% of students in the separation category felt it was more important to marry someone from their own culture. The only question in the marginalization category receiving more than 10% support was the question regarding cultural traditions. Twenty-one percent of the students responding to the cultural tradition question in the marginalization category signified it was neither important to maintain one’s own culture or adapt to American culture. Although integration was the overall acculturation choice among students, the results on the question level give credence to Berry’s findings that acculturation attitudes are fluid and ever changing (Berry et al., 2006).

**Perceived school support.** School personnel and programs are defined as staff and programs within a school that support the academic, social, and emotional lives of students. The school support variables are based on how students perceive the support from their teachers, counselors, and support staff and whether they feel welcome in clubs and sports. The strongest indicator of support was for the classroom teachers where 53 students (72%) agreed or strongly agreed that their teachers helped them with class assignments. The survey results reflect similar results as the qualitative data, where students feel supported by their teachers, but still have multiple academic challenges that have not all been addressed. As for counselor support, 47
students (64%) responded they knew how to find a counselor when needed, which was not as supportive as the students’ open-ended and interview responses, but may speak to the counselors’ concerns of lack of time to meet the needs of students. Principals and vice-principals did not fare as well as teachers and counselors. Only half the students (51%) felt that they could talk to the principal or vice-principal when needed. Also somewhat neutral were the responses of joining sports (50%) and clubs (56%) (See Table 15). The students’ responses to sports and clubs may have more to do with the cultural disconnect of extracurricular activities discussed under the qualitative data section, rather than not being welcomed.

Table 15

*School Personnel and Program Questions with Means*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. My classroom teachers help me with my assignments outside of class.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. I know how to find a counselor to talk to when I need it.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone in or out of school.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. I feel welcome to be on a sports team.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I feel welcomed to join clubs and after school activities.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.49</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Perceived emotional well-being.** For the purpose of this study, students’ emotional well-being is described as the presence of positive emotions and moods and the absence of negative emotions and moods (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDCP], 2013, para. 4). Four sub-sections were included in the student survey to measure emotions: School Adjustment, Life Satisfaction, Self-esteem, and Discrimination. Both School Adjustment and Life Satisfaction were removed from the mean analysis due to the low reliability of responses as measured by Cronbach Alphas.

Overall students had very strong self-esteem. In five out of the ten questions 69% to 79% of the students rated themselves with positive emotions (See Table 16). In support of the high self-esteem, only 10 out of 75 students (13%) felt that they were failures and 12 out of 75 (16%) felt useless at times. These results are supported by previous research indicating students’ self-esteem is unrelated to PTSD and other mental health concerns (Ehntholt & Yule 2006; Sutton et al., 2006).
Table 16

*Self-Esteem Questions with Means*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>N Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I take a positive attitude to myself.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. So far I have got the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the discrimination questions averaged 2.03 on the 5-point Likert scale. However, it is important to note that 32% of students felt that others had negative attitudes towards their culture. When asked how often groups of people treated them negatively due to their ethnic background, 24% of students responded “often” or “very often.” The percentage of students reporting they have been treated badly by adults or other students ranged from 5% to
12%. Teachers and kids outside of school were rated the most favorably with only 5% of students feeling teachers or students outside of school treated them negatively (Tables 17 & 18).

Examining the two largest subgroups, there was a distinct difference between Iraqi and DRC students. Students from the DRC reported 38% of others had behaved in an unfair or negative way towards their culture, which was slightly above the group mean of 32% and in contrast to students from Iraq who reported 25%, which was slightly below mean. As for being teased or insulted because of ethnic background, DRC students reported over twice the percentage at 54%, compared to the whole group of 24 % and the Iraqi students with just over the mean at 30%. When examining people who may treat students unfairly or negatively, the students reported favorably towards teachers with the DRC students indicating no negative responses and the Iraqi students equaling the whole group at 5%. There was a difference however between adults outside of school where DRC students reported no concern, but Iraqi students indicated 25% of the time they had been treated unfairly or negatively by adults outside of school due to their ethnic background. Perceptions were switched between the two student groups within school. DRC students reported 23% of other students treated them unfairly or negatively due to their ethnic background as opposed to a 10% negative report from Iraqi students. These results indicate there are differences between subgroups and ethnicity may be a factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. I think that others have behaved in an unfair or negative way towards my culture.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I don’t feel accepted by Americans.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I feel Americans have something against me.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I have been teased or insulted because of my ethnic background.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I have been threatened or attacked because of my ethnic background.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**: 2.03
Table 18

*Perceived Discrimination Questions with Means (part 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>f%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do the following people treat you unfairly or negatively because of your ethnic background?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Other adults outside of school.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Other students.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Other kids outside of school.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 2.03

Figure 4 provides a broad look at mean scores by subcategories. The subcategories that had mean scores above 3.0 on the 5-point Likert scale were integration ($M = 3.84$), school personnel and program support ($M = 3.49$) and self-esteem ($M = 3.36$). These results suggest students that have a strong preference for the Integration category and also reported support from school personnel and programs and had high degrees of self-esteem. The subgroups falling below the mean of 2.5 on the 5-point scale were marginalization ($M = 1.98$) and discrimination ($M = 2.03$). A low mean in marginalization indicates it was not preferred as an acculturation category. The low mean for discrimination points towards students in general not feeling discriminated against in and outside of school. Through the research questions in the next subsection of the study, a more detailed understanding of both the student and counselor’s perception of the questions within subgroups will unfold.
Research Question 1

What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?

Quantitative. To examine research question one, Spearman Rho correlations were calculated between subgroups of acculturation and the subgroup School Personnel and Programs. Table 19 shows the results of the correlation matrix. Correlations between each of the acculturation categories were as expected. Marginalization correlated negatively against assimilation, and integration, but positively against separation. Students who do not participate in either their own cultural traditions or adapt new traditions (marginalization) would not adapt to the host country culture (assimilation) or keep his/her native origin culture while adapting to new cultures (integration). However, if students chose not to participate in either culture they could still indicate preference for separation. In addition, integration had moderate negative
correlations against both assimilation and marginalization, indicating preference for integration does not allow for rejecting culture or assimilating to one culture.

Table 19

*Correlations among Assimilation Categories and School Personnel and Program Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assimilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Separation</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration</td>
<td>-.274*</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marginalization</td>
<td>-.320*</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>-.237*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School Personnel and Programs</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

There was no significant correlation between school support and any of the acculturation categories at the group level (Table 20). The direction of the relationship between assimilation and school support is positive, indicating those in the assimilation category view school personnel and program support positively. However, the relationship is not statistically significant at the $p = .05$ level. Correlations between school personnel and programs and separation, integration and marginalization are slightly negative at non-significant levels. This indicates that as a student who feels more marginalized, integrated, or separated, are more likely to see school support as not very positive. Although there were no significant correlations between the acculturation subgroups and the subgroups of school personnel and program support, there were several significant correlations between specific questions.
Table 20

*Correlations between Assimilation and School Support Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is more important to me to be fluent in English than in my own language</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments.</td>
<td>-.276*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. The counselor helps me find services when I need to contact someone in or out of school</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>.250*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. I feel welcomed to join clubs and after school activities</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.632**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Correlation is significant at the .05 level. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Several significant correlations at the question level were noted. Within the assimilation category, “I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own” correlated negatively to, “My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments” ($r_s = .276, p = .019$), in contrast to strong positive correlations to, “It is more important to me to be fluent in English than in my own language” ($r_s = .484, p = .000$). The correlation of assimilation and desire for fluent English support the open-ended and interview results pointing towards the importance of gaining English over all other cultural considerations. “The counselor helps me find services when I need to contact someone in or out of school” had strong positive correlations to “I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to”
(rs = .335, p = .005), and “I feel welcome to join clubs and after school activities” (rs = .312, p = .010). These results reflect the neutral responses from students on support of counselors, principals and vice-principals, and sports and clubs with mean data ranging from 50% and 64% in the three school support questions. The strongest correlation within all assimilation and school support questions was “I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to” and “I feel welcome to join clubs and after school activities” (rs = .632, p = .000). These two questions had a mean of 50% and 56% respectively. With nearly half of the students not feeling they could talk to administrators when needed, the students’ responses suggest a more active involvement between administrators and immigrant students may help increase students’ sense of welcome and willingness to join clubs and after school activities.

While there was evidence to support relationships between some specific acculturation components and school support questions, the correlations at the subgroup level indicated no significance, thus accepting the null hypothesis that there was no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived school supports of secondary refugee and immigrant students. In the following section the qualitative data will be examined to determine if the open-ended questions and interview responses support the findings from the survey data.

Qualitative. The open-ended questions on the student survey provided broad understandings of what teachers and counselors provided in the way of support for students and where the students would like additional support. The 12 interviews conducted with students and counselors around school support examined the questions at a deeper level. The interview questions uncovered seven emergent themes: School personnel support for academics, additional school programs and services, challenges to educational access, students’ academic strengths, school personnel support for emotional well-being, challenges to emotional well-being, and
students’ emotional strength. Under question one, “What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?” the responses from the academic perspective will be explored.

In order to personalize the responses, student and counselors were assigned pseudonyms. None of the participants' real names were used. In addition, the researcher used a denaturalized transcription process (Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005) for counselor and student responses when clarity was necessary. First, the researcher read through the original transcribed quote and if necessary removed utterances, pauses and grammatical errors that detracted from the meaning of the quote. Due to the student level of English, the researcher used a more aggressive editing process for students’ comments, adding punctuation and smoothing out areas of the conversation when clarity and flow of sentences were needed. The following is an example of editing around the question, “What would you want other adults to do for students new to the country?”

Original: They can just tell...not tell them, help them with anything they want and not make them scary. They would tell anyone to help them, 'cause when I was in the summer school, help my friends.’

Edited: They can help them with anything they need and not make it scary. They would tell others to help them, ‘cause when I was in summer school I helped my friends’.

If the student quote was plausible as spoken or if the direct quote enhanced the understanding of either the level of English or opinion the student was trying to convey, the quote was left unedited. The following qualitative sections are organized by major themes from the interviews and open-ended questions. Codes within themes are italicized for clarity.

**School personnel support for academics.** In the open-ended questions it was difficult to discern if students were writing about their EL teachers or their general content teachers unless
they specifically noted, however counselor Michelle addressed the reality for newcomer students when asked, “Which adults do you think spend the most time with refugee and immigrant students?” Counselor Michelle explained, in a newcomer program students may have four or five classes out of eight with an EL teacher, so the EL teachers become the students’ primary contact and support. The majority of the answers from students regarding teacher support referred to teachers and paraprofessionals helping students understand information. The following are typical comments referring to *EL teacher and EL paraprofessional* help from the open-ended survey questions. “They give me their notes and explain,” “EL teachers use pictures along with words,” “They try to make something sound easier by giving examples,” “They sit next to me and help me with reading and writing.” Almia pointed out the reason EL teachers were helpful stating, “The ELL teachers know my English and how we talk.” Faraji also addressed the support of EL teachers. “They [EL students] really like to have ELL Math class because Mr. Smith is, like, he's kind speaking really clearly and he's doing all that he can, all his best to make them understand.” Faraji also commented on the difference between his EL classes and that of general education classes, “All ELL classes I will do pretty well, but there's other class, Math, Biology, History, struggling a lot.”

Paraprofessionals were used at only one site. Counselor Michelle expressed concern of not having paraprofessionals, “It would be almost impossible for them [newcomers].” At site two, paraprofessionals took information from the general education teacher and provided notes, study guides and modified the format so students could understand the content. At the site where paraprofessionals were not used, Counselor Theo stated, “I think actually having assistants would be great for our kids. Having consistent assistants with educational training would be amazing for our kids in those [general education] classes.” The students who had
paraprofessionals assisting them also expressed how supportive they were, “Pretty much they [assistants] are doing really fantastic job, like in my Study Skills class, they are with some students who really doesn't understand much. So they really need help [to] finish all their assignments.”

All the student participants in the study had a newcomer counselor supporting them. Open-ended question number two asked, “What do counselors do to help you the most?” There were six negative responses of, “nothing” or “they don’t” (9%) and three neutral responses of “I don’t know,” (4%), which made up 13% of the total responses referring to counselors. Comparatively, all other responses in both the open-ended questions and interviews were 87% positive in nature. In the open-ended question referring to help counselors provided, scheduling classes was stated most frequently (33%) and helping with classes came in second (23%). In all eight student interviews, students made positive comments. Faraji stated the counselor should receive a grade, “Pretty much, she helping me. Not only me, all of us ELL students. She's our counselor and she's doing really fantastic job. She needs graded for it. Yea.” Mohamed made a more general comment regarding his newcomer counselor when asked what his counselor helped him with the most.

Like everything, like when I have bad grade, I go, like, right there, she talk to my teacher and my teacher talk to her and they give her, like, my homework if I miss any homework or something, and they...she give it to me and I will finish it or do it and give it back to the teacher, or if I do something wrong, like, I go to her like, "hey, I did that wrong, like what should I do", you know? She told me what she'd do.

