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ABSTRACT

This study examined experiences with immigration and being immigrants in the United States for 1 mother-daughter family unit. Given the challenges of navigating acculturation, this study aimed to broaden the scope of current research to understand linked individual and family experiences of immigration with an emphasis on resiliency and meaning-making. A qualitative research design was used to complete 1 family interview and 2 individual interviews of an immigrant family who had scored high on psychological wellbeing. The focus of this study was to illuminate ways that immigrants make meaning from and make sense of their immigration-related experience, as well as the strengths and resiliencies that they bring and that emerge. Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis was used to explore and illuminate experiences and meanings in a manner not previously done within this population. Themes of Cautious Optimism, Belonging, Lifting as We Climb, Finding Meaning in Struggle, and Self-Care and Emotional Support emerged. This study addresses a salient gap in literature regarding family and individual experience of immigration by providing insight into intergenerational issues within the context of resilience and meaning-making.
Review of Relevant Literature

Immigration to the United States

The process of migrating to a host country can impact overall well-being, physical health and mental health over the lifespan and development of individuals (Dow, 2011; Suarez-Orozco, 2015). The impact of immigrating can have lasting effects throughout generations and time (Caplan, 2007; Guarini, Marks, Patton, & Coll, 2011; Suarez-Orozco, 2015; Suarez-Orozco & Carhill, 2008). Yet, distinctions in the experience of acculturation for immigrants in different generations have been largely overlooked (Suárez-Orozco & Carhill, 2008). Pan and colleagues (2008) discussed the potential challenges of immigrating, and specifically addressed how the loss of connection to the home culture and the daily task of adapting to the host culture can be wearing over time. Furthermore, immigration and adaptation to migrating can impact occupation, social status, class, and family structure which comprise significant aspects of identity and meaning for individuals and families who migrate to the United States (Berger & Weiss, 2003, 2006; Hussain & Bhushan, 2011; Teodorescu, Siqveland, Heir, Hauff, Larsen, & Lien, 2012). These changes present opportunities for individuals and families to construct meaning or restore meaning within the context of these potentially stressful life events (Berger & Weiss, 2006; Hussain & Bhushan, 2011; Pan, Wong, Chan, and Joubert, 2008; Teodorescu et al., 2012).

Although immigration has decreased over the past few decades the flow of immigrants continues. In 2015, approximately 1,051,031 individuals became legal permanent residents in the United States (United States Department of Homeland Security, 2016). These numbers only account for the individuals who enter the United States and go through the legal immigration system. It is estimated that as many as one-third of Americans are either in the first or second generation to reside in the United States (Massey, 2010). Immigrants make up a large portion of
the United States population and continue to grow in numbers throughout the nation. It is imperative that literature seek to both understand the lived experience of these individuals and families as well as explore resiliencies and strengths to better provide targeted, contextualized mental health services.

**Generational Issues and Immigration**

The term immigrant covers a vast array of individual presentations and spans age, developmental stage and generation. The term *first generation* immigrant is utilized in the literature to demarcate individuals who were born in and socialized primarily in a home culture outside of the United States. First generation immigrants face challenges in pre-migration that lead them to consider migrating and then face the ongoing difficulty of adjusting to a different language possible loss of economic and social status and discrimination (Dow, 2011; Kia-Keating, 2009). The term *second generation* immigrant refers to children who are born in the United States of immigrant parents (Rumbaut, 2004). A tertiary term, *1.5 generation*, has also been created to denote the generation that is between first generation and second generation, for individuals who came to the United States as children (Rumbaut, 2004).

Generally, second generation immigrants are considered to have greater access to resources, increased social capital and command of the host culture language and customs. However, these individuals face unique challenges associated with immigrating and adapting (Ali, 2008; Padilla, 2006; Rumbaut, 2004). Specifically, Padilla (2006) discussed challenges with immersion in two cultures and the *social vacuum* many second-generation immigrants experience. This occurs when they learn about home culture through parents and secondary exposure to traditions, rather than immersion in the home culture by having firsthand experience in the home culture (e.g. living in the nation of origin and experiencing traditions there for themselves). Zhou (1997) posits that the lack of connection to home culture, combined with a
lack of cultural models in the host culture can contribute to a struggle to develop identity. Therefore, identity is heavily reliant on the models available and roles one plays in the host broker that can interrupt some hierarchical family systems and contribute to conflict and stress within immigrant families (Padilla, 2006; Zhou, 1997). Specifically, second generation immigrants have the task of navigating biculturalism, development of proficiency in both one’s home culture and host culture practices and values (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). Padilla (2006) discusses that biculturation has unique challenges and strengths associated with immigration.

**Acculturation.** Historically, acculturation was conceptualized as “the process whereby groups with different cultures come to have a common culture” (Berry, 1951, p. 217). This model proposed the ideal acculturation process as one of acquiring host cultural values and practices and discarding home cultural values and practices. To become assimilated into the host society, the immigrant had to make major accommodations and develop the values, beliefs, and mannerisms of the dominant culture. Schwartz and colleagues (2010) describe the historical context of acculturation and referenced the 1969 work by Park and Burgess, stating that this process meant adopting the attitude, memories and sentiments of middle-class, Protestant Anglo-Saxon cultural patterns, referred to as *core culture*. The original frame for immigrating was expunging one’s own ethnicity and culture to allow for oneself to be incorporated into the core culture. Berry (1997) expanded this conception and recognized that the acquisition of beliefs, values and practices of the host country does not necessarily imply that the immigrant will discard the home cultural beliefs, values and practices. Bidimensional acculturation models emphasize the possibility that the acquisition to the host culture is independent of maintaining the original culture (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). Modern conceptualization of acculturation and adaptation through immigrant experience is deeply
contextual (Schwartz et al., 2010). Acculturation has begun to move toward a multidimensional view (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 2010), and the theories developed are more extensive than the measurement of acculturation (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007). At this juncture in acculturation research, theorists have discussed ideas about acculturation more than they have worked to specifically identify and understand the valid and reliable measurement of the construct of acculturation. Schwartz and colleagues (2010) discussed the lack of consistency in the measurement of acculturation and the difficulties defining and assessing the construct. Further, many of the available measures utilize a unidimensional conceptualization of acculturation that may miss important information about the construct. (Thomas & Hoffman-Goetz, 2009). Matsudaira (2006) suggests employing a mixed method approach, utilizing qualitative and quantitative methods for a more comprehensive understanding of the acculturation construct.

**Biculturation.** Biculturalism has been defined as being a member of two or more cultures concurrently and connotes a plural cultural identification within one person (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). This sense of plurality has been discussed in reference to living as a person of color as well as living within Western culture. Dubois discussed a sense of split-selfhood as an African American man, post slavery, in the United States. He further indicated he understood this as a double consciousness and discussed the implications of being aware of oneself as part of more than one culture, but alien to those cultures simultaneously (Dubois, 2016). This early conceptualization, coined in 1903 by Dubois, contributed to the conversation on biculturation and the idea of living within two cultural realities simultaneously (Dubois, 2016). Authors continue to broaden and expand this topic to better understand how bicultural identity integration impacts psychological adjustment (Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Harris, 2008) how cross-cultural identity develops into positive adjustment,
and better understand overall competence in both home culture and host culture to increase bicultural individuals’ skills to accommodate the adaptation process (LaFromboise et al., 1993).

Many immigrants and their families adapt by developing the ability to culturally shift. The cultural shift concept refers to the ability to shift roles as needed for the situation and to be able to function effectively in more than one culture (Jambunathan, Burts and Pierce, 2000). Oetting and Beauvais (1991) suggested an orthogonal model of cultural identification that argues for the concept that individuals can identify with multiple cultures without losing one’s cultural identity in a diverse environment. Specifically, Oetting and Beauvais (1991) outlined four categories of bicultural identity development: (a) High bicultural identification, (b) high identification with one culture and medium identification with another, (c) low identification with either culture, and (d) monocultural identification. This model emphasized a pivotal conceptual contribution to research and practice: the importance of acknowledging and incorporating diverse environmental factors that impact adaptation as well as a basis for understanding normal identification with multiple cultures. Oetting and Beauvais’ research contributed to the recognition of the influence of environment on adaptation and normalized identification in multiple cultural entities. However, this stage-based model had not fully incorporated a holistic view of individuals that addresses multiple factors impacting bicultural identity development. Factors such as ethnic identification, language proficiency, social support and geography can impact the understanding of biculturation immensely, making linear stage-like models difficult to utilize for all bicultural individuals.

La Framboise and colleagues (1993) discussed bicultural competence and sought to identify the psychological impact of biculturalism to better facilitate a bicultural role and identify barriers to role development. One important component of bicultural competence is the
need to distinguish between intersecting social, psychological and affective processes that make bicultural development unique to an individual (LaFromboise et al., 1993). This suggests that an individual will continue in the process of cultural acquisition and maintenance at their own individual pace. La Framboise and colleagues go on to note that important bicultural dimensions to consider are knowledge of cultural beliefs and values, positive attitude for both acquired and home culture, bicultural efficacy, communication ability, role repertoire, and a sense of being grounded. The knowledge of cultural beliefs refers to the degree the person is familiar with history, institutions and everyday practices of a new culture; Positive attitudes towards both groups addresses the individual’s goal to hold each individual culture in a positive light, to desire bicultural competence; bicultural efficacy refers to the belief that people can live within two groups without compromising cultural identity; Communication ability addresses an individual’s effectiveness communicating thoughts and feelings to members of a specific cultural group; Role repertoire refers to the range of culturally appropriate behaviors and roles an individual has at his or her disposal; and the sense of being grounded addresses the establishment of stable social networks. These dimensions address the multiple factors contributing to positive navigation of bicultural identity and effective management of multiple cultural groups/experiences without damaging or disparaging one instead of the other cultural identity.

People living between cultures, such as many immigrants, are not simply faced with the task of converting to the new culture, but rather balancing and weighing the intricate interplay between individual, culture, and context within the home culture and the acquired culture. Literature suggests that people living within the context of two cultures do not inevitably suffer, yet much of the current research on immigration and cultural adaptation is pathogenic in nature and rooted in the assumption that immigration is a trauma to be coped with by the individual or
family. Park’s (1928) concept of the marginal man (as cited in Green, 1947) was re-examined by Green and referenced the idea of cultural changes and fusions within the communities of immigrants and marginalized peoples. These researchers posited that individuals within marginalized groups who live within two cultural identities may have some experiences that are beneficial, rather than wholly disconcerting, marginalizing, or traumatic. The researchers posited these instances may be both positive and negative; providing both strengths and setbacks. Further inquiry might focus on the positive coping, well-being and positive impact of immigration and identification with marginalized groups in addition to the literature that focuses on trauma and negative impacts and outcomes for immigrants. This expansion would allow for an examination of individuals coping with cultural differences in a multifaceted way that provides a platform for acknowledgement of personal differences, strengths, and intersecting dynamics in research, and beyond.