The counselors listed a broader array of supports than did the students. When asked what type of support she provided as a newcomer counselor, Michelle explained,
Well...it's pretty eclectic, I guess. It's kind of whatever they need. They come to me with all kinds of interesting problems and requests and I just try to do what I can to help them. Some are very personal, some have to do with their family, some have to do with social problems with school, sometimes its religious things, you now...its academics, its lots of questions about colleges and how to get financial aid, things like that. Seniors are very interested in that kind of stuff. Yea, it's hard to...it's not a typical counseling job, it's a little bit different just because the kids...I think it's just that they feel a connection, like...you know, I'm the one person that they can go to for a lot of things and they feel comfortable with me, and so...they come with all kinds of questions I guess.

Specific academic supports listed by counselors included:

1. Preparing for college or career
2. Testing support
3. Parent-teacher conferences
4. Scheduling interpreters
5. Liaison between student and general education teacher

In addition to EL personnel, there were other school personnel who were mentioned by either the students or counselors as being supportive. Alima mentioned the librarian, “There is a lot of teachers help me with a lot of things, like the librarian. She's not my teacher, but she help people a lot” and Alima felt comfortable talking to the vice principals. Faraji explained what made the difference to him when it came to one of his general education classes.

And what makes me more excited was my teacher. He was so amazing, fantastic guy. …I think what made difference is I start learning how the English came from England to USA to start all the colony, all that stuff, and how they did fights with England and the
fights with French, all that stuff. I really like it. And actually what made me more excited is after what we were studying, we had to watch some video clips, so I really love them.

From that day, I love US History 10.

Faraji also praised his math teacher for taking extra time with him. “I got confused with American math, so I go to him and ask, ‘hey, can we again do, I didn't understand’ and he always say, just keep coming, if you don't understand, I'm here for you, just keep coming.”

There were, however, also negative comments regarding general education teachers. When Mohamed was asked, “So do your content teachers, the ones with the American kids, do they spend time with you? He simply said, “not really.” Counselors were more reluctant to make negative comments. They acknowledged how much extra work it was for the teachers to accommodate for the newcomer students. Counselor Theo explained, “Ninety percent [of students], I would say, don't have the math background to be in a high school level math, which means the teacher has to accommodate, or has to work extra for the kids to be able to catch up.”

Both sites had some sort of extended day or extended year program. These extended programs were seen as a way to gain extra English, get homework help, and gain credits for graduation. Fabricio explained that he used the afterschool program at his school when he needed to ask questions on content he did not understand and the after school teachers would take the time to explain. Mohamed was also a regular attendee at the afterschool program at his school. “Last year I used to stay after school, like every day. That’s helpful, like, to finish my homework, yea. Like, if I have tests I didn’t finish, I will finish it after school. Like afterschool, helpful a lot.”

In addition to afterschool programs, summer school was seen as a way to catch-up if students either failed a class or if they needed the credit to graduate. However, counselors saw
having summer school for all newcomers as a necessity beyond credit recovery. Counselor Theo discussed how extended year programs had changed in his district away from students having something to do during the summer by taking extra classes they were interested in and getting extra practice in English, to credit recovery or age based credit need. The credit recovery model was used in both districts in the study.

Extended support was not limited to students, rather support for families was seen as a necessity by school counselors. Counselor John explained, “At least once a year we would have the families in [so] each individual family had a chance to talk to myself and to go over where they were with an interpreter [present].” Counselor Kathy referenced support from the newcomer counselor and other teachers who accommodated parents at conferences.

At parent-teacher conferences, I know that each was invited and we had translators here all set up... So we probably had more newcomer parents here at parent teacher conferences than we’ve ever had since I’ve worked here. … we kind of had a system set-up because when they first walk in, the first people they talked to were the counselors and so we knew where Michelle was and where the translators were and so we, you know, talked with Counselor Michelle and had a system set up where we directed them and took them back to where Mr. Smith and counselor Michelle and the translators were and then they took them around to all their teachers. I think that was, it was very successful.

Newcomer counselors saw the importance of connecting with parents to build relationships. Counselor Michelle believed in “face-to-face get-togethers” and personal contact that she stated made the difference in their program’s family involvement, “It makes anybody feel good when someone sits down with you to explain something rather than sending a paper home”. The personal sharing of information was what Michelle believe made the families feel like they were
a part of the school, as well and a part of their child's education. Students also recognized the importance of staff having a relationship with their families. Mohamed explained, “When counselor Michelle comes to my house that helps a lot, because when they call my mom, she speaks little bit English, she can't understand anything. Counselor Michelle comes to my house and explains everything so they can understand.”

**Challenges to educational access and support needed.** Overall the students were appreciative of the support they received in their newcomer programs, but the students and counselors also acknowledged the difficulty of learning when the students had so many barriers to overcome. There were many challenges discussed by both the students and counselors in regards to academic challenges. The codes that emerged included:

1. Lack of English
2. Communicating Information/Translations
3. Money
4. Transportation
5. Age of Student
6. Types/Levels of Classes
7. School program Access
8. Gap in Education
9. Additional Family Obligations

Additional requests for *English* classes was mentioned 16 times in the open-ended questions and concern of the low English skills among students was discussed throughout the student interviews with 17 mentions and counselor interviews with nine comments. More general statements were like that of Fabricio, “there are so many words that I don't understand yet, you know?” Alima described what it was like when there were no other ELL students in the class. “I can't really understand the teacher if there is no people [other ELL students] with me, by myself with American people.” Her suggestion was, “Put someone with me in the class.”
also addressed her fear of being in classes by herself, “Everyone talking and I'm the only one sitting by myself, and especially with classes with no one with me, Arabic people, so yea, I feel really...scared.” Counselor Michelle spoke to the difficulty beyond the language, “They [newcomers] have a difficult time comprehending because it's not only the academic information, it's the cultural information, the social information, they're trying to put together this whole different way of learning and living.” Mohamed’s resilience was apparent throughout his interview, even with an obvious language barrier.

When teacher talking, I was like, "what? what? what? what?", 'cause I can't even understand anything 'cause, like, you know it's not my language first, and second, like, I was like, "what is he talking about?", you know? But I'll still learn, …Nothing, like, if you know English, you're gonna be fine.

For Faraji it was the American dialect, which made comprehension difficult. “When I came here, I had some English, which was like British accent, and when I got here, American English, oh, phew, I never understand anything. If you talking to me, I am deaf. I am deaf.”

Several students and counselors requested more translations. The need for translations was mentioned eight times between students and counselors. Asha was annoyed translations were only provided in some languages, “They [provide] Spanish, Japanese, they translate for them, but us, they was like, "Oh you guys, you can know that." Counselors were also concerned there weren’t enough translated documents to meet the needs of the students and parents. The counselors also expressed a disconnect in the translation delivery from the district and what was accessible for immigrant parents. Counselor John believed more translations needed to be sent home in paper format. “We would use, our website [which] would translate, … like how many folks had Internet access? Although more laborious, counselors saw translated documents sent
home in all the students’ languages as the best way to communicate information between school and home.

Opinions on access to sports and clubs seemed to be varied among students and counselors. The expense of sports was only mentioned once among the students, since the students assumed that programs would be made available to them if they couldn’t afford them. At site one counselor John referred to the accessibility of sports, “[It’s] never a barrier. Not even for, I mean, even for spirit packs and all that stuff. We had all that taken care of. We found a way to fund everything for those kids if they wanted to play.” Counselor Michelle had a different opinion in reference to the excessive expense of some sports, “A lot of the sports teams do have fundraisers, but even that...it's tough for kids to afford everything that goes along with playing a sport.” When asked what she thought would help, “It would be really cool if there was some sort of dedicated fund or something that, you know, we could access to help these kids to make sure that they were able to participate.”

It was not only the cost involved for sports and clubs, but also the transportation. Counselors spoke about students in clubs and sports going to activities that required somebody driving them to wherever they were going to meet. They explained most refugee and immigrant newcomers do not have a parent who can drive them to practice, or they do not have a car that they can drive themselves. Just getting to practice and getting to games, especially during the summer, where it was crucial to turn out was a major barrier for newcomers.

Cultural differences also played a part in whether students participated in sports. Almina spoke to the difference in the Iraqi culture for boys and girls. “I can't because my family, they probably say no because travel everywhere and not home, we are different. But maybe my brother, if you ask my brother, I think he will say yes, because he's a boy.”
The counselors and students also spoke to the difference in how sports were viewed in different cultures. Counselor Kathy spoke to the level of commitment and expense involved in high school sports.

I know that a lot of our immigrant kids play soccer. For the kids on this kind of varsity competitive type level, almost all of those kids play club soccer outside of school and if you don’t, you’re not going to be at a level where you can even play varsity soccer at a high school. And for them to have access to club soccer, you know, for those kids, I don’t know that they do or that they could afford it, you know. I know a lot of the general population kids can’t afford it.

For Faraji, accessing the system was a major barrier.

I can say, like last year, when I got here, I can't play soccer here because I had no English, I didn't know anything about school, this was my first year, I was new person, new here, and so I got here late, we had to register for school like during summer and they start practicing during summer. So I didn't do all of that, so when I got here, my first day of school in my gym class, I talk to my gym teacher and he said, "I'm not soccer coach, so I'll talk to the guy whose coaching soccer." And he did talk to him and then he said, "Your too late, so you can't play soccer for now, maybe next year, which is this year. And for this year, I really like to play it and I went downtown for physical exams and I did pass it, and couple times I went and practiced, but personally, I couldn't keep in playing because I had to work.

Although Faraji didn’t play, his brother attempted to, but couldn’t make all the required practices. “My brother did practice and he kind of played, but he missed some practice, which is
not [allowed], that is one of the requirements, but he did miss, like, two, three, four, so, which kept him out”

Clubs also seemed to have their challenges, partly due to misunderstandings of rigorous practice requirements and competition, but also due to the students’ past experience. Counselor John spoke to students who came to the U.S. with some previous musical experience, but couldn’t break into the band or orchestra due to the level of skill required and rigorous outside school time requirements. John’s suggestion was to make music accessible for all students who wanted to play a musical instrument and expressed how powerful it could be for refugee students in particular. However, the counselors were also aware that in the current school system, most refugee and immigrant students lacked the experience in highly competitive sports and clubs, which further highlighted the gap between American-born and newcomer students.

Counselor Theo discussed one of the most difficult challenges for students was their access to education prior to coming to the United States and of the level of education of their parents. The mere gap in education was often unclear to students and they had an unrealistic understanding of their own abilities.

A lot of [refugee] kids are thinking that they are college bound the whole time. And they go and try to take classes and they can't do it. And some of kids probably would not have been able to do it no matter what, because…I enrolled a kid who is twenty years old, last time he was in school was when he was twelve. So he doesn’t have an educational background, he’s [not] going to graduate …he’s going to age out before he graduates. And there’s about seven [students] right now in the program that won’t get a diploma. But some of them, I think, have this false perception of the U.S. educational system, because we do have those sheltered classes that are really easy for them.
Rajul wants to be a computer engineer, but is worried about high school graduation and how to access college. “I’m worried about graduation, if I do the graduation, I need to take the SAT test right? And I don’t know yet what kinds of questions they give me. I don’t know yet how do I go to college.”

All students interviewed were 18 or older and were quite aware they had limited time to graduate and that they may not make the deadline. Mohamed stated, “I want to graduate, like, really fast, you know. ’Cause, like, I feel like I'm old for high school. I'm almost twenty.” Counselors also expressed the urgency, but had a more realistic view that many students may not graduate before they age out. Other students knew they would age out before graduating. Abdul was already planning on night school. “Because I am twenty and next year I can’t come back to school because [I’ll be] twenty-one, I [will] go to night-school, I want [to learn] more.”

However, not all students have the time to attend extended day or year programs.

Many students in immigrant families have the added burden of providing income for the family while going to school. In the current study, it was the boys interviewed who had the extra responsibilities. Counselor John explained that often times the students were the main or only wage earner in the family and their English might be the best in their family, thus have the most access to employment. Faraji summed up his typical day. “I get out school, go home, I get ready to go to work, go to work, when I come back from work I just, I just try to finish if I have homework, yea, almost every day.” Family obligations weighed heavy on Mohamed.

Yea. Like, I like to play, but I don't want to because I don't have time, you know? Like I work every day. I work from five until two in the morning. I come to school, seven, seven-thirty. Like, I'm the only one who works. I work from five ’till two. I get to school,
really tired, you know? I just want to finish my classes and go back home and take shower, eat lunch, go to work.

Regardless of the long days with heavy responsibilities, Mohamed expressed the importance of education, “And I come to school every day. Yea. 'Cause, like, if I don't come to school, I won't graduate.”

Clear throughout the interviews was the strength of the students, their love for learning and their perseverance through numerous barriers. Counselor Michelle expressed the students’ resilience.

I guess I consider myself very fortunate to work with immigrant and refugee students because they are inspiring, they have come through some very difficult times in their lives and in their families, and they are...they're just so positive. Very positive, they have great outlooks, they have great work ethics, and they really, really want to learn and that's always exciting to be around. …I think, American high school kids concern themselves, or get wrapped up in, it's not the issue for refugee kids, they really like school, they really want to be here, their attendance is great, for the most part, and they try really, really, really hard.

Throughout the open-ended and interview questions, support from EL teachers and newcomer counselors proved to be very strong. General education and school support staff also played an important part in the students’ academic success. In the acculturation categories, students showed the strongest preference for integrating to their new host country ($M = 3.84$). With assimilation ($M = 2.54$) and separation ($M = 2.51$) somewhat neutral. The least preferred acculturation category was that of marginalization ($M = 1.98$). Most students preferred to be a part of the host country, rather than outside of the culture. Overall, the students’ perceptions of
school support were very high, as was their preference to integrate within the host country. These qualitative findings expand on the statistically significant results between questions in assimilation as explained earlier. Faraji summed up the majority of the students’ sentiment for school support, “Like, last year when I came here, I had no English at all. So I really need help and I truly got help.”