**Acculturative stress.** Acculturation can be conceptualized as a process that is multidimensional and relates to the behavioral, psychological and cultural change that occurs when an immigrant and host society/culture come into contact with one-another (Berry, 1990; Berry, 2005). Acculturative stress includes a wide-array of experiences spanning feelings of uncertainty, alienation due to language or cultural norms, identity confusion and ongoing generalizations that leads to marginalization in host society. Acculturative stress is a distinct construct, which differs from acculturation due to the research findings that indicate acculturation is not consistently inversely proportionate to acculturative stress and can possibly lessen over time (Caplan, 2007). Acculturative stress identifies the negative by-products of the bi-directional process that can occur when individuals experience conflict between the host and home societal expectations and experiences (Berry, 1998a, 1998b, 2005; Marsiglia, Booth, Baldwin, & Ayers, 2013; Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Contextual factors, such as
perceived discrimination and documentation status (Dillon, De La Rosa, & Ibañez, 2013) and social support (Williams & Berry, 1991) affect the magnitude of the stressors related to the acculturative process. Unfavorable conditions for immigrants in the host culture increase stress and psychological distress (Berry et al., 1992; Revollo, Qureshi, Collazos, Valero, & Casas, 2011; Salas-Wright, Robles, Vaughn, Córdova, & Pérez-Figueroa, 2015). Specifically, Salas-Wright and colleagues (2015) found a link between acculturative stress and mental disorders. Hispanic immigrants were more than 3.5 times more likely to meet criteria for generalized anxiety disorder and more likely to experience major depressive disorder as well. Acculturative stress can negatively impact well-being, including physical and psychological health, throughout the process of adapting to the host culture (Lueck & Wilson, 2010). Factors such as age, education level, socioeconomic status, language proficiency, coping style, receptivity of host culture to immigrants, social support and experience with host culture previous to immigration impact the likelihood of acculturative stress in immigrants (Lueck & Wilson, 2010; Williams & Berry, 1991; Yeh & Inose, 2003). Acculturative stress is bi-dimensional and can be a result of failing to meet expectations in both the host and home cultures. Wang, Schwartz, and Zamboanga (2010) discussed the problematic circumstance of numerous immigrants whose attempts to meet the demands of one culture elicit conflict within the other culture, creating a double bind for the person. The current literature on acculturative stress continues to grow, yet many studies emphasize negative impacts, stressors and negative outcomes for immigrant. There is a need to understand the resiliency, effective coping and meaning-making process to grant a fuller vision of the experience of immigration in the United States.
Meaning-Making and Meaning-Focused Coping

Meaning-Focused Coping (MFC) has been identified as a coping strategy that focuses on the individual reevaluating and changing the appraisal of a stressful life event (Folkman, 1997; Park & Folkman, 1997; Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004). MFC specifically aims to change the evaluation of a given situation and make the individual’s beliefs, goals, and future stressful instances more consistent with positive appraisal. The strategy promotes benefit-finding in the appraisal of the stressful event, or the ability to recognize and emphasize positive gains from adversity faced in stressful life events (Tennen & Affleck, 2002). MFC emphasizes a re-examination of the event to create more positive evaluation, rather than amending the event itself. The process of MFC allows the individual to integrate the discrepancy between the stressful life event and global beliefs or goals through re-appraisal of the event as well as appraisal focused on benefit finding.

Folkman and Moskowitz (2004) defined two forms of meaning making: global and situational. Global meaning comprises broad beliefs regarding justice, control, goals (i.e. relationships, work, religion, and achievement), subjective feelings, and self-views (Park, 2010). Global meaning coping strategies influence an individual's thoughts, emotions and behaviors (Park, 2010). Situational meaning is developed in the context of a particular environmental occurrence, usually a stressful encounter (Park, 2010). This includes appraised meaning assignment (i.e., determination of threat and attributions), discrepancies between appraised and global meaning (i.e., one’s sense of controllability), and meaning making (i.e. cognitive and emotional processing; Park, 2010). These processes can be characterized along several dimensions including automatic/deliberate, assimilation/accommodation, searching for comprehensibility/significance, and cognitive/emotional dimensions (Park, 2010). Meaning making is widely, though not universally, considered essential for effectively adjusting to life
events and a sense of well-being (Kobau, Sniezek, Zack, Lucas & Burns, 2010). The discrepancy between global and appraised meaning is operationalized as distress. A significant level of distress can result in the engagement of the meaning making process when one’s larger global meanings are not reflected in situational meanings of life events. However, beneficial effects of meaning-making have been found in multiple studies, including: more positive mood (Affleck, Tennen, & Gershman, 1985), shifts toward more positive global beliefs and better adjustment with psychopathology, PTSD symptoms and social adjustment (Koss & Figuerdo, 2004), reductions in depression and increase in growth, as well as self-esteem with higher levels of meaning making (Hayes, Beevers, Feldman, Laurenceau, & Perlman, 2005), and better subsequent emotional and social well-being (Boehmer, Luszczynska, & Schwarzer, 2007). These studies all address either meaning making as a process or the meaning made product, but few studies address both the process and the outcome. Another important consideration is the retrospective aspect of meaning-making. Meaning is made across a lifespan and shifts as the individuals grows and adjusts to life events. Lindberg, Markman, and Choi, (2013) note that making sense of unexpected events increased feelings that a larger force was at work-be it fate, or intervention of a deity. By looking back over the course of a day or a lifetime, individuals tend to make sense of unexpected events with a hindsight bias wherein the projections of current knowledge into the past in conjunction with an underestimation of the influence of outcome information leads to seeing the event in a way that makes sense for the current narrative. (Hawkins & Hastie, 1990). Therefore, making meaning may be a process that differs over the lifespan and may be presented in a way that aligns with the narrative of the individual or family experience over time, without the full breadth of the story presented once meaning is made.

Positive Indicators of Health, and Resiliency
Positive aspects of the stress and coping process is discussed in the literature on immigrant adjustment and mental health (Berger & Weiss, 2003, 2006; Hussain & Bhushan, 2011; Teodosescu et al., 2012). Behavior that may be interpreted as maladaptive by dominant culture may in fact, be protective and functional for individuals with minority cultural identifications (Trueba, 2002; Tummala-Narra, 2007). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) proposed the cognitive transactional theory of stress and discussed the environment-person interaction, wherein they proposed that stress occurs when demands of the environment exceed the individual’s resources to cope with the stressor. In this model, appraisal of the stressor mediates the experience of stress via primary and secondary evaluation of the stressor. Hobfoll (1989; 2001) developed a more nuanced model, the Conservation of Resources (COR) model, which considers the impact of racial and cultural factors on stress and stressor appraisal. McLaughlin Doane, Costiue, and Feeny (2009) noted the importance of resisting the urge to assume the experience of racial and ethnic minority individuals leads to pathology, stress or trauma. An alternative to pathologizing individuals in ethnic minority groups suggested by researchers is to seek to better understand how individuals thrive despite potentially stressful circumstances is through resilience. Resilience factors in immigrant populations can be both external or internal, and some findings suggest that when individuals lack the external support, many muster internal strengths to cope with adapting to the host society (Goodman, Vesely, Letiecq & Cleaveland, 2017). McLaughlin and colleagues (2009) further remarked that resilience happens when vulnerability is high and a typical adaptation will not work; therefore the risk of adapting is worth the cost for the individual to cope effectively with this greater-than-normal stressor/event. Bonnano and colleagues’ research on resilience suggests that some individuals display the ability to thrive or demonstrate posttraumatic growth as possible responses to highly stressful or
potentially traumatic events (Bonanno, Galea, Bucciarelli, & Vlahov, 2006; Bonanno et al., 2002).

Antonovsky (1987) promoted a theoretical approach that ‘salutes’ strengths and factors that promote resilience, rather than focusing solely on the negative impacts of the stress process. The Salutogenesis Model can be utilized as a strengths-based approach to immigration stress. This theory can be applied to immigration and biculturation to emphasize resilience over pathology associated with these life transitions. Antonovsky’s theory postulates three basic assumptions about health and adjustment. Firstly, he theorized that psychological health is not acquired by default, but rather developed, built, throughout an individual’s life. His secondary postulate indicated that individuals are neither healthy nor sick, indicating that each person falls somewhere on a continuum between ‘health ease and disease.’ Finally, Antonovsky promoted a holistic view of the person with salutogenesis and an overall movement towards health and well-being on the continuum, rather than parsing out pieces of health without context of the individual’s life circumstances and context. The emphasis will be placed on resilience as a lens for the current study. This frame will be the focus of inquiry, rather than a focus on trauma and negative impacts to emphasis the strengths of the individuals who immigrated and live within the families of immigrants.

These theorized principles have led to thoughtful application of a holistic model that focuses on well-being, a ‘both-and-approach’, wherein the individual or family is recognized for their positive coping factors while acknowledging the presence of difficulty or trauma (Vossler, 2012). The model allowed for a person or family to be conceptualized as both healthy and sick concurrently- that could move them towards health ease or disease on the continuum (Vossler, 2012). The principles from these models can be applied to examine individual and family factors within the context of their resilience, well-being and resources.
One-way to apply the theoretical salutogenic approach is to review narratives with an emphasis on meaning making. O’Connor (2003) suggested meaning making can serve as a psychological bridge between negative emotions caused by negative life events and positive emotions that come from narrative structuring of these events. Literature has shown that meaning-making and the formation of a narrative is one way to better understand the resilience present for these individuals (Singer, 2004).

When applying a resiliency lens to families, this stance posits that families should be viewed as capable of facing challenge and emphasize the family’s reparative potential (Walsh, 1996). McCubbin and McCubbin’s (1996) family resiliency framework assumes that families experience stress over the course of the life cycle and that the families possess strengths that assist and protect them in recovering from negative life events. This research also speculates that families can gain resiliency through network of relationships, developing meaning and shared understanding of negative life events and work to restore order in times of crisis (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1996). Goodman, and colleagues (2017) remarked, “extant research demonstrates the complex psychological experiences of individuals in stress-inducing contexts and calls for resilience to be conceptualized beyond the individual.” (pp. 310)

Supportive social networks can facilitate the development of resiliency and increase the likelihood of positive coping and resiliency (Goodman, Vesely, Letieq & Cleaveland, 2017). Bak-Klimak, Karatzias, Elliott, and Maclean (2015) note, “the critical role of social support and intrapersonal factors in promoting and sustaining well-being of immigrants” (p.162). This study specifically revealed that social support and dispositional characteristics of optimism, self-esteem, etc. are strongly related to well-being while circumstances such as income and relationship have a weaker correlation with wellbeing. Social support has a significant impact on family and individual well-being of immigrants and promotes the ability to effectively develop
resilience in the face of stressful life events.

In conclusion, research suggests that intentional cognitive and behavioral strategies for proactive coping, and specifically meaning-making, increases well-being in immigrants as well as strong social support and characterological factors. These findings indicate the need to examine immigration from a resiliency framework that salutes strengths as well as recognizing challenges and stress. The research also suggests a focus on social networks and support structures that foster resilience and positive coping in times of stress.

**Family, Immigration, Resiliency and Research**

“Separateness and connectedness are the underlying conditions of a family’s life, and its common task is to give form to both.” (Hess & Handel, 1959, p. 1)

Each individual is located within the context of a family unit. Families grow together and separately to develop a unit of measurement distinct from individuals and vitally connected to those individuals as well. Family researchers have been criticized for focusing on the individual in both methodology and subject matter rather than a more holistic study of the family unit (Sprey, 2013). Hess and Handel (1959) presented a seminal form of holistic family methodology in where they wrote a book studying 33 families, identifying family themes, organization and gathering information from each individual family member. Handel (1996) argued that group and family membership is either under-emphasized or not discussed due to the difficulty in quantifying and analyzing data with family methodology. As Handel (1996) notes “No member of any family is a sufficient source of information for that family” (p. 346). A family is many perspectives that combine to form a group that is both related to the outside-family culture and unrelated to culture of wider society; individual and relational; as well as organized around common themes (Handel,1996). Current literature still reflects this disparity in family
methodology in addition to individual methodologies. The current study aims to have both family and individual interviews to provide information on immigration, meaning making, acculturation and resilience for individuals within the family system and the shared family narrative.

Law and legal practices have dramatically impacted immigration to the United States and limited access for many individuals seeking to migrate. Since the 1960s, United Stated immigration policies favored families when granting legal status. (Menjivar, Abrego, & Schmalzbauer, 2016). In 2011, two thirds of the 1 million immigrants who became legal permanent residents of the U.S. during that year were family-sponsored (US Department of Homeland Security, 2011). The Hart-Cellar Act, or 1965 INA, abolished national origin quotas, which limited migration to certain numbers from certain countries of origin due to the system of racial bias. As policy changes and reflects a lessening of family reunification prioritization immigrants and longer delays due to backlogs in processing many immigrants seek unauthorized immigration, due to the lack of access to legal avenues (Cruz, 2010). Furthermore, current administration in the United States continues to create challenges to immigration in general, with a decrease in the emphasis on family reunification. LeMay (2018) discussed current immigration policy, citing movement towards what the author terms a Fortress America beginning after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The author noted that legislation following these events emphasizes protecting the internal United States via legislation such as the U.S Patriot Act, which restricted civil liberties of U.S. citizens and broadened terrorism-related definitions from previous legislation. Currently, legislation continues to be passed to ban travel from seven Muslim-Majority nations (Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen), build walls to keep immigrants out, cut funding for sanctuary cities, and decrease avenues for naturalization of undocumented immigrants as well as limiting family reunification to immediate families only.
Greenstein (2006) discussed five principles of families, remarking that families are difficult to define. Families can be conceptualized as systems of individuals, who occupy multiple roles and statuses simultaneously, that much of family behavior is private and hidden and that we all have preconceptions about families and family life. Families must be explored in academia to better understand unique challenges and strengths of familial units. It is important to study families and family members to better understand how immigration impacts familial and individual meaning making processes. Studying the family unit as well as the individual will allow for further examination of the experience of immigration from the family and individual perspectives.

Falicov (2015) found “what is distinctive and most dramatic about migration is the uprooting of entire systems of meanings: physical, social, and cultural” (p. 81). This perspective is significant, as many immigrants come to the United States through family members, or due to whole or partial family migration. Immigration can be framed as a non-normative event, that can have little preparation for the far-reaching effects, lack celebratory rituals, have little framework for effective navigation and a limited number of imagined possibilities to replace old ideas of a future (Falicov, 2012). Many families find themselves living within two worlds and alternating practices, rituals and cultural codes to match the context of host culture, home culture and ‘hybrid’ combinations, which fall somewhere in between (Falicov, 2012, p. 297). Additionally, migration, involves family separation, be it physical relocation from extended family members or separation from original community networks of friends. In this way, immigrants are impacted by separation and adapting to a life where they no longer build shared life cycle narratives with loved ones. This study aims to broaden the literature on experiencing navigating *two worlds* as individuals and families and seeks to better understand how narratives and meaning are derived from immigration and adaptation after this event. Historically, a deficit-
driven perspective has dominated our understanding of the family process, which has led to a gap in understanding of the inherent strengths and variability that exists within families (Walsh, 1996). Literature suggests that family resilience is not simply the sum of all individual members’ resilience, but rather the relational, shared interplay of reliance shared by the family unit (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988). It is important that family resiliency be examined within a situated, ecological framework to account for the interplay between family, economic, political and racial relationships and experiences the family intersects with (Garcia Coll, Lamberty, Jenkins, McAdoo, Crnic, Wasik, & Vazquez García, 1996). There is limited understanding of the role family, cultural and community contexts play in pathways to resilience outcomes (Bottrell, 2009).

**Synthesis, Critique and Rationale**

First and second-generation immigrants face unique challenges related to immigration, acculturation, and well-being. Research on generational differences has been limited, as immigrant groups have been treated as homogeneous, often overlooking important intergenerational variability. First generation immigrants face several potentially stressful challenges that have been well studied, including stressors related to pre-migration, migration, and post-migration. Due to the nature of these challenges, there has been an assumption in the literature that greater assimilation (e.g. more time spent in host country, subsequent generations in the U.S.) is advantageous to well-being and other health outcomes. These assumptions could be challenged by asking: Are challenges inherent to one generation more amenable to meaning making than the challenges of other generations? Under what conditions do the challenges of the first-hand immigration experience result in increased sense of meaning, purpose, and growth?

There is a need to take a closer look at stress and coping processes in the experience of immigrants in order to understand the impact of immigration across generations (Rumbaut,
Immigrants and their descendants cannot be treated as one homogenous group due to the unique challenges each generation faces. Little research has been done to understand the unique processes, challenges, and strengths of second-generation immigrants in their journey coping with the acculturation process (Rumbaut, 1994). There is an extensive body of literature examining the stress-coping relationship (Aldwin, 2007; Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004; Lyon, 2011; Lyon, 2011; Taylor & Stanton, 2007), and processes of immigration and acculturation (APA, 2012; Berry, 2006; Kuo, 2014). However, there is a gap of recognizing and operationalizing cultural concepts within the stress-coping model (Kuo, 2011) and simultaneously examining the relationship between coping, acculturation and adaptation (Kuo, 2014). Wortman (1983) postulated that life events and philosophical orientation may impact the coping process for stressful life events. The meaning making research has generally overlooked the extent to which personal and social resources contribute to meaning making, as well as the eventual outcome of meaning made (Updegraff, Silver, & Holman, 2008). Diener (2013) suggests one area for continual study would be the outcomes of well-being within diverse cultural groups. Park (2010) recommends that further research on meaning-making focus on how the construct manifests, as well as how circumstances and types of meaning making are related to positive well-being.

In order to add to the existing literature, the current study explored the following primary research questions:

1. How do non-European immigrants make meaning of their experiences as immigrants and family members of immigrants?

2. What strengths and resiliencies, in addition to struggles, have the immigrants and family members discovered as a result of immigration?
(3) How do families make sense of immigration as a collective unit? How do individuals within families make sense of immigrating themselves or having a family member who immigrated to the United States? Do the individual and familial senses of meaning differ from one another?
Method

Introduction

This qualitative case study was a multi-generation exploration of coping and meaning-making in the context of immigration. The researcher used interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) to further understand the experience of individuals within a family creating meaning from immigration and the process of acculturation across generations. Specifically, this methodology focused on the everyday lived experience and the meaning made when something important has happened within an individual’s life (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2012). Interpretive phenomenological analysis was utilized to analyze data and information obtained through interviews. This case study is part of a larger multi-study project that sought to further understand psychological and physical well-being, coping, and meaning making within the context of immigration. Two other quantitative studies were completed as part of this larger project (Esfandi, 2017; Stein, 2018).

Qualitative approach. A qualitative method was used to allow for flexibility and depth of information on one family’s experience immigrating. The researcher sought to understand one family’s lived experience and interpretation through respectful interviews and observations. This format of research was chosen to maximize close, personal contact with participants and to help limit the impact of any previously held biases or stereotypes of the researcher (Mohatt & Thomas, 2006). IPA is most firmly grounded in hermeneutics, phenomenology, and ideography. These three foundational elements contribute to the different areas of focus characteristic of the IPA qualitative inquiry strategy. For instance, the hermeneutics focus recognizes the researcher as interpreter and the impact of personal account on information given by participants.

Phenomenology focuses on the account of an event from the lens of the participant/s. The idiographic focus accounts for the emphasis on examining individual details of the acquired
interview material. Further, the IPA researcher attempts to bracket, or withhold, taken-for-granted assumptions about the area of study in the service of allowing the process and experience of participants to emerge, facilitated by the researcher (Smith, 2011). Overall, IPA allowed the researcher to examine the meaning made from an experience. It provided the researcher a view of the individual and family within context and took into account the impact the researcher has on data collection, interpretation, and data usage post-study.

**Researcher as instrument.** "A researcher's background and position will affect what they choose to investigate, the angle of investigation, the methods judged most adequate for this purpose, the findings considered most appropriate, and the framing and communication of conclusions" (Malterud, 2001, p. 483-484).

The researcher is an integral part of the research process in IPA. By conducting the research as well as interpreting, the researcher worked through a double hermeneutic, in which the participant sought to make sense of an event and the researcher sought to make sense of the sense-making process the participant was reporting/experiencing (Finlay, 2011). The researcher functioned as the conduit to gather, examine, and organize the data obtained in the study. Therefore, reflexivity in the researcher was considered and implemented in the study. Reflexivity refers to the systematic attitude of attendance to the context of knowledge construction as it relates to the researcher and participants throughout the research process (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). The researcher is an unavoidable variable in the experience of qualitative inquiry (Holloway & Biley, 2011). In this study the researcher addressed reflexivity and their impact on data collection and evaluation through ongoing written notes of biases, reactions and experiences throughout the interview and transcription review process, as well as directly addressing researcher positionality and values in the manuscript. Furthermore, the researcher was a part of a lab that considered immigration, well-being and meaning making to increase discussion with
multiple investigators and increase awareness of assumptions and beliefs that may otherwise be
difficult for the researcher to identify. In current qualitative inquiry, researcher reflexivity is
paramount to the process of research (Bryman, 2008; Holloway & Biley, 2011). Doyle (2013)
notes that qualitative inquiry can be reflexive in nature and demonstrate a co-creation of research
methods, wherein both researcher and participant openly work together to increase reliability of
inquiry. In this study, the researcher was responsible for choosing a method for interviews,
conducting interviews, choosing criteria for participant involvement, and evaluating meaning
ascribed from the family and individuals in the interview process. At each stage, the researcher
must be aware and reflective towards researcher bias, experiences, and reactions while being
cognizant of the participant’s biases and context.

**Self-reflexive statement.** I chose this research project to examine the meaning
individuals and families make of immigration. My grandmother immigrated to the United States
mainland from Puerto Rico, speaking little English and with no familial support. My
grandmother did not share much of her story of immigration with me throughout my life. I
identify as bi-cultural because I see myself as both Native American and Puerto Rican and have
struggled throughout my life with being “torn” between these identities. Given my bi-cultural
experience, I am interested in how the children of first-generation immigrants see their
experience, the experience of the family, and the meaning they take from these interpretations.
My most salient bias is that I believe the family will have strengths that have been passed
through generations, and ways of coping that will emerge in interviews. I believe acculturation is
less like surviving a trauma and more like negotiating an ongoing obstacle. I would like to
perpetuate research that is strength-oriented, which means I could interview to confirm my bias.
These are assumptive positions that are important to name and examine openly as I conduct
research to assure I can communicate the story I am being told as honestly as possible. I did this
by being open with my chair and my team of researchers about my biases, having audio-recorded material so I can evaluate the recording, utilizing my chairperson as an auditor, as well as utilizing my written notes. I also wrote down my personal reactions and notes as I transcribed and coded the data to bracket my personal opinions and thoughts as they emerged.

**Quality of qualitative research.** Smith et al. (2012) recommended implementing Yardley’s (2011) four broad principles to assess qualitative research quality. The principles consist of (a) sensitivity to context, (b) commitment and rigor, (c) transparency and coherence, and (d) impact and importance. This research study implemented the above principles within the context of IPA methodology. Regarding sensitivity to context, the researcher asked about context in the interview and allowed space for the participants to self-report context in the interview as part of the procedure. Also, existing literature on acculturation, and applied knowledge concerning culture and context was applied in the write up and interview process. Rigor and commitment will be addressed in the inclusion criteria as well as the sensitivity of creating the questions and engaging in the interview process. The researcher facilitated ample space and time for the participants to parse out their experience in the individual and family interview. Rigor is also utilized by interviewing individuals first and then the family to get an individual and holistic picture of the family. Transparency and coherence were addressed through clearly stating goals and ideas behind research to participants and also being clear and communicating reactions throughout the process of data collection with the research team.

Coherence was sought through adherence to the methodological stance and commitment to examining the meaning made for the participant as the main ‘guiding principle’. Finally, impact and importance are expressed through the need for this research. The current body of research lacks the personal stories of the people experiencing immigration. This will further
inform the need for research and the increased understanding of acculturation and immigration through those experiencing it firsthand, and not those who research the idea of the construct.