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

Quantitative. To examine research question two, Spearman Rho correlations were calculated between subgroups of acculturation and subgroups of emotional well-being. Table 21 shows the results of the correlation matrix. Correlations between each of the acculturation categories were discussed under research question 1. There were no significant correlations between acculturation categories and the subgroups representing emotional well-being: self-esteem and discrimination, but the direction of the relationship provided some insight. Not surprisingly self-esteem correlated positively to assimilation ($r_s = .090, p = .452$) and negatively to separation ($r_s = -.128, p = .285$) and discrimination ($r_s = -.006, p = .959$), but at very low levels. However unexpectedly, self-esteem correlated negatively to integration ($r_s = -.091, p = .448$) and positively to marginalization ($r_s = .013, p = .917$), although also at very low levels. These results would suggest there is a small possibility that students who have strong preferences to integration may not have strong self-esteem.
Table 21

*Spearman Correlations between Acculturation and Emotional Well-being Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assimilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Separation</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integration</td>
<td>-.274*</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marginalization</td>
<td>.320*</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>-.237*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discrimination</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *Correlation is significant at the .05 level.*

There were however, significant correlations at the question level between assimilation and emotional well-being (Table 22). Within the subcategories, “I prefer to have only American friends” correlated negatively to, “other kids outside of school treat me unfairly or negatively” ($r_s = -.318, p = .006$). And, “I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own” and “I prefer social activities that involve Americans only” correlated positively to, “I take a positive attitude to myself” ($r_s = .326 p = .005$) and ($r_s = .254, p = .031$) consecutively. The strongest correlation between the acculturation and emotional well-being questions was, “I prefer social activities that involve Americans only” to “I prefer to have only American friends” ($r_s = .483, p = .000$). These results would indicate those students who prefer to assimilate as far as friends and social activities may also have a strong self-image.
Table 22

*Correlations between Acculturation and Emotional Well-being Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I prefer to have only American friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I prefer social activities that involve Americans only.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Other kids outside of school treat me unfairly or negatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.318**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I take a positive attitude to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Correlation is significant at the .05 level. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

As with question number one, the students’ strong preference to integration and low interest in marginalization indicate their strong bicultural desires. In the student survey responses within emotional well-being, discrimination was shown to be low with a mean of 2.08, and self-esteem was shown above the mean at 3.36 on the 5-point Likert scale. With student groups organized by country, students preferred integration overall with no preference for marginalization as a separate category (Appendix BB).

Although there was evidence to support relationships between some acculturation questions and emotional well-being questions, the correlations at the subgroup level indicated no significant correlations, thus, accepting the null hypothesis that there was no direct relationship between perceived acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students.

In the following section, the qualitative data will be examined to determine how the open-ended questions and interview responses support the findings from the survey data.
Qualitative. Responses that give insight into emotional well-being were reported in all open-ended questions and most of the interview responses. The themes pulled from the questions relating to emotional well-being were, school personnel support for emotional well-being, students’ challenges to emotional well-being, and students’ emotional strength. Under all three emotional well-being themes, the following codes emerged (see Table 10):

1. Personal counseling services
2. School personnel advocacy
3. Caring relationships
4. Cultural misunderstanding
5. Lack of friends
6. Trauma and or health problems
7. Student Resilience

School personnel support for emotional well-being. Counselors helping with student problems or “generally everything” was mentioned by students 21 times (30%) in the open-ended question, “What do counselors do to help you the most?” Some of the survey responses in this area were, “They help talk through my problems,” “They tell me what’s wrong and what’s right and how I can fix it” and “They are always there for me when I need them.” Counselors discussed how their job was different from other counselors. As new arrivals, the students they worked with had many questions, fears and insecurities. The students’ acculturating to the U.S. and to school, in particular, required a great deal more time from counselors than that of American-born students. The counselors explained that students simply want to belong and feel comfortable among their peers. Counselor Michelle, “It's so tentative for them at first that they
really need that checking in and support and that knowing that everything's going to be okay. Other people have been through the same thing and it's going to be okay.”

Although all counselors spoke to needing more services for newcomer students, Kathy shared the reality of what it might be like if schools didn’t employ newcomer counselors. “I have four hundred and fifty kids, so I don’t spend enough time with any kid in this school. If you have students who have very special needs, they really get left out of the loop.” Kathy and the other counselors expressed the need to have newcomer counselors to meet the needs of the students. Counselor Kathy also expressed how much she and other counselors liked having the newcomer students in the school, but that the demands of counseling did not allow for high levels of support. “As far as all the specialized stuff that she [Counselor Michelle] does with them, I don’t know when we would do that.”

Advocacy for students was prevalent throughout the counselor interviews. Counselors expressed the need for the newcomer program, describing the newcomer classrooms as a home base for the students to go to and the program where staff could help students’ bridge cultures between immigrant and American students. Often the counselors’ advocacy took them beyond school hours and days. Counselor John stated, “If I knew kids wanted to play soccer, in the spring, we went to get them physicals for the upcoming year.” The counselors would also get other community members involved to help break down barriers to participation in school events. “One time we bussed them [students] down to the Diamond Center where Dr. Smith volunteered to do physicals”

Having a personal relationship with students was practiced both inside and outside the school setting. Counselor Michelle summed up the importance of a caring teacher relationship when supporting students. “Well...at a real basic level, they're [newcomers] the most comfortable
in a classroom where they sense genuine caring and support from the teacher.” It wasn’t only teachers, but students and counselors included, vice principals, the librarian, kitchen staff and the resource officer as staff who accepted and supported refugee and immigrant students.

**Challenges to students’ emotional well-being.** It was clear throughout both the counselor and student interviews that students had many emotional challenges unique to adapting to a new country. The desire to have American friends was clear with 92% of students in the survey wanting friends from both their own culture and American friends, but not all students found this easily realized. Mohamed stated, “I don't have friends, only, like, in ELL.” In the open-ended question, “What would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country with?” two students indicated they would like help with friends and nine students simply wanted someone to talk to, to be understood and for people to be open and welcoming.

The word “therapy” or descriptions of mental health-related issues only presented once in the student discussions when Farji discussed difficulties concentrating in class.

Couple times last year, happen to me. Like, last year, sometimes...I didn't study myself, like, try to lose my mind, try...I can say I tried to control myself. I, sometimes I couldn't think that much as I used to. So I had to like, stop and get out of class, go wash my face, like, try to work myself up. This happened to me a couple times, two, three times.

The counselors recognized symptoms of PTSD and other health related concerns that the students didn’t discuss. Counselor John recognized that the behavior of students was not always what it seemed to be. “Students who have been through multiple refugee camps, possibly have some post-traumatic stress disorder, which can look like ADHD or can look a lot of different ways. [Students] have a harder time concentrating.” Counselors mentioned trauma and emotional
well-being issues 11 times in the interviews. Theo spoke to the need for school-based therapy and the difficulty of providing therapy within a school setting.

I think we could do a lot more extensive therapeutic work with our kids. I wish I had the time, or the means to really do it. Having access to an interpreter and an hour for a kid to talk to them, a lot of our kids could really use it. A lot of them have trauma, and we can refer them out and have Medicaid give access to it, but it's a lot harder for them and it brings in that stigma of 'I'm seeing a counselor' which a lot of cultures, especially in this population, don't want to do. I think if we have service within the school, then it's a lot more accessible to them. Because I have a lot of kids come to me and just want to talk. I don't have a solid time to have those serious conversations, [since] my door is always open and it's not as private of a setting to deal with trauma and all the stuff that they're going through.

Counselor John spoke of the need for knowing more of the students’ emotional needs upon arrival at school. “I feel like our information is sometimes really limited. I go through the background with them, but it was always really hard to know how much they were holding back.” There was a need for the counselors to know more of the students’ trauma background, but they expressed limitations in both time and clinical expertise. Counselor John would have liked to have conducted psychological assessments upon arrival. “I would love them [newcomers] to have some baselines, maybe the BASC is too big, but something like that. Something that would hit all the areas of a general behavior, emotional rating scale.”

Counselors were aware of student migration experiences and realized the difficulties the refugee and immigrant students faced had serious emotional side effects. Counselor Kathy spoke to many students who came out of refugee camps in their countries that had been there for a
decade before ever coming to the United States. She was also concerned that some of them had seen things that she hoped that nobody had to ever see.

It was clear in the discussions with counselors that the issue of emotional well-being was complex and needed more support to discern between various mental health issues. Counselor John explained,

We dealt with a lot of trauma [with] PTSD in kids, which would manifest [as] depression. I think some was expectations were pretty high with what it was going to be like when you came to America. And when you get to the reality of what it was going to take, that can be tough. And then there was the traditional stuff, missing home, missing family, adjusting to other students, other cultures.

**Students’ emotional well-being strengths.** Despite emotional challenges, counselors reported most students had the resilience to come to school every day and work through the cultural differences between their own culture and that of their new American host country. Despite Rajul knowing he would age out before graduating high school, he was determined to learn, “I want to be smart, and I want to learn. I want to be good English speaker. What I don’t understand, this is very hard, and that’s why I want to learn more.” Rajul’s desire to learn English and learn as much as he could was the common sentiment among students wanting to become bicultural and integrate within American society.

Although integration was a clear preference among students, it was unclear whether integration was practiced throughout the school, or if it was merely a preference. The counselors in the study commented on the importance of integration and finding ways for immigrant and native-born students to interact. They expressed the need to make more of an effort to integrate students into school culture through athletics, clubs, and activities. Counselors felt the students
who had the most success in school were those able to branch out into other aspects of high school life. Counselor Michelle shared, “Refugee and immigrant kids see American kids as very different and kind of intimidating.” Counselors also tried to make students aware that clubs were a way to learn more about things students might be interested in and be a way to meet people that they might have something in common with. Counselor Michelle wanted students “to take that chance and step out and try something new,” but students did not have a clear understanding of the purpose and had little interest in learning more.

Many of the responses from the students fell under the assimilation category. Students had a strong desire to master English and wanted to associate with American friends and activities. The responses from both counselors and students may indicate there were many assimilation practices in the school even though the student preference was integration.

In the analysis of the data collected to answer question two, there was a clear student preference for integrating within schools and strong perceptions of emotional well-being among the students with reports of high degrees of self-esteem, and low levels of discrimination. Overall, the students preferred to be bicultural and had strong perceptions of emotional well-being. There was considerable difference in the responses from counselors on the students’ emotional well-being, with counselors reporting concern for lack of integration within schools and students dealing with multiple emotional health issues. With opposite perceptions from the observer, and those being observed, a clear relationship between acculturation categories and emotional well-being cannot be determined.

**Research Question 3**

What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?
Quantitative. To examine research question three, Spearman correlations were calculated between subgroups of discrimination, self-esteem and school personnel and program support (Table 23). Although discrimination correlated negatively against self-esteem and school personnel and program support, and school personnel and program support correlated positively with self-esteem as expected, none of the subcategories indicated statistical significance. The correlations at the subgroup level indicated no significant correlations, thus, accepting the null hypothesis that there was no direct relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Personnel and Program Support</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following section, the qualitative data will be examined to determine how the open-ended questions and interview responses relate to findings from the survey data. The data analyzed for question three will focus mainly on the frequency of survey responses from school personnel and program questions and the students’ overall resilience. Additionally, perceptions of the students’ own challenges to emotional well-being will be discussed.

Qualitative. Participants’ narratives revealed students and counselors had multiple positive comments on school support, especially within the academic areas. Students made 18 references to EL teachers or paraprofessional as being helpful, 15 comments on support from
counselors, and 13 mentions regarding help from general education teachers or other staff members, making support from staff 33% of their comments. Notably, there were half as many counselors interviewed than students, but similar to the student comments, counselors referred to EL teacher or paraprofessional help 11 times, counseling services for academics 8 times, and general support from other school staff 10 times, supporting a conclusion that students and counselors were in agreement that students had strong school support from staff.

For program support, only extended day and extended year programs were mentioned by students (10 times). Students had two comments on family support, with Mohamed mentioning a home visit by counselor Michelle and Fabricio mentioning teachers sometimes phone parents. Counselors discussed family support in more detail than did the students. An additional service mentioned by counselors was providing translations. Student responses to sports and clubs reflected cultural difference. Two students stated they weren’t interested in sports, three students were working and had no time, and one female student stated her family would not allow her to participate in sports, although if she could choose, she would like to play volleyball. From the student perspective, there was very little interest in clubs. Five students stated they were not interested and two students indicated some interest in music.

Although students provided evidence they were well supported in school, multiple challenges accessing education and some emotional well-being concerns surfaced. Lack of English was reported most frequently between the two interview groups, with 17 responses from students and nine responses from counselors (see Table 10). Being able to understand information was of concern for students (6 times) and counselors (9 times). There was some concern for sports and club expenses from counselors (5 mentions), as opposed to students (1 time), but Counselor Theo also spoke of students and families not having a clear understanding
of how services were paid for. Theo explained students often couldn’t afford to get “stuff” or buy
“stuff,” so were not used to having it. Counselors also expressed once students began to
understand the school system the students believed they could just go to their counselor and ask
and they would get it for free.