Participants

Participants consisted of one first generation female immigrant, who immigrated by choice and married to become a citizen and one 1.5 generation female who immigrated due to her mother’s choice to immigrate to the United States. The participants agreed to be interviewed as a family; with each individual participant doing one family and one individual interview.

Description of participants. Ana is single woman in her mid-twenties of South-American descent. She is the daughter of Yessenia. She is currently attending a doctoral program in psychology. Ana is immigrated to the United States at age 12. Ana has one step-sibling and one younger brother. Ana immigrated with her mother and has no other identified family in the U.S. Ana is primarily Spanish-speaking and learned English when she immigrated to the U.S. She is currently attending a doctoral program for psychology in the Midwest. She self-identified as a first-generation immigrant and reported she felt her experience most closely resembled that of a first-generation immigrant. Ana works closely with student organizations and other community programs to increase awareness about immigration issues and educate the public in an advocacy role. She reported a strong relationship with her mother and limited relationships with extended family in her home South American country.

Yessenia is a married woman in her mid-fifties of South-American descent. She is the mother of Ana. At the time of interview, she was recently enrolled in a master’s program in Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) to begin later in the year. Yessenia immigrated to the United States as an adult. Yessenia knew some English and immigrated through marriage to her current spouse. While she currently feels a close connection to her spouse, she reported that he used immigration as a means for control at the beginning of their marriage. She has sought out
community membership in her rural town and found avenues of agency as time has passed since migrating. She reports a strong relationship with her daughter and shares many of her desires for advocating for immigrants and increasing the overall knowledge base about immigrants.

**Criteria for inclusion and exclusion.** Selection criteria for the study included the following. The participating first-generation immigrant must have immigrated voluntarily, regardless of age. Furthermore, the family must have emigrated from a non-European country and be from an ethnic group generally considered as *persons of color* (i.e., Latino, Asian, African). Age, gender, socioeconomic status and sexual orientation were purposefully not specified as these characteristics can vary based on the composition of the family selected.

**Measures**

Two measures from the larger project were utilized to identify potential participants for the current study. The Background Questionnaire (Harrell, 2013; Appendix B) is a 19-item demographic questionnaire that assessed descriptive information about the research participants. Questions request information regarding gender, age, race/ethnicity, country of birth and residence, education, employment, relationship status, parental status, financial situation, and stress/health. Additional questions ask about immigration and generation status, as well as aspects of the acculturation process and acculturative stress (e.g., length of residence in the U.S. and English language fluency). The Multidimensional Well-Being Assessment (MWA; Harrell, 2013; Appendix C). The MWA is a comprehensive measurement of well-being that includes dimensions of well-being that are relevant to racial/ethnic minority groups and individuals of lower socioeconomic status. The MWA is a 160-item scale that measures five general wellness contexts (Psychological, Physical, Relational, Collective, and Transcendent), with 2-4 dimensions of well-being within each context for a total of fifteen dimensions. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale and responses range from “Never” (scored 0) to “Always” (scored 5).
Scores are calculated for each Wellness Context, as well as for each dimension of well-being. Psychometric properties of the MWA are strong with Cronbach’s alpha indicators of internal consistency reliability ranging from (.76,.96; Harrell, 2018). The current study utilized the Emotional dimension within the Psychological Well-being context.

**Recruitment and data collection procedures.** The selection and recruitment of participants involved the following steps. After quantitative data collection for the larger project was completed, the researcher identified participants who scored in the highest quartile on the emotional well-being dimension and in the highest category of the acculturative stress item on the Background Questionnaire. This provided the opportunity to focus on coping and meaning-making experiences that contribute to positive adaptation in the context of high exposure to acculturative stress. Only those participants who indicated during the informed consent process that they were willing to be contacted for an in-person interview about their immigration experience and coping were contacted for this follow-up study. A list was made of eligible participants and the participant ID numbers were placed in a random order. Potential participants were contacted by email and the researcher responded to each participant who met criteria until one family met full criteria and agreed to the study.

Appendix D includes the script of the email screening questions for participation in the interview study for individuals. Participants had to have at least one family member over the age of 18 of a different generation status (first, 1.5 or second generation) whom they believed may be willing to be interviewed. The researcher requested that the initial participant provide the researcher’s contact information to family members and ask that they contact the researcher if they are interested. The researcher then sent informed consent information to the potential participant and family member via email. The emails with family members consisted of the researcher providing information about the interview study, assessing interest, obtaining contact
information for sending the Informed Consent, and making arrangements to contact the participants for one group interview (Appendix D). This process continued until 2 members of a single family expressed verbal interest in the study. Both participants voluntarily agreed to participate in the study after the researcher provided information on the purpose, procedures, confidentiality, possible risks and possible benefits of the study.

After a participant family (minimum of two family members) was secured, the researcher began the formal consent procedure and scheduling of the interviews. Scheduling of interviews was conducted by email to request participation and informed consent as well as information on the study was emailed to participants. Participants were given the option to be interviewed in a private location of their choice to maximize comfort of disclosure. Options suggested to participants include a private room in the family home, a room at their place of worship or employment, a room reserved at a library or community center, or a room in one of the three Pepperdine clinics (West Los Angeles, Encino, or Irvine). Interviews were also offered via Skype if one member of the family was not in the Southern California area or unable to attend the interview.

Participants returned the informed consent documents via email before the interview process began. Prior to beginning the interviews, participants were given the opportunity to ask any questions or request clarifications from the researcher regarding the content of the informed consent document.

Participants were asked to choose a pseudonym or have one assigned to be used during the interview process to enhance confidentiality of the recorded interview. The researcher assigned both participants a pseudonym for the purposes of this study. Family members were interviewed in the family group in one interview. Participants were given the option of receiving a transcript of their responses via email or post in order to review the transcript and add or clarify
provided responses. Family participants were not provided the transcripts of the individual interview with the other participating family member. Requests for addition of information were instructed to be communicated to the researcher via email, postal mail or phone conversation with the researcher. Neither participant requested modification or inclusion of additional information.

**Semi-structured interviews.** The interview process was led by the researcher and allowed flexibility for the responses and stories from the participants (Smith, Flowers, & Larking, 2012). The researcher had interview questions prepared prior to the interview in four different formats (first, 1.5, and second-generation individual interviews and a family group interview). The provision of these questions to the participants was done to increase transparency in the process and strengthen the attached informed consent document. Prior to beginning the interview questions, the researcher informed participants of approximate length of interview (one hour to an hour and a half for both individual and family interviews), reviewed consent forms, and answered any questions. At both the beginning and end of the interview, the researcher inquired if the participants would like to add any questions or topics to explore.

The first-generation individual interview (Appendix F) was organized into six sections: General Story and Motivation, Immigration Story, Impacts, General Questions and The Experience of the Interview. The first-generation individual interview consisted of questions such as, “How do you make sense of your experience living in the United States?” The 1.5-generation individual interview (Appendix G) was also organized into the same six sections, with similar questions to the first interview type, including questions such as “What has it been like for you to live with the family’s primary or “home” culture in conjunction with the culture of the United States?” The family interview (Appendix H) was organized into the same six sections as the individual interview. The questions are aimed to gain reflection from the family as a unit, for
example “How does your family discuss the history of how they came to be in the United States? What is important to tell when talking about immigrating, living in, and adjusting to the culture of your family and the culture you reside within?” Interviews were recorded on a digital recording device approved by Pepperdine University’s IRB. All participants had a pseudonym beginning the interview and all information was secured with a digital password. Both interviews were completed over Skype. Interviews were completed in one day and lasted about an hour each for a total of a little over three hours. Interview sequence was as follows: Skype interview with Yessenia (mother), Skype interview with Ana (daughter), Skype interview with both participants for family interview.

Data Management

The interviews were recorded on a digital recorder and transcribed by the researcher. The transcripts included all data gathered in the interview with both individuals and family. Interview data were removed from the recording device and secured in a password-protected computer file. Transcribed data was typed into a password-protected Microsoft Word document. The researcher maintained all written records and analyses with the use of pseudonym and maintained them in a password protected digital file.

Data Analysis

Consistent with an IPA approach, the researcher’s focus was on meaning constructed by participants and individual/family meaning of experiences, rather than specific words, silences or phrasing (Smith, 2011). The analysis emphasized grounding the researcher’s results in the participants’ worldview and phenomena by examining the interview data in an immersive style through the interview process and during the final reviews. The analysis process included reading each interview while noting initial observations, examining themes, and then re-reading interview data for emerging themes in the context of all the data collected.
According to Smith et al. (2012), IPA consists of a six-step process. The steps are not linear and can be retraced, revisited, or reorganized dependent upon the nature of the phenomenon and process of interpretation. The process begins with reading and rereading a transcript, facilitating immersion in the text. Next, initial open-ended exploratory commentary is completed. The focus in this secondary phase is noticing descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual undertones in a single transcript. The third step begins by examining themes by distilling data into succinct statements. The fourth stage focuses on exploring the interplay between themes and involves a creative process of mapping to connect themes. When a singular transcript goes through this process the investigator then begins to analyze the next participant’ transcript while attempting to bracket content form the previous case. Step six emphasizes searching for patterns across cases. The primary purpose of the steps is to gain a focused understand of one transcript and examine it individually before beginning to integrate information across transcripts.

**Ethical Considerations**

The participants in this study were asked to participate voluntarily. The researcher provided information regarding the study and purpose of data collection upon first contact with participants. The researcher also provided typed transcription of the interview to participants for review, if requested. Participants were verbally and in writing informed of confidentiality, length of data retention, and plans to utilize this data.

A significant ethical concern in this study was the possibility that re-iterating the story of immigration and acculturation thereafter might reveal negative reactions or experiences for participants. Participants may also be uncomfortable with a non-family member discussing familial and individual experiences about immigration. In order to address these concerns, the researcher provided general questions before the interview and emphasized that all information shared is voluntary. The researcher placed emphasis on the right of the individual or family to
decline answering questions they do not feel comfortable answering, as well as the option to stop the interview at any time without any negative consequences.
Results

The purpose of the study was to investigate one family’s experience with immigration and meaning making. The participants provided accounts of both their individual and family experience immigrating and acculturating through narratives about their experience. The study focused on two family members’ experiences when they immigrated to the United States and on their ongoing process of making meaning of their experience as time goes on living in the U.S. The study also focused on acculturation and the narrative meaning made in individual, intermediate family members and extended family members. The data yielded six themes present throughout the three interviews (two individual interviews and one family interview).

Themes

For an identified theme to be retained, it needed to have occurred five or more times across the three interviews. The final themes included Cautious Optimism, Belonging, Meaning in Struggle, Lifting as We Climb, Living Under Assumptions, and Self-Care/Emotional Support. Cautious Optimism refers to a feeling of remaining hopeful about the future but maintaining practical expectations about the experience of acculturation. The Belonging theme reflects the various realms where the participants felt a sense of being ‘part of’ or ‘separate from’ the host culture and the home culture. Finding Meaning in Struggle references the sentiment of creating a story and developing a sense of purpose to the experience of immigration and adapting to the host culture. Lifting as We Climb reflects the theme of ‘giving back’ in multiple ways for each participant and sharing knowledge with others about their experience. Living Under Assumptions refers to the feeling of coping with microaggressions, assumptions about identity made from host and home cultures and ongoing difficulties adapting when prejudgments are made based on appearance or heritage identity. Finally, the theme of Self Care and Emotional Support refers to the emphasis on caring for one’s own needs while adapting and seeking the
necessary support to stay mentally and physically healthy. Table 1 presents the number of times each theme occurred in the family and individual interviews.

Table # 1

*Frequency of Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Recurrence in Family Interview</th>
<th>Recurrence in Individual Interviews</th>
<th>Total Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cautious Optimism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Meaning in Struggle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifting as We Climb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living under Assumptions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care and Emotional Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cautious optimism.** Yessenia, family interview: “(An immigrant) It’s a hard-working person; a person that has to go through many things in order to, you know. That’s big in regard for me. Who doesn’t have the same opportunities like the rest.”

The participants noted they moved to a rural area where access to other individuals was limited and interpersonal contact outside the immediate family happened infrequently. The experience of navigating different geographic circumstances, foods, gender expectations, lifestyle expectations and status transitions made the task of immigrating and adjusting a challenge. The participants discussed their experience immigrating to the U.S and the recognition of the difficulty in the move. Ana and Yessenia, collectively and individually, communicated a desire for family members, Americans, and immigrants to understand the challenge intrinsic in
the experience of immigration. In the family interview both participants agreed on statements Yessenia made about immigration expectations that they found important for community members, fellow immigrants or prospective immigrants, and family members to be aware of; Yessenia stated: “be prepared” and “don’t expect it to be a dream moving here.”

When asked, collectively, what advice the participants would give to those considering immigrating to the United States Yessenia reported, “Don’t have always positive expectations, because things aren’t all like they portray them always. You are not just going to come here and next month you’re going to be a documented person, you’re going to live a happy life and that’s it, and you’re going to marry somebody rich, and you’re going to be happy. No it’s not, you know. Since the moment you get here you just get to this wall. The first thing is the culture difference we have with language. Every single thing just shock you, so be aware of that. That will be the first thing, not to have, you know, from the very beginning don’t have positive expectations, you know, too high of expectations. To this Ana remarked, “I think what she’s trying to say is be optimistic but always be careful.”

In this collective interview, it was clear Yessenia and Ana shared the viewpoint that careful consideration and recognition of the reality of immigration is necessary. Ana clarified that immigrating entails, “being careful. Not necessarily hypervigilant, not by any means, that’s totally a totally different condition. But especially to be careful when you’re by yourself. If you don’t know anyone else.”

**Belonging.** Belonging within the context of family and social relationships was discussed in all interviews. Participants discussed finding sources of support in family members and in friendships. Ana also discussed educational settings and finding supportive figures as she attended school. However, Ana and Yessenia shared how these interpersonal contexts additionally challenge their sense of belonging. Ana first shared her experience with friendships
throughout her lifespan and how these relationships have been challenged by her immigrant identity. Ana shared that friendships have been limited by excluding important topics to her from conversation due to friends’ discomfort with the issues, perhaps because they were primarily non-immigrants or could not relate to the experience of immigration. She related:

friendships that I developed, I’m still friends with some of them, but when it comes to talking issues about immigration or race, they avoid those things. They refuse to talk about that with me…They avoid, its taboo, to talk about.

Ana then shared some examples of in educational settings and struggling to find faculty and staff that understood her struggle with adjusting and reached out to help her adapt better to social dynamics and cultural expectations. Ana reported, “It didn’t matter if I told the principal that I was being bullied. It was in our school boys would be boys or they are kids and they didn’t mean any harm. So definitely a lot of my invalidation is there.” In this instance, Ana shared how the lack of support also resulted in her concerns being minimized or downplayed, which she indicated was painful and communicated to her that her feelings or hardship were invalid to the authorities in her educational system. Ana reported experiencing relatively minor instances of invalidation, paired with ongoing feelings of insufficient instrumental and emotional support in educational settings were ongoing difficulties for Ana. Another example she discussed was being asked to explain things in class or to speak for others “like her.”

There were definitely some circumstances too where I would be singled out for a particular issue, people would ask me what my opinion was for things. Sometimes I would be like I don’t know. I would not give you the satisfaction of me telling your story because now you’ll base it on and be like well this person said this, and that’s true for everyone. So now whenever I speak I’m always very clear. This is from my perspective, my lived experiences, and what I know. This doesn’t mean that it applies to everyone. I
definitely set that tone now whenever I speak to someone that way they cannot say that I am speaking on behalf of anyone, because that’s not the case at all. So I’m very clear with that now, because it also kind of helps with the generalizations and stereotypes.

Yessenia also discussed this experience of not wanting to speak on the behalf of all immigrants in the family interview and reported “This is just for me, not for everyone, we are all different and have different experiences.” Yessenia noted the experience of speaking for others who are like her due to immigration status alone caused a difficulty in relating to others. These constant reminders of being separate from the host culture and having an identified identity that is constantly questioned or over-generalized was a theme seemed to be a constant barrier to a sense of belonging in the host culture. Yessenia emphasized her belonging in her family in this quote discussing a family reunion when going back home and her experience speaking with family members saying, “when I go… I feel so isolated from there because when we are in a reunion with them, I don’t feel like I belong there. I feel like in this isolation.” Furthermore, when in the family interview Ana remarked:

The times that the family members that have visited they have been here and they really… the time they have spent in the US has still been like the honeymoon stage, and they actually had someone guiding them to navigate different processes, help them out, let them know how the system works, but that wasn’t the case for us.

Both Ana and Yessenia agreed the family had a changed sense of immigration after having gone through the experience. They both discussed how this difference in perception of the immigration experience made relating to family members more challenging at times. Finally, participants discussed social environments and community belonging. Yessenia shared a story about going to a community meeting and members of the meeting saying, “you should have approached us” and “we didn’t know you were here.” She reported feeling like an outsider in the
community and aware that there is “no way they didn’t see the only Latina woman in the town.”

Ana related about community gatherings and events:

It’s definitely one of those experiences where people invite you for compromise, and not necessarily because they want you there. Or they may invite you because it looks good. And then you kind of know or get the vibe that it’s an inconvenience to have you there. But then at the same time… they may invite you and you kind of turn down the invitation, then sometime in the future they could say, “but we invited you every time. But then you always said no.” That’s something that just started happening recently. So, you know it’s, you also think about what about the other ten years that went by and nothing was done?

The participants expressed feelings of being left out while concurrently taking note of ‘double binds’ in social situations where there is no good choice, so one must choose the best between two or more poor options. Above, Ana is addressing the double bind of knowing an invitation is disingenuous and she may not be truly welcome to something she was invited to attend; but also realizing that not going would result in negative social consequences as well.

**Finding meaning in struggle.** Yessenia: “Strengths I didn’t know I could build; I have.”

Participants discussed themes of meaning making and finding strength and resiliency in the struggle of migrating. These themes arose when asked questions about what it means to be an immigrant, what has been gained due to this identity, and what has been learned or as a result of the immigration experience. As Yessenia reflected on her overall experience immigrating she expressed: “You think…how did this happen? You think, as you go farther…you’re quite proud of yourself, because I overcame that. I’m here. I’m standing still, stronger… Look where she (Ana) is. Look where I am.” Yessenia also noted:

I become more empathetic with people. If I wouldn’t have immigrated I wouldn’t have
any clue how are people skills in this country. I can be more empathetic. You know, I never thought that I was gonna be so emotional or maybe put in somebody else’s shoes, to really know how they are feeling when something happens to them.

In these quotes Yessenia demonstrated her reflection back of what she has gained in her journey adapting to the host culture. She discussed developing empathy for others who struggle and expanding her ability to “walk in someone else’s shoes.” She also discussed the pride she has developed out of her experience being challenged as a person and growing.

Ana and Yessenia discussed how the process of reflecting on the experience of immigrating and adjusting to life in the U.S highlighted strengths, positive support, and meaning they developed as a result of their experiences. Ana noted that she has developed a positive relationship with her identity as an immigrant and stated:

I think that a lot of experiences that I had gone through would not make sense if I did not add the immigrant context. It has been … embedded as far as my identity for like over a decade now, so to really separate myself from that I don’t think is really necessarily any social justice to me or other people who came after me, or even before me, too. Because that would be, I think, negating the experiences that I’ve had.

Ana discussed that her identity as an immigrant has provided a context to understand her life experience and has given a sense of meaning to some of her struggles and strengths as a person. She went on to relate her experience of reflection clarified some of her choices throughout her life. She stated, “For me it was about really reinforcing the decisions I’ve made throughout my life, and basically recognizing myself that I either made a decision that was close to being the best option for me or I was spot-on with a lot of things.” Yessenia also commented on her decision to move her and the increase in opportunities for herself and Ana that happened as a result of immigrating to the U.S. Yessenia commented:
Where I live it hasn’t been easy, but she (Ana) is doing something that she wouldn’t be able… to do in her own life, getting this type of education. One of the causes, I decide to immigrate was, for her and for me to get a better life, a better education. Even me, like I never thought I was going to go back to school, but here I am going back today. Because now regardless of your age, you can do it here. Something that… is so hard to do in (my country).

Yessenia emphasized the increased opportunities and access provided to her and her daughter due to immigration to the U.S. She specifically highlights education and the benefits of increased access to educational resources and institutions in the United States as compared to countries in South America. In her own educational environment, Ana points to the meaning she had created from developing peer support and mentorship relationships with faculty. Ana emphasized the difficulty in finding safe spaces within her university and seeking to educate others in classes and in presentations about immigration. She reported,

I have a very supportive faculty here. Even my program. Sometimes the university doesn’t necessarily do what I hope them to do. But knowing that I have that niche in the university and know that I can come to my apartment and feel safe. I think those are the two things that really keep me going at this point.

**Lifting as we climb.** Ana discussed how she and her mother hope to contribute to the research community and lead other immigrants to increase participation in research to increase knowledge and advocacy. Ana said, “I hope I model people for participating in the future.” Ana also discussed how she sees herself as an advocate who educates others and provides academic presentations on immigration to increase awareness of immigration and humanize the experience. Yessenia also reported a vested interest in humanizing her experience as an immigrant through participation in research and sharing in her community. She shared, “I like to
share, to know that what’s behind my story, behind my person, what was that made me move here. Because I don’t want just to be judged and look at me, “oh, she’s an immigrant.” But they don’t know my story. They don’t know who I am. They don’t know what I went through. So instead of just pointing the finger at me, you know, just think about who (I am) instead.” She further went on to share her interest in her individual interview towards continuing education in clinical counseling “to help other people like me, because I can understand the struggle of coming here.” Yessenia also stated, “I think about all the people who are less lucky or whatever you call. They need a visa, where do they go, when they find themselves in this situation? What is the system for that?”

**Living under assumptions.** Ana and Yessenia discussed the impact of microaggressions, stereotypes and assumptions on their quality of life. In the interviews, the participants related stories of assumptions made about their character, history and interests based upon their appearance and status as a non-European immigrant. Throughout the stories, it was clear assumptions have impacted the participants’ sense of wellbeing and general comfort in social situations both in the host culture and the home culture. Further, both participants reflected on the sense that ‘there is one right way’ in the host culture. The participants remarked on the pressure to look, act, and complete tasks as an American would because the covert message was that it is the only right way. Even if the same results could be achieved with diverse methods or practices. In the family interview, Yessenia stated, “the customs, it is different… sometimes you are used to doing things in a way, and then you find yourself saying that, no, you don’t do that in this way. You do it in the American way.” To which Ana replied, “Even though both of those ways will get you to the same point, or the same result.”

The participants discussed how these messages of a right way and wrong way, determined solely by the cultural norms of the host culture, intersected with micro-invalidations,
stereotypes, and assumptions about their identity and experiences. Yessenia reported ongoing assumptions about her country of origin and the burden of continually explaining her country of origin and rectifying the assumptions of knowledge and culture about the other culture. She said, “what comes to my mind is like the stereotype, “oh, well what part of Mexico are you from?” It’s like they don’t even bother, you know, to ask in a nice way if you are from a different place than Mexico. They just look at you and say, ‘Oh, you’re brown. You are from Mexico’.” One phenomena the participants discussed, both individually and in the family interview, was the experience of the responsibility others placed on them across social and educational settings in both cultures to educate and justify behavior against the established norm of either culture. Furthermore, individuals who remained in the home culture maintained expectations of the experience of immigration that differed from the participants’ lived experience, which the participants reported made it harder for Yessenia to “tell them the details of my experience, because it isn’t what they think.” These concerns resulted in a break within the family for Ana and she stated,

You always have to justify every action or decision you make. It can’t just be a decision you make on your own. You have to justify it and give explanations with it, some type of reason to be accepted…and then two, it’s like, you know, she talked about our struggle to fit in. In my case, after thorough…and careful consideration…I made a decision to not associate myself with them. So when I think of family, I think of my mother, my little brother, and then our pet.