There was also a difference in perception for transportation. Students only mentioned
transportation issues twice, but counselors seemed to deal with transportation for students more
regularly. Both newcomer sites covered geographically large areas and counselors had to help
students understand their responsibility to get themselves to sport and club practices. Counselor
John explained that the students came from all over the Valley, so if they wanted to play soccer
and they lived in another part of town they would have to find a way to get home and
transportation was the biggest issue.

There was disconnect between students and counselors in the perceptions of gaps in
education. Students had low levels of concern (3 times) and were not as aware of the educational
gap as were their counselors. Counselors mentioned inappropriate level of classes (10 times) and
concern with significant gap in education (13 times).

There was also contrast in the responses that came under the theme of emotional well-
being. Counselors mentioned personal counseling services (8 times), staff advocacy (9 times),
and caring relationships (5 times) as support, whereas students did not mention any of these
services. Notably, students lacked advanced English skills that would distinguish academic
support from more relational support and any comments from the students on teachers or
counselors were placed into the academic category, due to a general or academic reference. In
addition, students had limited concern over cultural background (3 times) and friends (2 times),
and only one mention of a health problem. Whereas counselors mentioned cultural background
being an issue 9 times and trauma or other emotional health concerns 11 times. None of the students seemed concerned when asked, “Do you know who to go to if you were treated unfairly” and were able to articulate whom they would go to if they were ever threatened or bullied. The staff students mentioned included, EL teachers, EL counselors, vice-principals, school resource officer, and principal. Although no student indicated concern for bullying, one student thought the color of his skin might be an issue when asked if there might be anything that might make joining a sports team difficult. Faraji “No, I don't think...maybe my color, but I'm not sure about it, because I'm Black. Yea, with White student, maybe, but...I don't [know].”

The qualitative data mirrored the quantitative data in many areas in that students perceived they were well supported from school personnel and reported high levels of support from teachers, counselors and other staff members. However, emotional well-being was reported differently by participant groups. Students made only a few comments regarding emotional health, while all four counselors had significant concerns of PTSD and other mental health issues among the students. This positive outlook by students may have to do with the students’ resilience reported by counselors during interviews. There is also the possibility with the average time in the country for the student participants being less than two years, their positive attitude may be due to the time variances between trauma experience and trauma manifestation, as was discussed in Chapter II. There is also the chance that the results may simply be due to the fact that emotional well-being questions are quite personal and not students typically would discuss with a stranger.

**Summary of the Results**

A broad picture of acculturation categories emerged from running statistical means analysis. There was some evidence of Berry’s four acculturation categories, however integration
was the preferred category for 94% of students. Both assimilation and segregation were recorded as a preference for two students and a combination of marginalization and assimilation was preferred for one student. There were two students having no preference, leaving all three additional categories sharing the remaining 6%. This imbalance in acculturation categories provides stronger evidence of one large integration category, rather than all four.

Among the acculturation subgroups, correlations paralleled Berry’s theory, with integration correlating negatively to marginalization and separation and positively with assimilation. Spearman’s Rho correlations at the subgroup level between acculturation categories, school personnel and program support and emotional well-being, indicated no statistical significance. However, individual questions within those subgroups did indicate significant correlations. The relationship of the correlations added to the understanding of the study. The question-to-question statistically significant correlations included:

1. “I prefer to only have American friends” correlated negatively to “other kids outside of school” treating the student unfairly or negatively \( (r_s = -.318, p = .006) \).
2. “I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own”
   a. Correlated negatively \( (r_s = -.276, p = .019) \) to “My teachers help me with my classroom assignments.”
   b. Correlated positively \( (r_s = .326, p = .005) \) to “I take a positive attitude to myself.”
3. “It is more important to me to be fluent in English than my own language” correlated positively to,
   a. “The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone outside of school.” \( (r_s = .268, p = .025) \)
4. “I prefer social activities that involve Americans only” correlated positively to “I take a positive attitude to myself” ($r_s = .254, p = .031$)

The qualitative data added additional understanding to the research findings. With the first research question, “What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?” there were mixed results for acculturation categories with a high emphasis on English acquisition, which fits strongly in the assimilation category and weak support for joining sports and clubs, which fits into the separation category. In addition, interviews’ indicated students were well supported by teachers, counselors and other school staff, but students and counselors both expressed multiple challenges to students adapting within schools.

The second research question, “What is the relationship between acculturation categories and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?” also had mixed results. Students had a clear preference for integrating in their host society and reported very little concern with emotional well-being. From the student perspective, one could conclude integration related positively to emotional well-being. However, counselors reported their work with immigrant students dealt with high degrees of trauma and stress, which the counselors saw as being under diagnosed. The research data collected to answer question two regarding the relationship between acculturation and emotional well-being was inconclusive.

Clear conclusions for the third research question, “What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and
immigrant students? was also problematic. Again, perspectives of school support was strong from both students and counselors, however, the conflicting reports from students and counselors for students’ emotional well-being led to inconclusive results.

Triangulating the results of the study brought out unexpected findings from both the quantitative and qualitative data. Although students reported a preference for integrating, the survey data and the interview results indicated that students were more likely to be assimilated than integrated. There were weak correlations between the acculturation categories and the subgroups discrimination, self-esteem, and school support, but positive correlations on the question level within each of the above subgroups. In addition, counselors reported concerns that there wasn’t more of an effort to integrate students within high schools and students reported that the most important acquisition was that of English.

In the final Chapter of this current study, the key findings will be discussed and interpreted and the limitations of the study will be expanded from Chapter III. In addition, recommendations for future studies and implications for school practitioners who work with newcomer immigrant youth within a school setting will be presented.
Chapter V

Discussion

Introduction

This study focused on refugee and immigrant students within secondary newcomer programs, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between immigrant youth acculturation, the support they receive in school, and the effects on students’ emotional well-being. Three questions drove this current study:

1. What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?
2. What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?
3. What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

The general theoretical literature connecting student acculturation and the relationship between school support and emotional well-being is limited and inconclusive. This study was designed to add to research on immigrant youth through the quantitative and qualitative data collected within two newcomer centers in adjoining suburban school districts in the Western United States. Although there is evidence newcomer centers provide additional support to newly arrived immigrant youth (Custodio, 2011; Short & Boyson, 2004, 2012), newcomer centers across the country are being dissolved due to funding and political reasons (Harvard Law Review, 2007; Short & Boyson, 2012). For many of the programs still in existence, there has been a shift to rural and suburban areas in non-traditional immigrant states (Short & Boyson, 2012). This study is included in the shift to non-traditional immigrant states. In the two
participating districts, diversity has been steadily growing similar to the growth across the country over the last decade. The rise of student newcomers in the studied districts influenced the two adjoining school districts to invest in newcomer programs and place the programs within high schools staffed with newcomer counselors and specially trained professionals to work with the new arrivals.

The student participants in the study represented Iraq, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Vietnam, Mexico as well as other countries from around the world, for a total of 21 countries in all. The student sample was representative of current refugee and immigrant youth populations across the country (U.S. Department of State [USDS], 2014), which helped test the theoretical framework of Berry’s acculturation categories and the study’s research questions surrounding school support and emotional well-being.

In addition to the 75 immigrant students who participated in the survey, the researcher added semi-structured interviews with eight newcomer students and four counselors working with refugee and immigrant students to add depth to the study. Aligning both sets of interview questions allowed the researcher to conduct a comparative analysis of both students and counselors’ perceptions around school support and emotional well-being. In addition, the mixed methods approach helped the researcher to explore complex issues around student acculturation. With the quantitative data, surveys provided broad understandings of students’ preferred acculturation categories, their perceptions of their own mental well-being and how they perceived being supported in school. The additional semi-structured interviews either verified the perceptions of the students, or allowed for a more complex picture of acculturation to emerge.

In this final chapter, a discussion and interpretation of the study, limitations of the research, recommendations for future studies, and implications for government agencies,
secondary school practitioners, high school counselors, and students and their families are presented. Interpretation of the study’s results is discussed and synthesized through the major research topics: acculturation, school support and emotional well-being and the specific research questions.

**Interpretation of Results**

The first research question, “What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?” was first answered by analyzing student responses to preferred acculturation categories.

**Categories of acculturation.** This current study replicated the analysis of acculturation categories to Berry’s theory (Berry et al., 2006) by examining both group and individual responses. Initially, the means for the students’ acculturation preferences were determined for all participants and then for country of origin. The mean provided a quick look into the students’ overall and group preferences, but due to many countries having only one or a small number of members, comparative analysis was only examined for the two largest country groups, Iraq and DCR. Examining the mean among all student acculturation category responses on the Likert 5-point scale, integration was most preferred ($M = 3.84$). Looking at the two largest country groups, DRC ($N = 13$) and Iraq ($N = 21$), the results were nearly identical with both groups having a mean of 1.99 for marginalization and 2.49 for separation. There was only .01 difference for assimilation with DRC being 2.54 and Iraq 2.53 and both student groups preferring integration, DRC $M = 3.83$ and Iraqi $M = 3.50$. Due to the fact that these two groups of students come from areas that are geographically and culturally very distant speaks to the international preference for the integration category.
To further examine whether the current study supported Berry’s theoretical framework at the group level, Spearman’s Rho correlations were conducted between acculturation categories. Correlations performed as expected with Marginalization correlating negatively with assimilation ($r_s = -.320, p = .006$) and integration ($r_s = -.237, p = .044$), and positively with separation ($r_s = .364, p = .002$). Results also showed integration correlating positively with assimilation ($r_s = .274, p = .019$). These results were somewhat problematic due to Cohen’s alphas being below the .70 acceptable levels for all but the Assimilation category, indicating poor reliability. Nevertheless, the choices by the students indicated those who chose to be assimilated within the host country did not feel marginalized, but did feel separated from the host culture. In addition, students who preferred to be integrated into the host country were also accepting of assimilation.

**Integration versus separation.** The nearly identical acculturation preferences between DRC and Iraq, which are geographically, culturally and ethnically distant, adds to previous research that the majority of immigrants from all parts of the world prefer to integrate within their new societies (Berry et al., 2006; Chia & Costigan, 2006; Coatsworth et al., 2005; Schwartz and Zamboanga, 2008).

At the individual level, 85% of student participants preferred integrating and another 9% preferred a combination of either integration and separation or integration and assimilation. Also, at the question level 94% of students agreed it was important to be fluent in both English and their native language and 92% of students preferred to have friends in both cultures. Demographically there was no significant difference in responses due to gender, countries of origin, or ages. The overwhelming preference to integration points towards students wanting to share both their native heritage and that of their host country.
Although integration was highly preferred, some students expressed the need for friends and wanting schools to be open and welcoming. Other students, as in Mohamed’s case, expressed they only had EL friends and no American friends. Counselors also believed schools could do a much better job integrating students into school settings. These responses suggest that there still remains separation in schools, which was not an acculturation preference for students.

There is solid evidence that a sense of belonging supports well-being in newcomer centers (Roxas, 2011). Although there were some students who felt separated from the general population, many students in the newcomer centers felt they were welcomed. Faraji expressed it best, “I have a lot of friends, we hang out, talk, have fun, yea. So pretty much I talk to everyone here.”

**Assimilation.** Responses to questions under the assimilation category indicated what is preferred is not always realized. Overwhelmingly, the need for strong English skills was reported. In the open-ended questions, 8% of the responses from students requested additional English instruction and English being what the teachers helped the most with was mentioned 20% of the time. In interviews, students mentioned importance of English in 23% of their comments. As stated earlier, in the survey data 94% of students said it was important to be fluent in both their native language and English. However, when deciding whether it was more important to be fluent in English than their native language there was a preference for English by 17%. Counselors also agreed English was a strong barrier for students. Counselor Michelle summed up the students’ struggles in class, “Their language is a challenge since they have very limited English. Some [students] have more than others, but typically if they're beginners or advanced beginners, they do have trouble comprehending what is going on in the classroom.”

The results of the study indicate that although English is being provided to students, extended
day and extended year programs are needed in order for students to catch up and increase their chances of being successful post high school. A plethora of current literature supports the need for newcomers to have intensive instruction in English if newcomer students are going to close the gap in their education (Custodio, 2011; Mercuri et al., 2010; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Gaytan et al., 2010).

**Marginalization.** Marginalization received only one response stating the student did not want friends from either culture or to attend activities with either culture. In addition, only four students agreed neither English nor native language was important. The highest number of students agreeing to any one question under marginalization were 15 students who felt it was not important to maintain either American or native traditions. This could have a number of interpretations including students not seeing the importance of maintaining any type of tradition. No student fell within the marginalization category either by group or individually. This finding suggests friends, family, traditions, and language are a shared experience all the students want to participate in. As with other studies (Chia & Costigan, 2006; Coatsworth et al., 2005; Phinney et al., 2001), marginalization demonstrated to be preferred least among students. The lack of reported marginalization may suggest staff and programs supporting newcomers are desirable to the extent that no student wishes to be marginalized by school or home cultures.