Ana went on to discuss her decisions to make meaning of her family as her immediate relationships to her dog and mother and significant friends. In the above quote she was demonstrating her process of making meaning in her difficulty with finding identity in a new framework for family. Ana had identified family as her close relatives in her home South-
American country and she reported “it was what I knew” but felt alienated in her home with her stepbrothers and stepfather. This lack of goodness of fit resulted in her decision in adulthood to break away from the family she had obtained through marriage and allowed her choice in her family relationships. In this way, Ana demonstrated her agency and her ability to choose her family situation through the meaning she chose to make of family.

**Self-care and emotional support.** The participants found many ways to adapt to their circumstances after immigration. They shared the strengths, modes of thinking and difficulties they hope others can use, or avoid using, to best cope and adapt well into a new host culture. The first of these adaptations they discussed was perseverance and both reported actively maintaining commitment to their individual goals in their individual interviews. In the family interview Yessenia said,

The only thing I could say is never give up. Keep trying. Always be yourself. Don’t try to change. Because in that way you are just losing your identity. You know it’s something that…is us, our identity, wherever you come from.

Ana followed up with her desire to retain her commitment to goals and reframed the need for self-care in her ongoing commitment to goals. She stated,

My advice would be that it’s ok to take breaks and to really listen to your body when you want to rest and you want to kind of rejuvenate again; that is, you know, sleeping or eating something or whatever that may be, just really giving yourself those breaks. And not considering those setbacks. So really in a way to kind of like regain your strength to be able to keep going to whatever your objective may be.

Ana reframed her experience of rejuvenation as a needed break that allowed her to continue pursuing what was most important to her. Yessenia noted the loss of her community,
family and past experiences and reflected on the strength she developed of recognizing that she doesn’t have to share a common hope or idea for her life in America to feel a sense of wellness. She remarked “it’s very hard to immigrate, I leave everything behind. When you immigrate in some ways you feel even though you’re surrounded by a lot of people and you see faces like you don’t share the same hopes and values and you do not have to fit into their hopes.

Yessenia warned about finding emotional support that is sufficient for well-being upon moving to a new country. She discussed her journey developing more support and peers to share her emotional life with as she acculturated. She related her experience and advice:

You don’t have the emotional support that you really need. You don’t know what to do. You don’t know where to go, who to talk to. And uh, the only person I had at the time to talk to was Ana. You know…disappointments that I had with my husband I put on her to, sharing that with her. And I feel that hurt very much to her. And I shouldn’t have never done that. But at the time it was the only one person that I could trust, I still trust. I think it was a lot for a twelve-year-old… Because I didn’t want to call my mom, because maybe she couldn’t understand, or I didn’t want to give her that pain that she would be worried about me. I didn’t know. I mean, there were many emotional struggles.

Through these experiences, Yessenia noted the recognition for the need of emotional supports who understand the experience and who can be trusted with the intimacy of sharing. Ana remarked in her individual interview that her mother and she “shared a lot” and reported the experience of immigration was very different for a teenage girl than a woman immigrating into the role of wife. Ana also noted that her mother and she are beginning to equalize in their experiences of immigration as they share stories and get older. Both participants recognized the intimacy of the sharing and the relationship that came with immigrating together, but each saw it differently in their overall coping.
**Interview observations.** The interviews were conducted over Skype in one day and completed by meeting with mother (Yessenia) while she was in her home in the mid-west then daughter (Ana) at her home in another state. A family interview was conducted via Skype the same day. In the interview with Yessenia her affect was mixed and changed as she discussed the content of each question. She became tearful discussing the experience of leaving her home country, showed facial signs of anger and frustration when she provided examples of the stereotyping and discrimination she faced once she was living in the United States and laughed heartily at her pride and joy of finding ways to get she and her child’s needs met. Her individual interview was rich with stories of perseverance and an overall climate of resilience mixed with worry about any mistakes she may have made that impacted her children negatively. She also discussed a sense of purpose as she shared her experience reconnecting with her own needs and seeking education later in life. She shared her fear that she relied heavily on Ana for support as her only connection to home and concern that Ana “is still so angry.”

Ana’s individual interview was filled with impassioned stories of a young woman who was bullied in her youth, angry for leaving her home country and friends and tasked with adjusting to a new language, culture and people. She noted her experience finding mentors in educational settings and in the workplace as she grew older. Ana shared her anger and resentment at classmates and teachers who pigeonholed her due to her accent or assumptions about her background. Each story ended with a sense of justice and a tie back to her purpose in pursuing her education and advocacy career. Ana’s affect was relatively static throughout the interview and was not punctuated by tears or joyful moments. Furthermore, Ana’s stories were told matter-of-factly and eloquently stated; her tone and rate of speech were quick and factual throughout the interview, regardless of content.

In the two of these interviews, both participants shared their experience in the form of
many stories that demonstrated their experiences, as requested by many of the interview questions. Participants both shared stories of discrimination and talked about their feelings associated with their experience yet did so with different affects. In the family interview Ana would wait for Yessenia to answer the question and then she would speak. Much of what Yessenia would say, Ana would mirror and expand upon with more sophisticated wording and analogies. At times, Yessenia would cue Ana to speak first because she did not have an answer. At times, both interrupted the other to add to a point and both allowed space to hear the other. In this interview both showed a wider range of emotion, with Ana displaying more joking and smiling behaviors and Yessenia displaying more anger/passion and determination-oriented themes and stories. Ana did not speak for Yessenia or try to explain her story to the researcher, except once when she said, “what I think she is trying to say is be hopeful but be careful.” This theme was a common thread throughout both of their stories and it seemed both individuals wanted to be clear on their position about being cautious while acclimating to a new culture and host country, but also be hopeful about the opportunities.
Discussion

The purpose of this research was to explore how immigrants experience acculturation and the process of immigration as individuals and as parts of a family. Through three interviews with two members of a family who immigrated from a South-American country to the United States, I was able to explore the strengths, challenges and meaning made from immigrating to the United States. I was able to discuss and hear about the experience of acculturating from both individual and family interviews with the same family. I interpreted the information through an ongoing reflexive process of discussion, bracketing thoughts, values and reflections throughout the research process and self-reflective statements. Kvale (1995) refers to the process of discussing validity and the development of research materials and the concept of “communication validity” (p. 22). Discussions with committee members and lab members concerning the process of qualitative inquiry and evaluation allowed for unknown biases or assumptions to be brought to my awareness throughout the research process. I also sought to be self-reflective concerning positionality when interviewing and reviewing interview data. Bettez (2015) defines positionality as “the combination of social groups to which one belongs and one’s personal experience (understanding that experience is always individually interpreted, and it is the interpretation that gives an experience meaning).” (p. 943)

These findings suggest the importance of various aspects of the experiences Non-European immigrants may encounter when immigrating to the United States. The findings illuminate personal accounts of strengths and resiliencies developed through the process of immigration and acculturating while also addressing the challenges of the experience. The interviews specifically informed the research questions posed for this study.

The first question concerned how non-European immigrants make meaning of their experiences as immigrants and family members of immigrants. The findings on this suggested
that these immigrants make meaning through developing a sense of belonging, passing on what they know and developing greater community. The findings also suggested meaning making is done through reflection on the past experiences of adapting and immigrating and making sense of the purpose and reasons the events occurred to bring the participants to their current way of being. Furthermore, it was clear from results that meaning making is largely impacted by retrospective meaning making, where the participants look back over past events and evaluate the events that led up to outcomes as stepping stones to the current positive outcome narrative. Both participants discussed events and referenced the theme of stepping stones, or their understanding of events as leading up to current positive outcomes. Participants suggested the events prior to the positive outcome were “meant to be” in the individual and family interviews.

The second question focused on the strengths and resiliencies, in addition to struggles, that immigrants and family members discovered due to immigration. The data from this study suggests the strengths of community involvement, persistence, self-care and bravery are developed in the process of immigration. Both participants discussed the bravery needed to face acculturative stressors, such as language barriers and lack of access to resources and the persistence to continue addressing these difficulties in their daily lives. Self-care strategies were also important developments that allowed the participants to focus on themselves while also striving for their goals and being a part of community. Finally, both participants discussed the desire to ‘give back’ to immigrants and advocate for the needs and stories of immigrants to be better understood.

Finally, the third set of questions explored the shared and unique experiences within the family. The data suggested the family and individual stories develop simultaneously in families where the immigrating members are close and communicative with one another. The unique experience of a family interview was reported by Ana to be “a way we can see how much we
both share in common, because we don’t talk about it together much.” Participants noted that the family dynamic can be overlooked and noted that the collective story was different, experientially, then the individual interviews.

**Interview Overview**

**Ana’s individual interview.** Ana discussed her overall experience as one of difficulty in her teenage years coping with peers and belonging in a new country while learning a new language. She also framed her experiences from the lens of her current educational pursuits in the mental health field. Ana shared many stories of discrimination, marginalization and cultural misunderstandings within the host culture. She specifically noted her efforts to pursue avenues of education to help other immigrants and community members better support immigrants and to find common ground within educational settings. Ana presented a passion for teaching and a sense of independence in her thoughts, which her mother commented on in individual interviews saying “sometimes she is so independent, I worry about her. I don’t want her to become so hard.” Ana placed major focus on self-care and her drive to complete her goals, but also maintain her physical and mental wellbeing by setting boundaries, taking breaks and maintaining relationships that support her growth.

**Yessenia’s individual interview.** Yessenia discussed her overall challenges from a framework of pain and confusion at first immigrating to the United States. She remarked on the experience of adapting and the intersection of geography, gender, family expectations and host culture expectations. Overall, her experience was one of resilience and learning to communicate with her significant other, daughter and society members in a way that allowed her to advocate for herself more effectively. One major source of stress that she was able to overcome over time was her undocumented status and reliance on her partner to marry her so she could attain citizenship, which came at a great economic disadvantage to her, due to the prenuptial agreement.
her forced her to sign. Yessenia remarked that her husband “came around eventually” and supported her decision to attend school to pursue her passion for advocacy and helping other immigrants in the mental health field. However, her experience reflects a consistent report in the literature of expectations for coming to the United States and being met with obstacles that make achievement challenging. The inability to find employment while undocumented and develop financial security has been shown to be a chronic stressor for women who immigrate to the United States (Goodman, Vesely, Letiecq & Cleaveland, 2017.) Immigrants arrive in the United States with the perception that the U.S is a land of opportunity, where hard work and determination result in a better life and economic security (Vesely, Goodman, Ewaida, & Kearney, 2015). Yessenia noted her hardship and feelings of economic insecurity when she was unable to work due to geographic limitations and lack of access due to being undocumented. Her experience is consistent with discussion of the economic challenges other immigrant women faces when met with needing to meet the basic needs of a family versus the access to avenues for the hard work and determination they expected to implement to gain economic security (Goodman et al., 2017).

**Family interview.** Content within the family interview almost exactly reflected content provided in the individual interviews. The family members shared the same stories in both interviews and maintained the emotional tone in both interviews. I expected marked differences in the collective understanding of adapting to immigration and the experience of making meaning in the individuals, yet there were no disparities in report and little to contrast. The family interview provided a clear picture that family identity and individual identity may be very similar in families that have successfully navigated the stressors involved in immigration. The results in this study suggests that this family displays characteristics of bidirectional socialization, wherein the daughter has influenced the mother’s socialization and meaning
making as well as the mother influencing the child. This is consistent with ideas that point to development being reciprocal, rather than unidirectional with parents only influencing children’s beliefs, attitudes and meaning. As Maccoby and Martin (1983) reported, “The emphasis on interaction has led us away from viewing parental behavior as something that is done to children or for children towards the view that it is done with children” (p. 78). This family demonstrated that the beliefs that are held had been created, shared and adjusted over time with Yessenia’s educational pursuits, which impacted her mother’s educational pursuits and their overall meaning structure that shared so many commonalities in language and theme.

The six identified themes that emerged from the interviews below reflect the ways that the participants constructed the idea of adapting to the host society, emphasized their development of strengths and examined the ways in which meaning was made and barriers addressed for the participants individually and in the family unit.

**Belonging**

*To be rooted is perhaps the most important and least recognized need of the human soul.*

*Simone Weil*

Participants in this study discussed the challenges in feeling a sense of belonging after immigration. Both Yessenia and Ana discussed how communities had to be negotiated and evaluated for sensitivity and commonality before the institution or peer group felt safe to engage with for the participants. Belonging, commonly denotes relatedness, connection and membership and is largely concerned with individual evaluation of feeling connected with and cared for within relationships (Ryan, 1995). Belonging is a social concept that has been difficult for scholars to define and the meaning has often been taken for granted or considered self-explanatory (Antonsich, 2010; Mahar, Cobigo & Stuart, 2012). Mahar and colleagues (2012) go on to define belonging after review of literature from 1991 to 2011 to be:
A subjective feeling of value and respect derived from a reciprocal relationship to an external referent that is built on a foundation of shared experiences, beliefs or personal characteristics. These feelings of external connectedness are grounded to the context or referent group, to whom one chooses, wants and feels permission to belong. This dynamic phenomenon may be either hindered or promoted by complex interactions between environmental and personal factors. (p. 1028)

The participants in this study both discussed community and discovering ways to effectively relate to the host community. These results demonstrate the challenges many immigrants face in finding communities that feel inclusive due to differences in values, practices or rituals shared between members. These findings were consistent with the acculturation literature that noted immigrants facing challenges of choosing what to assimilate of the host culture to feel a sense of belonging and at times feeling pushed to discard held beliefs, attitudes and traditions in lieu of the host cultural practices. This family chose to attempt to strike a balance of belonging with the host culture and maintaining a sense of belonging to the home culture, which is consistent with literature discussed earlier concerning bidimensional acculturation, wherein the family maintains connection to both cultures without discarding one for the other (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). They both reported difficulties in finding and developing reciprocal relationships that allowed for a greater sense of belonging and connection within the host society. Studies on belonging suggest people who experience a sense of belonging have increased positive emotions of joy and happiness (Milner & Kelly, 2009), while those individuals with lower experiences of sense of belonging may not get the psychological and physical benefits a strong sense of belonging provides (Pitonyak, 2010). In fact, Pelletier (1994) remarks “a sense of belonging appears to be a basic human need – as basic
as food and shelter. In fact, social support may be one of the critical elements distinguishing those who remain healthy from those who become ill.” (p. 137)

The age of migration is important and affects how immigrants integrate into institutional contexts that provide avenues to belonging (Carling, Menjivar, & Schmalzbauer, 2012). Menjivar (2008) remarked that undocumented status can negatively impact levels of optimism as the immigrant learns that access to opportunities and mobility are limited. Specifically, Yessenia faced difficulties related to her first-generation status, despite her ambitious and successful professional life in the home country. Yessenia remarked on her experience of feeling a disconnection in her belonging to family due to misunderstandings of her experience migrating. She discussed her decision not to let people know the difficulty, because the expectation is “you get married, move to the U.S, and you have it easy.” In many ways, these challenges to belonging point to the participant’s ability to see the ethnic community as an extension of family, wherein duty to family members in the native country and belonging to the larger social group of immigrants motivates and obliges individuals and families to give back to these communities (Weng & Lee, 2016). Participants also discussed the barrier to a sense of belonging that came up when they were being asked to speak for all immigrants or Latino/a individuals. The barrier is two-fold, being reminded of immigrant identity and asked to be a spokesperson can be a constant reminder of difference from the host culture members. Furthermore, the barrier of belonging with the home culture can be experienced by speaking on behalf of all immigrants or Latino/as and providing information that may not reflect all immigrants or individuals of color. For instance, speaking about one’s home culture from an individual contextual position can be overgeneralizing and may paint an unrealistic picture to host culture members about the immigrant experience.

**Finding Meaning in Struggle**
Meaning-focused coping (Folkman, 1997; Park & Folkman, 1997; Folkman & Moskowitz, 2000; Tennen & Affleck, 2002) and making meaning (Hawkins & Hastie, 1990; Kobau et al., 2010; Lindberg, Markman, & Choi, 2013; Park, 2010) are different literature sets that encompass the topic of meaning. Meaning-focused coping examines appraisal of stressful events, addresses benefit finding, benefit reminding and re-ordering of priorities that stems from a positive psychology lens on stress appraisal and response. Making meaning is included within the Meaning-Focused coping literature and addresses both the process of “making sense” and making meaning from stressful life events as well as the outcome, or product, of a “meaning made”, such a story or developed sense of purpose for the events or experiences a person encounters in his or her life. Meaning can be made of traumatic events and can be the narrative of life one tells or asserts to better understand the event (McAdams, & Jones, 2017). Ana and Yessenia found ways to create narratives and meaning form both negative and positive experiences associated with migrating to the U.S. Consistent with meaning-making literature and theory (Park, 2010) the process of making meaning was reported to be stressful by the participants. Yessenia noted her outrage and discouragement at her treatment by community members and the lack of access to resources when she migrated. She went on to explain how she found meaning in her ability to overcome “more than I knew I could.” Ana discussed the struggle of higher education and locating groups that would provide support and growth in her pursuits. She discussed the difficulty of feeling a lack of “fitting in” in many groups throughout school, yet she went on to report that she was able to construct the meaning of her experience as fuel to create and educate people on the importance of these groups in higher educational settings. Clinicians may assist individuals who immigrate through meaning construction that affirms the individual and family stories told and reframes the narrative of the experience in affirming ways, without invalidating the real distress present while people ‘make-meaning’ (Sheikh, 2008). The
participants actively participated in the process of benefit finding, wherein the person notices a new strength and attributes it to the result of a negative life experience (McAdams, & Jones, 2017.) The participants also underwent, and continue to undergo, the development of narrative creation throughout their life, wherein they continually re-engage with meaning making and adjust stories over time. Researchers note this ongoing process of developmental meaning-making highlights the experience of narration as reflective and creative practice that develops meaning in a complex reciprocal system (Fivush, Booker, & Graci, 2017). It is important to consider the participants in this study will continue to re-evaluate, narrate, and ascribe meaning to these qualitative accounts over time. Clinicians would benefit from the recognition that memory and narrative is reciprocal and not fixed. The participants in this study alluded to the evolving nature of their account of immigration and noted the shift in perspective and ascribed meaning as time and circumstances shifted their re-telling and memory of events.

Lifting as We Climb

Yessenia and Ana remarked on their desire to give back to other immigrants and the larger community of South-American individuals. They discussed the motivation and drive they both felt for higher education and the necessity of sharing their story to better help others in similar circumstances. Hoffman et al. (2007) found that individuals show a stronger sense of community when they contribute to the cause of others. The experience of volunteering has also shown to enhance social capital and increase integration into the host country (Handy & Greenspan, 2009). The strength and resiliency to work towards contributing to the U.S and perceptions of immigration as well as the support of immigrants coping with migrating was paramount to the experiences reported by the participants. For example, Yessenia and Ana spoke in both the family interview and individual interviews about their desire to “participate in research to help other immigrants” and increase awareness of the immigrant experience. Weng
and Lee (2016) discussed how one factor contributing to the formation of ethnic identity for immigrants is being different from others and that difference being reinforced by interactions with host society members. Consistent with the findings in this study, participants were constantly being questioned about their racial and ethnic backgrounds while interacting with new people. To maintain a sense of cultural belonging and ethnic identity rooted in belonging, the participants created opportunities to support individuals with similar experience. For Ana and Yessenia, they have reached out into communities to find individuals who have experienced migration and developed peer groups and educational outlets that support their efforts to enhance understanding and increase positive outcomes for immigrants.

**Living Under Assumptions**

One of the greatest challenges reported was adjusting to different cultural norms of the host culture while concurrently navigating learning a new language. Both participants, individually and within the family interviews, discussed the assumptions community members and family members made about their experience as individuals who immigrated to the United States. A large part of immigrating is adapting to the host culture’s expectations of ethnic groups and may become more challenging for individuals from a native country that differs significantly from the host country (Sodowsky, Kwan, & Pannu, 1995).

They discussed the difficulty of living with assumptions (i.e., stereotypes, prejudice) associated with their immigrant status, language ability, intelligence and overall personhood. The participants negotiated contact points in educational settings, peer groups, local communities and home culture throughout their lives after immigrating. Allport (1954) introduced the intergroup contact hypothesis, wherein he theorized that increased contact between ethnic groups near one another would increase knowledge of the other group and decrease prejudice under specific conditions, “i.e., if the person had equal status contact between majority and minority
groups in the pursuit of common goals”; the contact is sanctioned by customs, laws and institutional support, and seeks to find commonality between the members of the two groups.” p. 281). Ongoing research supports that intergroup contact, under certain circumstances, can lead to prejudice reduction (Binder et al., 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and increased knowledge can be a mediating variable between prejudice and intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008.) The intergroup contact theory is consistent with the information both participants provided in the interviews. For instance, Yessenia discussed how her contact with community members grew to decrease her prejudice of them and increase her understanding as she increased contact over time. Ana reported a similar mutual increase in knowledge and decrease in prejudice as she negotiated higher education settings and found locations where she could have a bidirectional knowledge increase with certain peer groups and faculty members. These reports resonate with the literature which indicates that certain circumstances can allow for knowledge through contact to decrease prejudice. The important factor to consider in this study was the participant’s need to find community members who were willing to acknowledge difference and allow knowledge to increase. Participants expressed the experience of finding people who were unwilling to grow their knowledge base, even when these people were in close proximity to participants. It is important to consider how intergroup contact can best be supported and facilitated for immigrants and communities that gain immigrants. Participants indicated finding communities that were open to receiving contact with them was both difficult and rewarding to establish. These results indicate immigrants may be tasked with identifying receptive community members while concurrently encountering and addressing assumptions and microaggressions that occur as individuals from host communities learn more about immigrants. Research points to microaggressions and impacting mental health. Araujo and Borrell (2006) found that perceived discrimination positively correlating with higher occurrences of depression and stress, lower
levels of well-being and lower levels of personal agency. Furthermore, chronic stressors such as micro aggressive assumptions and negatively impact the wellbeing of individuals of color (Araujo & Borrell, 2006; Harrell, 2000). Specifically, Sue and colleagues (2007) suggest frequent and enduring micro-stressors can be more harmful than acute stressors due to the cumulative nature and chronicity of the exposure. I defined these as “brief and commonplace daily verbal or behavioral indignities, whether intention or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults that potentially have a harmful or unpleasant psychological impact on the target person or group” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273 )

Researchers and educators should continue to examine ways in which they can facilitate community awareness about contact with individuals who differ from themselves.