For the current study, there was an overwhelming preference for integration with 94% of students preferring to integrate or preferring a combination of integration and separation or integration and assimilation. Only one student (1.3%) preferred separation and one student (1.3%) preferred assimilation and marginalization. In addition, two students were neutral in their responses, not favoring any category. It’s possible these students didn’t have opinions in any one direction or they simply chose randomly, rather than purposefully. For the student who selected
assimilation and marginalization equally, random selection is also likely since these two categories are polar opposites. Following this line of reason, three surveys indicated unpurposeful selection. These results give strong evidence of the students’ desire to be bicultural. The results also suggest one large acculturation cluster, rather than defined clusters of all four acculturation categories.

**School support.** Generally, students in the study felt supported by teachers with 72% of students agreeing teachers helped them with their class assignments but somewhat neutral towards administration with 51% feeling they could talk to their principal or vice-principal if they needed to. The open-ended questions had favorable comments towards teachers with 20% of comments referring to teachers helping students understand assignments and 17% mentioning teachers helped them with homework. Interview responses were also positive toward EL teachers, with all students and counselors stating EL teachers and paraprofessionals were the students’ main academic support. In addition to EL teachers, general education and support staff received approving comments.

School programs referring to sports and clubs had mixed results. Over 50% of student survey data indicated students felt welcome to join sport teams and clubs, but during interviews the students were, for the most part, uninterested in extracurricular activities. There was a variety of reasons for the students’ lack of interest including, joining not being allowed by family, no time, unaware of programs, or work related responses. For most of the boys, providing income for the family was a necessity, taking them out of any extra activities altogether.

There could be multiple interpretations of the students’ responses to program support. First, there is clearly a cultural difference that places the extracurricular experience somewhere outside of school and in unfamiliar territory for students. In addition, students had strong desires
to graduate high school, which was already taking extra time and effort. Extracurricular activities were seen as unnecessary and getting in the way of graduation. Counselors, however, had contrary responses. Counselors felt if the students joined clubs where there were American-born students, it would increase the immigrant students’ sense of belonging. Additional studies will need to be conducted to discern desired participation from barriers to participation.

Counselors were seen as a lifeline for many of the students. In the survey data, 64% of students knew how to find a counselor when they needed one and 59% of students had counselors help them find services outside of school. In addition, all students in the interviews discussed counselor support being very helpful. Not all the students had high levels of English to express the support counselors provided, however the general comments from “everything,” to “she should win an award” demonstrated the sentiment the students had toward their counselors. The two counselors not in current newcomer counselor positions expressed the importance of specially assigned counselors to meet the multiple needs of newcomers, since the student load of general education counselors would not allow for such service.

Current literature on counseling for immigrant students suggest counselors need to go beyond traditional duties, in order to build relationships with students and provide academic, emotional and social supports that maintain cultural traditions and languages (Birman, 2005; Gaytan et al., 2007; Lockwood, 2010; Orozco, 2007).

The role of acculturation in school supports. For 85% of student participants, there was a clear preference for the integration category. However, the integration subgroup questions demonstrated low interreliability and thus put in doubt whether the subgroup results should be considered. Unlike integration, assimilation demonstrated good internal consistency and was further examined on the question level. Correlating assimilation and school support, there were
three significant findings. The questions correlating positively were, “It is more important to me to be fluent in English than my own language” to “The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone outside of school” ($r_s = .268, p = .025$), “I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to” ($r_s = .335, p = .005$), and “I feel welcome to join clubs and after school activities” ($r_s = .312, p = .010$). These results suggest at least some school support confirms assimilating, rather than integrating. When digging deeper into the qualitative portions of the study, some answers to the open-ended and interview questions provided additional connection between assimilation and school support. The most telling may be the numerous comments from both the open-ended and interview questions indicating the students felt well supported by their teachers, counselors, and other school staff.

Overall, the results from the survey data provided little evidence of correlation between acculturation categories and school support. Conversely, many of the individual responses from open-ended questions and interviews indicated strong school personnel support and preference for integration and assimilation. These mixed-results may suggest there is a difference between integration preference and lived realities within schools. It is also clear that acculturation, as Berry contends, is not tightly defined (Berry, 2005) and further studies between acculturation and school support may be needed before conclusive statements can be made.

**Emotional well-being.** The second research question, “What is the relationship between categories of acculturation attitudes and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?” was again explored at the subgroup and individual question level. The results from the self-esteem subgroup questions suggest very high self-perception among the students, with 79% taking a positive attitude toward themselves. In addition, Spearman’s Rho correlations indicated self-esteem correlated negatively to discrimination ($r_s = -.055$) and
positively to school personnel and program supports ($r_s = .077$). Although the analysis did not show significance at the $p < .05$ level, it did indicate direction pointing toward support.

In the discrimination subsection, there was very little perceived discrimination reported from the student survey. Less than 5% of students believed their teachers treated them unfairly and only 12% felt other students treated them unfairly. Correlations between discrimination and acculturation categories indicated negative correlations between assimilation ($r_s = -.006$) and integration ($r_s = -.099$) and positive correlation to separation ($r_s = .156$) and marginalization ($r_s = .013$), but not at significant levels ($p < .05$). The direction of perceived discrimination with the acculturation categories indicates low levels of discrimination favor assimilation and integration. These results support the work of Kia-Keating and Ellis indicating support and a sense of belonging leads to stronger mental health (2007).

From the students’ perspective, very little was mentioned in the category of discrimination, with the exception of Faraji mentioning his color might prevent him from being in clubs or sports. The limitations of the study did not allow for further exploration of this concern and as such, it was undetermined if racial issues were more prevalent than reported in the interview or if this was one student’s perspective.

Though not reported by students, all counselors discussed concerns of emotional well-being and the need to assess students’ mental health. Themes pulled from questions relating to emotional well-being were, school personnel support for emotional well-being, students’ challenges to emotional well-being, and students’ emotional strength. In the area of personnel support, the activities of support were easy to determine. Counselors listed a number of services provided to students by counselors and other staff. These extra supports fell under personal counseling services, personal advocacy, and caring relationships. Assessing and intervening in
mental health issues was much more problematic. The counselors discussed the time and resources to deal with mental health concerns would be challenging. Although the counselors dealt with many emotional well-being concerns among students in private settings, most of the students were unwilling or unable to portray a depressive or negative outward appearance. Some studies have determined depressive symptoms are less frequent among refugee children (Heptinstall et al., 2004). Nonetheless, counselors in the study were conscientious that there was much more to be done in the area of emotional health for newcomers and school-based services would be a good first step in healing pre-migratory emotional wounds.

**The role of acculturation in emotional well-being.** There was some correlation between the subgroups separation and assimilation and emotional well-being on the individual question level. “I prefer to have only American friends” correlated negatively to, “other kids outside of school treat me unfairly or negatively” \( r_s = -.318, p = .006 \). And, “I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own” and “I prefer social activities that involve Americans only” correlated positively to, “I take a positive attitude to myself” \( r_s = .326, p = .005 \) and \( r_s = .254, p = .031 \), respectively. Contrary to some previous studies (Chia & Costigan, 2006; Coatsworth et al., 2005; Phinney et al., 2001), these findings suggest some students who choose to assimilate may also have a strong sense of self-esteem. It may also mean the students strong desire to “fit in” and portray a positive outward appearance influenced the responses in both the assimilation and self-esteem subsections.

As with the first research question, in the second research question there were significant correlations at the individual question level, but no conclusive results supporting relationships between acculturation and emotional well-being at the subgroup level. These mixed results between questions and subgroups leave many unanswered questions. Broader psychometric
measurements and more directed interview questions may be needed in order to separate acculturation preferences from the students’ lived realities.

**School support and emotional well-being.** The final question, “What is the relationship between perceived school support and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?” is answered by providing an overview of the survey information and sharing qualitative data responses from students and counselors.

In the survey results, students reported strong levels of self-esteem and low degrees of discrimination. In addition, Spearman Rho analysis correlated discrimination negatively against self-esteem and school personnel and program support. These results were as expected, however none of the results in the subcategories indicated significance at the $p < .05$ level. Nonetheless, students overwhelmingly reported “positive attitudes” and “having the important things in life.”

Data from the open-ended and interview questions from students and counselors provided strong evidence for school personnel support. There was however, a clear difference between participants’ views on student’s emotional well-being and counselors’ views. The majority of the students reported no emotional well-being concerns, whereas the counselors had significant concerns. Although the mixed results do not allow for a clear determination of the relationship between school support and emotional well-being, there was evidence in both the quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating students felt well supported by school personnel. This finding indicated the supportive nature of newcomer centers but did not answer the disparity between the students and counselors perceptions of the students’ emotional well-being.

**Conclusions**

The current study indicates students have a preference for the way in which they acculturate. Students overwhelmingly prefer being bicultural and integrating within schools. The
multiple studies conducted previous to this study support the finding of integration as a preferred acculturation choice among immigrant students (Coatsworth et al., 2005; Phinney et al., 2001; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2010). The complex undertaking of assessing acculturation as been long debated (Chia & Costigan, 2006; Cohen, 2010; Rudmin, 2009; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2010) and current research is recognizing acculturation instruments need to be based on broader measures in order to accurately determine various dimensions of acculturation (Celenk & Van de Vijver, 2011). Berry’s decades of work in the acculturation field has provided additional understandings of the acculturation process, but the researcher and other psychologists have yet to develop an instrument that accurately measures the complex process of acculturation. It is the opinion of this researcher that the categories of acculturation do exist and students do make choices to live within their native culture or host culture in various degrees. This current study was able to detect some preference in all four acculturation categories at the sub level, but only one acculturation category preferred overall.

While the data in the current study indicated integration was preferred, it may have not always been realized. A strong desire for English even over the student’s own native language and the practices of English only instruction in the newcomer programs may have led to more assimilation than integration practices. As stated throughout this study, the need for strong English skills in order to be successful academically and socially in the host country may have driven student responses. In addition, there were indications of separation practices as well, with some students testifying they only had EL friends and most reporting not participating in any extracurricular activities provided by the schools. For many of the students the time and effort to participate in extracurricular programs took away from the time they needed to study or work.
The cultural disconnect to school sports and clubs was also a determining factor in choosing not to participate.

Though there were areas of improvement specified by both students and counselors, the high school newcomer centers proved to be strong support for secondary refugee and immigrant students. Students described the strongest backing from their EL teachers, newcomer counselors, and EL paraprofessionals. While students would like additional English classes, they expressed when they needed help they received help. Most of the students’ challenges came within the general education classes due to the level, and gap in students’ education and language skills. These challenges verify other newcomer research stressing the importance of supporting students’ literacy and adaptation to U.S. schools (Custodio, 2011; Freeman & Freeman, 2002).

While counselors within the centers felt students needed more mental health services, the counselors were able to provide emotional support beyond that of teachers and even general education counselors. Although students mentioned counselor support being mostly academic or generalized the support into “everything,” counselors mentioned a long list of additional supports which they provided including emotional supports through personal counseling, advocacy, developing caring relationships, and providing services outside of school time. In much of the literature, counselors were seen as necessary support for newcomer students who are often overlooked due to appearing to function adequately (Heptinstall et al., 2004). Participants in trauma therapy in previous studies have reported they portray a positive outside to hide internal feelings in avoidance to being judged and to help increase their own positive feelings (Fazel & Stein, 2002 as cited in Sutton et al., 2006). Many of the students in this study seemed to fit this profile as the disconnection in student and counselor responses appeared to determine. The concern from the counselors and this researcher is the enduring nature of mental health issues
and the possibility of psychological symptoms and disorders that may still be hidden even years after the students experienced traumatic events (Ehntholt & Yule, 2006). Although effects of childhood exposure to traumatic events vary, there is a concern that students’ positive responses are a self-protection mechanism shielding them from emotional harm, but not portraying the nature of their true emotional well-being. By leaving this area of health unexplored it is unknown how students’ trauma might manifest in years to come.

The issues surrounding emotional well-being are not easily assessed, however counselors have the opportunity to function as screeners of possible mental health issues and help establish interventions and outside clinical support for students who may confide in counselors in more personal settings. Refugee and immigrant students’ resilience should also be emphasized. Students in this study were determined to attend and complete school no matter the obstacles and demonstrated outward emotional strength despite traumatic pre-migratory experiences.

The newcomer programs’ protective factors and the students’ emotional strength was unexpected by the researcher. Through the study it was clear that early intervention of newcomer support not only strengthened academics, but the students’ self-esteem. These results add empirical evidence of the supportive nature of newcomer centers and the importance of establishing and maintaining newcomer programs in order to meet the needs of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students.

**Recommendation for Future Research**

This study built on previous youth acculturation research and provided additional understanding on the complexities of acculturation within school settings for secondary refugee and immigrant students. While there were contributory aspects from the research, the study also left a lot of unanswered questions. To begin, the study was conducted at two, well-staffed
newcomer centers, which were supported by counselors with training in multicultural studies. Clearly, there is a need to conduct an experimental model at school sites without newcomer programs to further examine students’ acculturation within multiple school sites. This experimental model would allow for comparative analysis between districts with and without newcomer centers.

Furthermore, the students’ time in the country may have limited their responses on both the survey and interview questions. Using a sample of refugee and immigrant youth from early language skills to students and graduates who have mastered the English language would provide more in-depth answers to interview questions and allow the students themselves to make additional recommendations. Also, additional time in the country may provide evidence of student trauma or other mental health concerns that were not realized in this study.

The acculturation survey also had its limitations. First, the survey is a perception survey and thus subjective. It was evident through the interviews that counselors’ experiences were different from the students themselves were reporting. Observations of students within school settings would provide a third party, objective view of students’ actualities. There were also concerns with the acculturation survey’s internal consistency, which proved to have low Cronbach alphas in all but the assimilation category. Using an acculturation survey with strong reliability may have shown different results. It is also suggested that a combination of acculturation surveys may allow for additional insight into patterns of student acculturation.

The scope to which emotional well-being can be explored is limitless. The emotional well-being questions used in the current study only allow for surface level understanding of students’ emotional well-being and not how students deal with emotional issues at the psychoanalytical level. Assessing adolescents with instruments that accurately measure the
strength of mental health may need to be left to highly trained specialists, but clearly counselors could play an important role in identifying symptoms and making connections to services. Additionally, future surveys assessing immigrant youth could include psychological and behavior problem questions to allow for deeper understanding of students emotional well-being without involving deep psychoanalysis.

Finally, the theoretical model used in this study could be expanded to include other research-based models. Although this study provided evidence of integration as a preferred acculturation category, the researcher’s experience working with students in school settings may have influenced the decision to use Berry’s four-acculturation category model. Using additional acculturation theories and looking for patterns of acculturation using Latent and Confirmatory cluster analysis may provide stronger evidence of various acculturation clusters.

**Implications for Professional Practice**

As government agencies decide how best to spend diminishing public funds, the findings from this current study may have implications to suggest staff in schools with newcomer programs provide the academic and emotional support needed to change the trend of downward mobility for many newly arrived refugee and immigrant students.

There are several suggestions for government agencies, school districts, school staff, and newly arrived refugee and immigrant students and their families.

**Government Agencies:**

1. Fund and support newcomer programs at the secondary level.
2. Hire specially trained teachers to support newcomer students.
3. Hire specially trained counselors to support the additional emotional well-being of newcomers.
4. Fund professional development in the areas of cultural proficiency for all school staff.

Counselors and School Staff:

1. Value students and families' cultures in support of a more integrated school.
2. Create an atmosphere of belonging through welcoming practices and open communication with students and their families.
3. Work with outside agencies and specialists to assess and intervene in support of students’ emotional well-being.
4. Provide additional English classes and appropriately leveled classes within the capabilities of newly arrived refugee and immigrant students’ abilities.

Students and their families:

1. Maintain home cultures and share those cultures within schools and the community.

Despite pre- and postmigratory challenges, immigrant students are finding ways to adapt and flourish within secondary newcomer programs. For these students, there is a strong desire to be bicultural and integrate within schools. Government agencies and school staff have the opportunity to support student acculturation, by honoring student and family cultures and ensuring integration practices are instilled throughout schools. In conclusion, maintaining newcomer programs within districts may be the best step leading to post secondary success for the fastest growing and most vulnerable student population within public schools.
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Appendix A

Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 1)

Student Assent

Project Title: Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students:
The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support

Investigator: Diane Oliva

I am doing a research study related to Acculturation (how students adapt to the American culture) and the relationship between student acculturation and the support students receive at school. The study will identify school-based supports and services that are preferred by students and school staff.

A research study is a way to learn more about people and systems. If you decide that you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to complete questions that include several multiple choice questions and three open-ended questions on school supports for students. This survey will be read aloud by an adult and will take you approximately 60 minutes to complete, which may be during one or two class periods. Not everyone who takes part in this study will benefit. However, the benefits might include providing more resources for school support programs for immigrant and refugee students. When I’m finished with this study I will write a report about what was learned. This report will not include your name or that you were in the study.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, that’s okay too. If you decide you want to participate in the survey questions, please check the box below. Students who do decide to take part in the study will be entered into a drawing to win an IPod Shuffle at each of the school sites participating in the study.

Thank you,
Diane Oliva Researcher Northwest Nazarene University doliva@nnu.edu
Dr. Paula Kellerser Research Supervisor Northwest Nazarene University pkellerser@nnu.edu

☒ Yes, I agree to participate in the study (1)
☒ No, I do not agree to participate in the study (2)

Thank you for your participation in this study. Learning more about how newly arrived students acculturate and the relationship of acculturation to school supports, has the potential to add to the body of work needed to support newcomers within U.S. public school systems. We appreciate your involvement in helping us investigate how to better serve and meet the needs of secondary refugee and immigrant students. The following questions are part one of the survey.
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 2)

Please enter the number given to you by a teacher. The number will be used to connect the first part of the survey to the second part of the survey.

The following are some questions about yourself and your background that would help the researcher with her study. You are not required to answer the questions. This is a voluntary questionnaire. If you do not feel comfortable answering one or multiple questions, please leave them blank.

You can answer almost all the questions by clicking on the selection beside the answer that applies best. In some cases you are asked to write your answer.

1. How old are you?
   - 14 (1)
   - 15 (2)
   - 16 (3)
   - 17 (4)
   - 18 (5)
   - 19 (6)
   - 20 (7)
   - 21 (8)

2. What is your gender?
   - Male (boy) (1)
   - Female (girl) (2)

3. In what grade are you in school?
   - 9th grade (1)
   - 10th grade (2)
   - 11th grade (3)
   - 12th grade (4)

4. In what country were you born?
   - United States (1)
   - Another Country. What Country? (2) _________________

5. If born in another country, how old were you when you came to the United States?
6. Are you a United States citizen?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)
   - I don't know (3)

7. Are you a citizen of another country?
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)
   - I don't know (3)

8. What is your religion?
   - No religion (1)
   - Protestant (2)
   - Catholic (3)
   - Greek Orthodox (4)
   - Jewish (5)
   - Muslim (6)
   - Buddhist (7)
   - Hindu (8)
   - Other (write in) (9) ____________________

9. What is your ethnic origin?
   - African (1)
   - Asian (2)
   - European (3)
   - Latin American (4)
   - Middle Eastern (5)
   - North American (6)
   - Other (7) ____________________

10. What language do you speak at home?

Here are some statements about language, cultural traditions, friends, etc. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by checking the answer that applies best to you.
11. I feel that my own culture should adapt to American cultural traditions and not maintain those of their own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I would rather marry someone from own culture than an American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. I feel that my culture should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adapt to those of America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 5)

15. I would be just as willing to marry an American than someone from my culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I feel it is not important to maintain my own cultural traditions or to adapt to American traditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I feel that I should maintain my own cultural traditions and not adapt to those of America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I would not like to marry someone from my own culture or an American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 6)

19. It is more important to me to be fluent in my own language than in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. It is more important to me to be fluent in English than in my own language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. It is important to me to be fluent in both my own language and in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. It is not important to me to be fluent either in my own language or English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 7)

23. I prefer social activities that involve both Americans and people from my own culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I prefer to have only American friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I prefer to have only friends from my own culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I prefer social activities that involve Americans only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 8)

27. I prefer to have both friends from my own culture and American friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I don’t want to attend either American activities or activities from my own culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I prefer social activities that involve people from my own culture only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I don’t want to have either American friends or friends from my own culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When people with different backgrounds are together, one may sometimes feel unfairly treated. The following questions are about these kinds of experiences.

31. I think that others have behaved in an unfair or negative way towards my culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. I don’t feel accepted by Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. I feel Americans have something against me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. I have been teased or insulted because of my ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 9)

35. I have been threatened or attacked because of my ethnic background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Other adults outside of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Other students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 10)

39. Other kids outside of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Often (4)</th>
<th>Very Often (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotional Well-being Life Satisfaction
How do the following statements apply to how you think about yourself and your life?

40. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. At times I think I am no good at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 11)

**43. I am able to do things as well as most other people.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**44. I feel I have not much to be proud of.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emotional Well-being: Self-esteem**

**45. I certainly feel useless at times.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**46. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please mark one answer (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please mark one answer (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I take a positive attitude to myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please mark one answer (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please mark one answer (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 13)

51. The conditions of my life are excellent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. I am satisfied with my life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. So far I have got the important things I want in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Support: Adjustment

The following statements are about school. How well do you think they apply to you? Please check the answer that corresponds best to your own opinions and experiences.
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 14)

55. At present I like school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. I have problems concentrating in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. I feel uneasy about going to school in the morning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. I have problems concentrating when doing homework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 15)

59. I wish I could quit school for good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. I feel lonely at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. I believe my teacher thinks my school performance is:

- Poor (1)
- Below Average (2)
- Average (3)
- Above Average (4)
- Good (5)

62. My present Grade Point Average is:

- 1.0-1.9 (1)
- 2.0-2.5 (2)
- 2.6-2.9 (3)
- 3.0-3.5 (4)
- 3.5-4.0 (5)
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 16)

63. I been absent from school all day or part of the day without a valid reason.
- Never (1)
- Almost Never (2)
- A few times a year (3)
- A few times a month (4)
- A few times a week (5)

School Support: Added Service

64. My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. My classroom teachers help me with my assignments outside of class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. I know how to find a counselor to talk to when I need it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone in or out of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acculturation Youth Survey (p. 17)

68. I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. I feel welcomed to be on a sports team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. I feel welcomed to join clubs and after school activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark one answer (1)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Rarely (2)</th>
<th>Sometimes (3)</th>
<th>Most of the Time (4)</th>
<th>Always (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Supports: Open Ended

71. What do teachers do to help you the most in class?

72. What do counselors do to help you the most?

73. What would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country with?
Appendix B

Student Interview Questions

1. Which classes do you feel the most comfortable with and why?

2. Who are the adults in the school that spend one-on-one time with you? (Here you want the role of the adult not their names)

3. Who are the content teachers that spend the most time with you? (Here you want content, not teachers' names)

4. Has it ever been difficult for you to understand information in class? (If yes, go to question 5. If no, go to 6)

5. What do you think made it difficult for you to understand the information?

6. Have you ever had difficulty concentrating in class? (If yes, go to question 7. If no, go to question 8)

7. What do you think makes it difficult to concentrate?

8. Describe how you get information about sport teams at school.

9. Is there anything that would make it difficult for you to join a sports team? Explain

10. Are you aware of any costs or requirements to being on a team?

11. What would help you to be part of a sports team?

12. Describe how you get information about school clubs.

13. Is there anything that would make it difficult for you to join a school club? Explain

14. What would help you to be part of a school club?

15. What help does your counselor provide you?

16. What other counseling services would you like to have available?
Student Interview Questions (p. 2)

17. Have you ever taken afterschool or summer classes? If so, which classes?

18. Why did you take the extra classes or why not?

19. Are there any additional classes that you feel would be helpful that are not provided?

20. What would you hope school staff would do if you were treated unfairly by someone at school?

21. Are you aware of who to talk to in the school when someone treats you unfairly?

22. What were the most difficult obstacles you had to face when you first started school in the U.S.?

23. What would have been helpful in overcoming these obstacles?

24. What support do you think schools could provide to other students new to the country?

25. If there were no assistant teachers in classes, how would that affect your learning?

26. What do assistant teachers do to help you the most?

27. Are the members of your family aware of how they can participate in your education? If yes, how?

28. What could the school do to help your family be better informed?

29. Do you have any concerns about meeting graduation requirements? If so, what are your concerns?

30. Are you aware of your college or career options once you graduate? If so, how are you made aware?
Appendix C

Counselor Interview Questions

1. Which classes do you feel refugee and immigrant students are the most comfortable with and why?

2. Who are the adults in the school that spend the most time one-on-one with refugee and immigrant students? (Here you want the role of the adult not their names)

3. Who are the content teachers that spend the most time with refugee and immigrant students? (Here you want content, not teachers' names)

4. Do refugee and immigrant students have difficulty understanding information in class? (If yes, go to question five. If not, go to question six)

5. What do you think makes it difficult for refugee and immigrant students to understand the information?

6. Do refugee and immigrant students have difficulty concentrating in class? (If yes, go to question seven. If no, go to question eight)

7. What do you think makes it difficult for them to concentrate?

8. Describe how refugee and immigrant students get information about sport teams at school.

9. Is there anything that would make it difficult for the students to join a sports team? Explain

10. How are the students made aware of any costs or requirements to being on a team?

11. What do you think would help refugee and immigrant students to be part of a sports team?

12. Describe how refugee and immigrant students get information about school clubs.

13. Is there anything that would make it difficult for the students to join a school club? Explain

14. What would help refugee and immigrant students to be part of a school club?
Counselor Interview Questions (p. 2)

15. What counseling support services do you provide refugee and immigrant students?

16. What other counseling services do you think would be helpful?

17. Are you aware of any afterschool or summer classes refugee and immigrant students have attended? Describe

18. Why do you think refugee and immigrant students take the extra classes? (or why not?)

19. Are there any additional classes that you feel would be helpful to the students that are not provided?

20. What action does the school staff take if a refugee or immigrant student is treated unfairly by someone at school?

21. How are students made aware of who to talk to in the school when someone treats them unfairly?

22. What do you believe are the most difficult obstacles for refugee and immigrant students when they first start school in the U.S.?

23. What would be helpful in overcoming these obstacles?

24. What support do you think schools could provide to other students new to the country?

25. If there were no assistant teachers in classes, how would that affect the students' learning?

26. What do assistant teachers do to help the students the most?

27. Are the members of the students' families made aware of how they can participate in their children's education? If yes, how?

28. What could the school do to help families be better informed?
Counselor Interview Questions (p. 3)

29. Do refugee and immigrant students have any concerns about meeting graduation requirements? If so, what are their concerns?

30. Are refugee and immigrant students made aware of college or career options once they graduate? How are they made aware?
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Student Member Checking Email

Date

Dear ,

Thank you for your participation in the study, *Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrants Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support*. Attached is a transcript of our one-on-one audio taped interview took place a few weeks ago. Please let me know if the transcript accurately depicted our conversation.

I would also like to share how your comments might be used to support the study. If your interview comments fit within one or more of the research questions, they may be used in reporting the qualitative data in the results or conclusion sections of the study. If quotes have language or grammar errors that cause lack of meaning or flow due to the nature of literal translations, the direct quote will be corrected and noted in the dissertation. If you have any suggestions or modifications to the transcript or codes, please let me know.

If you would like help understanding the information in this email, please feel free to discuss the email with your school counselor.

Thank you again for your help,

Diane Oliva
Email: doliva@nnu.edu
Telephone: 208.871.0253
HRRC Approval #142014
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Counselor Member Checking Email

Date

Dear-

Thank you for your participation in the study, *Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrants Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support*. Attached are two documents: 1) a transcript of our one-on-one audio taped interview and 2) an attachment of the codes and themes resulting from all the counselor interviews that took place a few weeks ago. Please let me know if the transcript accurately depicted our conversation and if I captured the themes and codes from the interview.

I would also like to share how your comments might be used to support the study. If your interview comments fit within one or more of the research questions, they may be used in reporting the qualitative data in the results or conclusion sections of the study. If quotes have language or grammar errors that cause lack of meaning or flow due to the nature of literal translations, the direct quote will be corrected and noted in the dissertation. If you have any suggestions or modifications to the transcript or codes, please let me know.

Thank you again for your help and I look forward to hearing from you.

Diane Oliva
Email: doliva@nnu.edu
Telephone: 208.871.0253
HRRC Approval #142014
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Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND
Diane Oliva, in the Department of Graduate Education at Northwest Nazarene University is conducting a research study related to Acculturation and the Emotional Well-Being for Refugee and Immigrant Students. The study will identify school-based interventions, supports, and services that are preferred by students and school staff. The study will also identify which school-based interventions produce the greatest emotional/behavioral and academic outcomes. We appreciate your involvement in helping us investigate how to better serve and meet the needs of Northwest Nazarene University students.

You are being asked to participate in this study because you are a healthy volunteer, over the age of 18.

B. PROCEDURES
If you agree to be in the study, the following will occur:

1. You will be asked to sign an Informed Consent Form, volunteering to participate in the study.

2. You will complete a survey, which includes demographic questions.

3. Some participants may be asked to answer a set of interview questions and engage in a discussion with the researcher. Interviews will be recorded so they can be reviewed and transcribed accurately.

4. You may be asked to reply to an email at the conclusion of the study asking you to confirm the data that was gathered during the research process.

These procedures will be competed at a location mutually decided upon by the participant and principal investigator. Surveys will take about 60 minutes, and if chosen to participate, Interviews about one hour.

C. RISKS/DISCOMFORTS
1. Some of the discussion questions may make you uncomfortable or upset, but you are free to decline to answer any questions you do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time.
2. For this research project, the researchers are requesting demographic information. Due to the make-up of Idaho’s population, the combined answers to these questions may make an individual person identifiable. The researchers will make every effort to protect your confidentiality. However, if you are uncomfortable answering any of these questions, you may decline to answer.

3. Confidentiality: Participation in research may involve a loss of privacy; however, your records will be handled as confidentially as possible. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications that may result from this study. All data from notes, audio tapes, and disks will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the Department and the key to the cabinet will be kept in a separate location. In compliance with the Federal wide Assurance Code, data from this study will be kept for three years, after which all data from the study will be destroyed (45 CFR 46.117).

D. BENEFITS
There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information you provide may help educators to better understand and work with newly arrived refugee and immigrant students. It will also help identify school-based interventions, strategies, supports and services that will provide the greatest emotional/behavior and academic outcomes possible for secondary refugee and immigrant students.

E. PAYMENTS
There are no payments for participating in this study.

F. QUESTIONS
If you have questions or concerns about participation in this study, you should first talk with the investigator. Diane Oliva can be contacted via email at oliva.diane@meridianschools.org, via telephone at 208-350-5104 (W) / 208-871-0253 (C) or by writing: 1303 E. Central Drive, Meridian, Id. 83642

Should you feel distressed due to participation in this, you should contact your own health care provider.

G. CONSENT
You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. Your decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on your present or future status as a student at Northwest Nazarene University.
I give my consent to participate in this study:

Signature of Study Participant       Date

I give my consent for the interview and discussion to be audio taped in this study:

Signature of Study Participant       Date

I give my consent for direct quotes to be used in this study:

Signature of Study Participant       Date

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent       Date

THE NORTHWEST NAZARENE UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED THIS PROJECT FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH.
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Translator Confidentiality Form

Confidentiality Agreement for Translators

I understand that every part of the translating or interpreting process is confidential.

I will not share any information about any translating or interpreting activities related to the research project, Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support, This includes but is not limited to:

- Who I am working with
- What the content of the translation/interpretation is
- Where or when the translation/interpretation takes place

All information related to translating or interpreting will remain confidential at all times.

__________________________
Signature of Translator/Interpreter

__________________________
Printed name of Translator/Interpreter

Date: ________________________________

Diane Oliva
Email: doliva@nmu.edu
Telephone: 208.871.0253
Appendix H

Assent Form

Student Assent

Project Title: Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support

Investigator: Diane Oliva

I am doing a research study related to Acculturation (how students adapt to the American culture) and the relationship between student acculturation and the support students receive at school. The study will identify school-based supports and services that are preferred by students and school staff.

A research study is a way to learn more about people and systems. If you decide that you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to complete questions that include several multiple choice questions and three open-ended questions on school supports for students. This survey will be read aloud by an adult and will take you approximately 60 minutes to complete, which may be during one or two class periods. Not everyone who takes part in this study will benefit. However, the benefits might include providing more resources for school support programs for immigrant and refugee students. When I’m finished with this study I will write a report about what was learned. This report will not include your name or that you were in the study.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, that’s okay too. If you decide you want to participate in the survey questions, please check the box below. Students who do decide to take part in the study will be entered into a drawing to win an iPod Shuffle at each of the school sites participating in the study.

Thank you,
Diane Oliva Researcher Northwest Nazarene University doliva@nnu.edu
Dr. Paula Kellerer Research Supervisor Northwest Nazarene University pkellerer@nnu.edu

☐ Yes, I agree to participate in the study (1)
☐ No, I do not agree to participate in the study (2)

Thank you for your participation in this study. Learning more about how newly arrived students acculturate and the relationship of acculturation to school supports, has the potential to add to the body of work needed to support newcomers within U.S. public school systems. We appreciate your involvement in helping us investigate how to better serve and meet the needs of secondary refugee and immigrant students. The following questions are part one of the survey.
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Permission to Use ICSEY Survey

Oliva Diane

From: JBarry <elderberry5@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 12:22 PM
To: Oliva Diane
Subject: Re: Permission to use survey

dear diane,

yes, you may use the ICSEY questionnaire.

good luck with your research.

cheers, john

---

Oliva Diane

From: Oliva Diane
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 10:20 AM
To: JBarry <elderberry5@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Permission to use survey

Dr. JBarry,

I am conducting a study to help determine if there is a relationship between acculturation and school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students. I am also using your 1989-2006 research with the four levels of acculturation as foundational theory and I'm requesting permission to use your survey tool in my study. Please look at the attached permission document and contact me if you have questions or concerns.

My personal cell is 208-871-6253

In appreciation,

Diane Otta
Federal Programs Coordinator
Joint School District No. 2
1500 E. Central Dr.
Moses Lake, WA 98837
206-350-3104

INTERNET CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication, including any attachments, is confidential and intended only for the use of the person to whom it is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the person to whom it is addressed or an agent or employee responsible for delivering it to the addressee, please notify me immediately that you have received the message in error, then delete this communication and attachments, if any, without reading or copying them.
Appendix J

Researcher Added School Personnel and Program Questions

On a 5-point Likert Scale – Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

1. My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments.

2. My classroom teachers help me with my assignments outside of class.

3. I know how to find a counselor to talk to when I need it.

4. The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone in or out of

5. I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to.

6. I feel welcomed to be on a sports team.

7. I feel welcomed to join clubs and after school activities.

School Supports: Open Ended Questions

8. What do teachers do to help you the most in class?

9. What do counselors do to help you the most?

10. What would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country with?
Appendix K

Email to EL Expert Committee

Dear experts,

Thank you for your patience as I took the time to reformat the interview questions per my Chair's request. The research project has been very interesting and quite a learning experience.

I have reformatted the questions so that you are able to rate each question separately, even if the question is connected to the previous question. Again, these interview questions are designed to be semi-structured and worded similarly for both students and counselors so I am able to check for correlations between the two. It is my hope to start interviews next week, if the questions have all been validated.

If any of you are interested in the results of the final research project, the paper will be completed in April and I would be happy to send you a copy. Please just let me know.

In appreciation of your time and expertise,
Diane Oliva
doliva@nmu.edu
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Study Synopsis

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership – Diane Oliva

Dissertation Title
Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship Between Acculturation and School Support

Purpose Statement
The purpose of this study will be to examine the relationship between student acculturation, school support, and emotional well-being. This research is grounded in the theoretical framework of Dr. John Berry. Berry divides acculturation into context (understanding both or all cultures that members contact) and strategies (the variations in which members engage in a culture). Members within these societies react to each other’s culture in both attitude and behaviors. Berry’s (2005) framework of acculturation has the dominant society reacting to the immigrant populations by excluding, segregating, blending (melting pot), or embracing through multiculturalism practices. This theoretical framework suggests that immigrants fall into one or more of four categories: marginalization, separation, assimilation, or integration. In all cases, adjustments are being made throughout the acculturating process (some positive and some negative). When members experience difficulty, acculturative stress is prominent and may result in a less desirable result of marginalization or separation. Less acculturation stress leads to integration (or biculturalism), which Berry considers the healthiest of the four forms of acculturation (Berry, 2005). The results of the study will assess if school support influences acculturation levels and whether it has a significant impact on academic performance, behavior, and emotional well-being for newly arrived refugee and immigrant secondary students. This research has the potential to add to the body of work needed to support newcomers within U.S. public school systems by providing suggestions from students themselves and from school personnel who have daily contact with newcomers. In addition to school supports, district leadership will have empirical data to help guide program decisions, which have historically been focused on academics, with less understanding on the social-emotional needs of refugee and immigrant students.

Research Questions
The following guiding questions will shape this study:

Question 1. What is the relationship between acculturation levels and perceived school support for secondary refugee and immigrant students?
Question 2: What is the relationship between acculturation levels and perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?
Question 3: Does school support correlate with the perceived emotional well-being of secondary refugee and immigrant students?

Methods
A mixed methods study design will be used to investigate how secondary refugee and immigrant students acculturate to their host country, and determine if school support has an impact on
Appendix L

Study Synopsis (p. 2)

acculturation. The mixed methods will allow the researcher to generalize results using a larger population base, as well as explore in-depth within subgroups (Creswell, 2013; Yen, 2009), adding to the validity of using mixed methods with such complex societies (Lund, 2012). The research will be conducted at two high school Newcomer Centers in Idaho.

1) **Participants.** The sample in the study will be a purposeful, convenient sample of four school counselors and 100 secondary refugee or immigrant newcomer students. The participants attend or work in one of two newcomer programs in bordering districts, within a suburban community, in the Western United States. The school districts have a combined population of 300,000 (U. S. Census Bureau, 2012) and high school student populations of 1350 and 1850. The refugee and immigrant students will be ages 14-21, born outside the U.S, and have English language levels between advanced-beginning and intermediate, as determined by the state’s annual English Language Assessment or placement test.

2) **Surveys.** The first phase of the study will begin in September 2014 and involve distributing the student 4-part survey taken from the original instrument, *The International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY) Survey* (Berry et al., 2006) to 100 refugee and immigrant secondary students. Dates and times to conduct the survey with students will be arranged with the students’ main EL teacher and approved by building administration. The original survey included 144 questions, of which there were subsections on acculturation attitudes, school perceptions and emotional well-being perceptions. These subsets will provide the 80 questions used in the current survey.

3) **Interviews.** The second phase of the study will begin in October 2014 and involve four conveniently chosen counselors working with newcomer refugee and immigrants and four students at each of the centers randomly chosen using selection criteria from the students’ surveys. These counselors and students will be offered the opportunity to participate in one-to-one audio taped interviews. Both the counselors and students will be given a thorough explanation of the intent of the study, its timeline and opportunity to opt out of the interviews. All participants in the interviews will be 18 years or older with sign Informed Consent Forms.

**School Administrators**
Thank you for your time. If you have questions or thoughts, do not hesitate to contact me at doliva@nnu.edu.

With appreciation,

Diane Oliva
oliva.diane@nnu.edu
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Expert Group Validation Form for 10 Added Question – Original Questions

School Support Survey Questions – Validation

Sections:

Please rate each question with a 4, 3, 2, or a 1 rating. You are NOT answering the question, but rather helping to determine the strength of the question. The purpose of this survey is to gather perception data from refugee and immigrant secondary students’ on support in schools. You may use the comment section if you have a suggestion to alter a question to make the question clearer or think different wording would produce a better outcome. Thank you for your time!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The first seven questions are Likert type questions where students mark answers on a scale</th>
<th>How relevant are the following questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y teachers help me with my assignments in class.</td>
<td>Very (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y teachers help me outside of class when I need it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is a counselor to talk to when I need help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone outside of school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to feel welcomed to join after school sports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel welcomed to join non-sport activities after school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The next three questions are open-ended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do teachers provide you that is most helpful with your classes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do counselors provide you that helps you the most outside of class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support would you like the adults at school to provide?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Electronic Pilot Consent Form

CONSENT FORM
PILOT SURVEY AND PILOT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Project Title: Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support

Investigator: Diane Oliva

I am doing a research study related to Acculturation (how students adapt to the American culture) and the relationship between student acculturation and the support students receive at school. The study will identify school-based supports and services that are preferred by students and school staff.

A research study is a way to learn more about people and systems. If you decide that you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to complete 10 survey questions, which include seven multiple choice questions and three open-ended questions on school supports for students. There are also five feedback questions on your perception of the questions. The 10 school support survey questions are part of a larger survey that newly arrived immigrant and refugee students will be taking next month. The 10 survey questions and five feedback questions should take about 15 minutes to complete and will be conducted during school hours.

Once the larger survey is completed I will use the answers from the survey to design 10 interview questions to be given to eight students and four counselors. I also need to get feedback on the 10 interview questions before I administer the interviews to the eight students. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to answer the 10 interview questions and provide feedback on the questions. The 10 interview questions and feedback should take about 45 minutes to complete and will be conducted during school hours. The administration of the second set of questions will take place on a different day than the first set of survey questions.

Not everyone who takes part in this study will benefit. However, the benefits might include providing more resources for school support programs for immigrant and refugee students.

When I’m finished with this study I will write a report about what was learned. This report will not include your name or that you were in the study.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, that’s okay too.

If you decide you want to participate in the pilot of the survey questions, please check the box below.

____ I am over the age of 18 and want to participate in this research study.
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10 Added Research Questions - Pilot Survey

On a 5-point Likert Scale – Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree

1. My classroom teachers help me with my class assignments.
2. My classroom teachers help me with my assignments outside of class.
3. I know how to find a counselor to talk to when I need it.
4. The counselor helps me find additional services when I need to contact someone in or out of
5. I feel I can talk to my principal or vice-principal when I need to.
6. I feel welcomed to be on a sports team.
7. I feel welcomed to join clubs and after school activities.

School Supports: Open Ended Questions

8. What do teachers do to help you the most in class?
9. What do counselors do to help you the most?
10. What would you like adults in your school to help you and other students new to the country
with?

Feedback

1. Was it clear that the survey was anonymous?
2. Was it clear that by checking the box on the consent form that you were agreeing to participate in the survey?
3. What terminology or vocabulary if any, were you uncertain of?
4. What statements if any, were unclear?
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Committee Approval Site One

Research Project

RUSS HELLER <RUSS.HELLER@BOISESCHOOLS.ORG>
Fri 2/21/2014 11:35 AM
Inbox
To:
Oliva Diane;
Cc:
BONITA HAMMER <bonita.hammer@boiseschools.org>
Bing Maps
Action Items
Diane,
You may contact Bonita directly; I copied her my last message to you.
I do not believe there are any roadblocks to this research.
Best,
Russ

>>> Oliva Diane <Oliva.Diane@meridianschools.org> 2/21/2014 11:30 AM

RUSS HELLER <RUSS.HELLER@BOISESCHOOLS.ORG>
Fri 2/21/2014 11:27 AM
Inbox
Diane,
The committee has all the information needed, except for the publisher's permission re. the survey. The document you describe in your message of 2/8/14 is sufficient for the committee to give approval to the project. Please consider this message notification of that approval, contingent as always on securing permission of the site administrator/principal. Please do share your findings with my office. All the very best,
Russ

Russ Heller
Educational Services Supervisor
February 12, 2014

Northwest Nazarene University
Attention: HRRC Committee
Heiskell Business Center 1st floor
623 S. University Boulevard
Nampa, Idaho 83686

Re: Research Proposal Site Access for Ms. Dinne Oliva

Dear HRRC Members,

This letter is to inform the HRRC that Administration at [Name Redacted] has reviewed the proposed dissertation research plan including subjects, intervention, assessment procedures, proposed data and collection procedures, data analysis, and purpose of the study. Ms. Oliva has permission to conduct her research study in the district of and with the students and staff of [School Redacted]. The authorization dates for this research study are July 2014 to May 2015.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Superintendent
February 20, 2014

Northwest Nazarene University
Attention: HRRC Committee
Haustrom Business Center 1st Floor
821 S. University Boulevard
Nampa, Idaho 83686

Re: Research Proposal Site Access for Mrs. Diane Oliva

Dear HRRC Members:

This letter is to inform the HRRC that the Administration at [Redacted] reviewed the proposed dissertation research plan including subjects, intervention, assessment procedures, proposed data and collection procedures, data analysis, and purpose of the study. Mrs. Oliva has permission to conduct her research with students and the staff, which work with the students in the ELCT program. The authorization dates for this research study are August of 2014 to May of 2015.

Respectfully,
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Support Terms for Student Survey

_Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support_

- citizen
- ethnic origin
- culture
- adapt
- traditions
- fluent
- prefer
- unfair
- accepted
- insulted
- satisfied
- proud
- useless
- equal plane
- attitude
- concentrating
- absent
- resources
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Qualtrics Practice Survey

Default Question Block

Thank you for your participation in this study. Learning more about how newly arrived students acculturate and the relationship of acculturation to school supports, has the potential to add to the body of work needed to support newcomers within U.S. public school systems. We appreciate your involvement in helping us investigate how to better serve and meet the needs of secondary refugee and immigrant students.

How old are you?

- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21

How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click to write Statement 1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I prefer social activities with American friends over friends from my culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click to write Statement 1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am satisfied with the help I get at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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EL Academic Coach Confidentiality Form

Confidentiality Agreement for EL Coach

I understand that every part of the data collection process is confidential. I will not share any information learned through the process of proctoring surveys for the English Learners in the research project, Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support. This includes but is not limited to:

- Who I am working with
- What the content of the survey is
- Information shared by students in the process of collecting the data

All information related to collection of data will remain confidential at all times.

________________________________________________________________________

Signature of EL Coach

________________________________________________________________________

Printed name of EL Coach

Date: ________________________________

Diane Oliva
Email: doliva@nmu.edu
Telephone: 208.871.0253
Appendix V

Verbatim Instructions for Survey Administration

Hi my name is ______________.

I am here to tell you about a research study being conducted at your school entitled, *Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support*. A research study is a way to learn more about people and systems. This study is being conducted by Diane Oliva to help understand more about students’ acculturation (how students adapt to the American culture) and the relationship between student acculturation and the support students receive at school. The study will identify school-based supports and services that are preferred by students and school staff.

Before you are allowed to participate in the study, we need to first get your parents’ permission. Once we have permission from your parents, then you will be able to decide if you would like to participate.

If you decide that you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to complete a survey, which includes demographic questions, acculturation questions and questions on support from staff at school. The survey will take approximately two half periods and will be conducted during school hours. Students from the school may be asked to answer a set of interview questions based on the general survey responses and engage in a discussion with the researcher. Interviews will also be conducted at school and be recorded so the student’s answers can be reviewed and transcribed accurately.

Not everyone who takes part in this study will benefit. A benefit means that something good happens to you. I think the benefits might include providing more resources for school support programs immigrant students find helpful.

When we are finished with this study we will write a report about what was learned. This report will not include your name or that you were in the study.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, that’s okay too.

If you decide you want to be in this study, your name will be entered into a drawing for an iPod Shuffle. One iPod shuffle will be given away to a student at each school that participates. Please take home the Parent Consent Form and ask your parents to read. If they agree you may take part in the study, I will come back on another day to ask you if you are interested. If you choose to be part of the study I will give you some questions to answer on your perception of acculturation, emotional well-being and school supports.

Thank you

(Pass out the translated consent forms or English forms with translated tags)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very(4)</th>
<th>Quite(3)</th>
<th>Somewhat(2)</th>
<th>Not(1)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which classes do you feel the most comfortable with and why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who are the adults in the school that spend one-on-one time with you? (Here you want the role of the adult not their name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who are the content teachers that spend the most time with you? (Here you want content, not teachers’ name)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you ever been difficult for you to understand information in class? (If yes, go to question 5. If no, go to 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What do you think makes it difficult for you to understand the information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have you ever had difficulty concentrating in class? (If yes, go to question 7. If no, go to question 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What do you think makes it difficult to concentrate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Describe how you get information about your school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there anything that would make it difficult for you to join a sports team? Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are you aware of any club or requirements to be in a team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What would help you to be a part of a sports team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Describe how you get information about school clubs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is there anything that would make it difficult for you to join a school club? Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What would help you to be a part of a school club?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What help does your counselor provide you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What other counseling services would you like to have available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have you ever taken after school or summer classes? If yes, which classes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Why did you take the extra classes or why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Are there any additional classes that you feel would be helpful that are not provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. What would you hope school staff would do if you were treated unfairly by someone at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are you aware of what to talk to in the school when someone treats you unfairly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. What were the most difficult obstacles you had to face when you first started school in the U.S.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What would have been helpful in overcoming these obstacles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. What support do you think school could provide to other students new to the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If there were no assistant teachers in classes, how would that affect your learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. What do assistant teachers do to help you the most?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are the members of your family aware of how they can participate in your education? If yes, how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. What could the school do to help your family better informed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you have any concerns about meeting graduation requirements? If yes, what are your concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Are you aware of your college or career options once you graduate? If yes, how are you made aware?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Very(4)</td>
<td>Only(3)</td>
<td>Somewhat(2)</td>
<td>Not(1)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Which classes do you feel refugee and immigrant students are the most comfortable with and why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Who are the adults in the school that spend the most time one-on-one with refugee and immigrant students? (Here you want the role of the adults not their names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who saw the content teachers that spend the most time with refugee and immigrant students? (Here you want content, not teachers' names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do refugees and immigrant students have difficulty understanding information in class? (If yes, go to question five. If not, go to question six)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What do you think makes it difficult for refugees and immigrant students to understand this information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do refugees and immigrant students have difficulty concentrating in class? (If yes, go to question seven. If no, go to question eight)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What do you think makes it difficult for them to concentrate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Describe how refugee and immigrant students get information about sport teams at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is there anything that would make it difficult for the students to join a sports team? Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How are the students made aware of any costs or requirements to being on a team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What do you think would help refugees and immigrant students to be part of a sports team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Describe how refugees and immigrant students get information about school clubs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is there anything that would make it difficult for the students to join a school club? Explain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What would help refugees and immigrant students to be part of a school club?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What counseling support services do you provide for refugees and immigrant students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What other counseling services do you think would be helpful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Are you aware of any after-school or summer classes refugee and immigrant students have attended? Describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Why do you think refugees and immigrant students take the extra classes? (Or why not?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Are there any additional classes that you feel would be helpful to the students that are not provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. What action does the school staff take if a refugee or immigrant student is treated unfairly by someone at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How are students made aware of who to talk to in the school when someone treats them unfairly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. What do you believe are the most difficult obstacles for refugees and immigrant students when they first start school in the U.S.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What would be helpful in overcoming these obstacles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. What support do you think schools could provide to other students new to the country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If there were no assistant teachers in classes, how would that affect the students’ learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. What do assistant teachers do to help the student the most?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are the members of the students’ families made aware of how they can participate in their children’s education? If yes, how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. What could the school do to help families be better informed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Do refugees and immigrant students have any concerns about meeting graduation requirements? If so, what are their concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Are refugees and immigrant students made aware of college or career options once they graduate? How are they made aware?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Y

### Student Interview Question Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expert 1</th>
<th>Expert 2</th>
<th>Expert 3</th>
<th>Expert 4</th>
<th>Expert 5</th>
<th>In Agreement</th>
<th>CVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Relevant</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Z

**Counselor Interview Question Validation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expert 1</th>
<th>Expert 2</th>
<th>Expert 3</th>
<th>Expert 4</th>
<th>Expert 5</th>
<th>In Agreement</th>
<th>Item CVI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Relevant</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AA

Transcriptionist Confidentiality

Confidentiality Agreement for Transcriptionist

I understand that every part of the transcription process is confidential. I will not share any information about any transcriptionist activities related to the research project, Emotional Well-being of Secondary Refugee and Immigrant Students: The Relationship between Acculturation and School Support. This includes but is not limited to:

- Who I am working with
- What the content of the transcription is
- Interview information shared by students and counselors

All information related to transcription work will remain confidential at all times.

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Transcriptionist

________________________________________________________________________
Printed name of Transcriptionist

Date: ______________________________

Diane Oliva
Email: doliva@nmu.edu
Telephone: 208.871.0253
### Appendix BB

#### Student Acculturation Means by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Marginalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(M) 3 (F) 1</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.R. Congo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(M) 8</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F) 1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(M) 11 (F) 10</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(F) 3</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(M) 1 (F) 1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(F) 4</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(M) 2 (F) 3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(F) 1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(F) 2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(M) 1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(F) 5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bolded numbers detect greatest acculturation mean*