**Self-Care and Emotional Support**

Consistent with the literature on acculturation, this study points to the presence of acculturative stress associated with many dimensions of adjusting to immigrating. The host culture and culture-of-origin may have competing demands that cause conflict for individuals trying to navigate maintaining both cultures (Wang et al., 2010). Acculturative stress is not inevitable for all immigrants (Lueck & Wilson, 2010). Factors such as age, education level, socioeconomic status, language proficiency in host and culture-of-origin, cognitive styles, and prior experiences with the host culture can work as buffers or stressors that impact immigrants’ experience. For instance, one participant moved to the United States with limited language proficiency, limited access to social support and experienced relational challenges which made her vulnerable to acculturative stress and impacted her well-being upon moving. However, her cognitive style combined with her experience managing limited resources effectively throughout her career in her home South-American country allowed her to be flexible and navigate the challenges listed above to cope with the stressors of immigration. Acculturation is multi-faceted.
This study illustrated the need for social support for participants as one important element to consider in acculturation. Specifically, these findings are consistent with literature that suggests greater social support reduces risk for acculturative stress when immigrants have access to cultural organizations, extended family members and agencies that welcome and support immigrants (Williams & Berry, 1991; Yeh & Inos, 2003). Furthermore, these studies suggest that immigrants who immigrate to host cultures with pluralistic attitudes have less acculturative stress than do those individuals who immigrate to societies with assimilationist attitudes (Lueck & Wilson, 2010; Williams & Berry, 1991). Both participant’s reports of difficulty navigating the change in familial and peer support and difficulties they each faced gaining English language proficiency were consistent with findings suggesting these stressors negatively impact psychological well-being (Kirmayer et al., 2011).

**Conclusion for Themes**

This research highlighted issues of struggles and resilience as experienced by the participants. Overall, both interviewees developed a strong value in community, advocacy, self-agency, self-care, family values, and balance between host culture needs, individual needs and family needs. In this study the participants, separately and collectively, made meaning from their experiences that allowed them to continue striving, maintain hope and maintain a plan for action to increase their well-being and that of community members. It seems the meaning came from a sense of purpose to self, family, immigrants in the US and the immigrant identity. It seems the only difference in family meaning made and individual meaning-made was the stance the individuals take to develop meaning. Ana had a greater sense of reported urgency and reported more stories with undertones of anger and frustration at community members. Yessenia reported frustration at geography and her marriage but focused more on the ways those experiences led to a sense of hope and commitment to long term education.
Latino Mental Health

Immigration from Latin America totaled nearly 500,000 in the 1950s and it reached 4.2 million during the 1990s, making up 44 percent of the entire immigrant flow as a result of the Hart-Cellar Act (Massey & Pren, 2012). Latinos are one of the largest ethnic minorities in the United States and are expected to comprise 30% of the population by 2060 (Colby & Ortman, 2015). The term Latino is challenging, as it covers a wide range of diversity and tends to encompass many presentations of individuals (Castañeda, 2008). Many individuals of South American descent have emigrated to the United States in search of greater economic opportunities in addition to increased safety (International Organization for Migration, 2018). Some South American countries, which were once central destinations for immigrants all over the world to move to, became places that people were leaving at unprecedented rates between 1990 and 2007 (International Organization for Migration, 2006). Many of the immigrants from South America attained high levels of education prior to immigrating. When they leave their countries, the human capital of educated workers, leaders and citizens is reduced. These issues can impact the economy and culture of both home culture and United States culture. These educated immigrants may come with skills that were valuable, sought after and earned in home culture, yet be unable to apply them due to language barriers or differences in educational systems from country to country. When skilled migrants leave the home country the home culture can be negatively impacted by the loss of skilled individuals who are important to both economy and infrastructure. South American immigrants choose to leave their country to increase options for economy, safety, financial stability or to seek new cultural opportunities in conditions where the cultural messages may be harmful or difficult to manage (Takenaka & Pren, 2010). For instance, some South American countries may emphasize upward mobility, economic gain or emphasize sadness. However, when individuals and families immigrate to the United
States, they face the cultural norms that permeate the society. Terms, stereotypes and assumptions concerning immigrants, national identity and language create challenges to adaptation and decrease access to the opportunities that originally motivated the immigration process.

Historically, the term *Hispanic* was developed by the Bureau of the Census in 1970 to classify people of Spanish origin, which became the grouping under which all Spanish-speaking individuals have been placed by default (Comas Diaz, 2001). These continual groupings have led to further generalization of individuals who speak Spanish as their primary language and ongoing assumptions of commonality in largely diverse groups of people. Further, Smart and Smart (1995) discussed the context that many Latino immigrants come from home countries with people of mixed heritage and race. The categorization as *Latino* or *Hispanic* is neither the preference of Latino individuals, nor the way these individuals self-identify (Pew Research Center, 2012). Specifically, National survey data revealed that 51% of Latinos prefer to self-identify by nationality, 24% prefer to use Hispanic or Latino, and 21% prefer the term Americano (Pew Research Center, 2012). These nearly constant difficulties around self-identification and experiences of marginalization, can result in negative mental health outcomes for Latinx immigrants.

Among Latinx immigrants, acculturative stress has been consistently associated with increased anxiety and depressive symptoms (Revollo, Qureshi, Collazos, Valero, & Casas, 2011; Salas-Wright, Robles, Vaughn, Córdova, & Pérez-Figueroa, 2015; Sirin, Ryce, Gupta, Rogers-Sirin, 2013). To complicate the picture of mental health, research has demonstrated that greater identification with Latinx culture relative to mainstream American culture may be associated with negative experiences of social and environmental stressors (Caplan, 2007; Perez & Fortuna, 2005). These experiences of discrimination and negative experiences of life events associated
with acculturation can lead to a sense of a lack of control and the experience of feeling as though one must withhold aspects of one’s identity when they conflict with the host culture’s ideas of identity (Kim, 2002; Weber, Appel, & Kronberger, 2015). To compound those difficulties, Falicov (1998) noted that Latinx culture is described as collectivistic and places the family life in a central position to the communities and lives of individuals. The participants discussed ideas of familismo, referring to the emphasis on wellbeing of the collective family unit over that of the individual (Añez, Paris, Bedregal, Davidson, & Grilo, 2005; Falicov, 1998). When families undergo migration, the concept of familismo may be challenged and the core family community forced to rebuild and transform or challenge the expectations for mutual reciprocity when they go unfulfilled due to limited economic or emotional resources (Hurtado-de-Mendoza, Gonzales, Serrano, & Kaltman, 2014). Yessenia and Ana discussed the concepts of the idea of family being challenged, transformed and shifted, yet both came back to the sense of familismo and a focus on their immediate family’s interwoven success and health. Ayon and Villa (2013) found that it is important that families transmit their culture and continue to promote wellbeing through a sound sense of a Latinx cultural orientation. Researchers found that families that exhibit strong Latinx cultural orientation had a strong sense of familismo which promoted a strong sense of support, guidance, protection against stress, and protection from mental health problems (Ayon, Marsiglia, & Bermudez-Parsai, 2010; Ayon & Villa, 2013; Benhke, MacDermid, Coltrane, Parke, Duffy, & Widaman, 2008; German, Gonzalez, & Dumka, 2009). Anzaldúa and Keating (2002) coined the phrase entre fronteras to address the concept of living between borderlands. Latinx individuals are tasked with navigating several cultures at the same time, the borderlands (Keating, 2006). Latinx immigrants may also struggle with the challenge of living with the label Latino (Quintana & Scull, 2009), when this does not account for the heterogeneous nature of
Latino/as who come from a multitude of different heritages and nations, with different cultural norms.

**Implications for Clinical Practice**

Immigrants coming to the United States often arrive with dreams of greater educational opportunities for themselves and future generations, greater economic opportunities and less exposure to war and violence. These expectations can provide a source of hope and disheartenment when immigrants come to the U.S. It is important for clinicians to better understand these expectations and the individual experience of how expectations differed or resembled the reality. The participants in this study illuminated the experience of making meaning of an immigrant experience that differed from the story family members in the native culture expect and accept. Clinicians should focus clinical attention on the contextualized immigration story that may or may not have layers of acculturation as it is understood in the western frame of reference.

These interviews provided rich, contextualized accounts of life adapting to a host culture and a glimpse of the depth of information concerning the experience of immigration. The implications for clinical practice with immigrants points to a recognition of the story and the experience as well as the far-reaching effects of adjusting to host culture and home culture. The stories told took hours of recollection through experiences and themes related to questions. The questions asked were framed in a deliberate format to increase story-telling and seek for strengths and resiliency, rather than pathology. Future clinicians can gather contextualized, rich stories by asking appropriate questions in intake and throughout therapy. Silva, Paris, and Anez (2017) outline a method for intake assessment that provides the questions clinicians can ask to elicit rich, contextualized accounts of immigration in both Spanish and English. The article also provides empirical evidence on the need for this kind of assessment in clinical practice. The
complexities that emerged in this family were displayed in the interview due to time and willingness of both participant and researcher to hear the unexpected, expected and unaccounted-for elements of adaptation after immigrating across generations. The stories Yessenia shared about being in a rural area and having limited access to people in general, provide an important consideration for the intersectionality of geography and immigration status come together to create either positive or negative conditions for well-being. Ana’s account of finding mentors and ways to access her power through her ability to share her story showed ways in which immigrants find personally meaningful ways to relate to host culture and enrich the tapestry of knowledge shared between people in an intercultural setting. These aforementioned complexities emerged when the participants were given the opportunity to discuss the individual and family experience in depth. Stories are important. To fully understand acculturation, immigration and resilience from people who have experienced it over a lifespan, it is imperative that researchers create spaces where participants are encouraged to share personal phenomena.

When considering the context of these individuals in the study, it is also important to note that the participants immigrated from a relatively large diverse city in a South American country. However, they may not have ever had to identify themselves racially or ethnically, due to the relatively homogenous societies they came from originally. Rumbaut (2008) referenced this reflexive ethnicity as a common adaptation to the discrimination, microaggressions and exclusion experienced by non-dominant racial and ethnic individuals. Weng and Lee (2016) suggested it may be helpful for practitioners to recognize that recent immigrants are adjusting in multiple ways, including their new ethnic identities in the host country. Practitioners may increase focus on examining identity development and the implications of homogenous native cultures versus host societies that ask individuals to identify themselves through their race or ethnic background.
Themes of belonging, meaning-making and giving back to community were hugely important to the participants. Future clinical practice may focus on developing a sense of meaning and connecting clients to communities that provide adequate and meaningful social support. Vesely, Goodman, Ewaida, and Kearney (2013) suggested service providers can assist immigrant families in developing social networks among parents in similar circumstances and help them learn how to functionally navigate institutional systems to find support in the host culture.

The theme of Living under Assumptions addressed the ongoing challenge of coping with discrimination, stereotypes and assumptions placed on the participants. Discrimination can be a form of trauma (Harrell, 2000). Culture-centric models of healing may be appropriate to help individuals coping with ongoing discrimination. This form of therapeutic intervention may be specifically useful with immigrants who experience the discrimination consistently simply being in a host cultural setting and feeling a sense of lack of belonging and social interactions that tend to be assumptive due to their identity. Gone (2013) discussed a model of culture-as-treatment to assist clients in facing trauma and stress related to their cultural, ethnic and religious identities. Clients may be feeling a sense of betrayal when they arrive to the United States expecting social services support, access to opportunities and government support. Goodman, Vesely, Letiecq, and Cleaveland (2017) also discussed the sentiment raised by Watkins and Shulman (2008) suggesting clinicians can further assist clients in developing communities of resistance, wherein community members can join to question, reject and challenge oppression and increase empowerment through advocacy. The most important part of any clinical practice will be the ability to modify and adapt treatment to meet the needs of clients in individualized ways that address the multiple identities of the client, the adaptation/migration process, and the environment. Integrative treatment strategies that utilize multiple intervention types based on the
contextual needs of the patient may be clinically indicated to better address specific needs and concerns that one treatment strategy or intervention could miss. It is important for clinicians not to gloss over discussions of ethnicity, immigration and language in intake and throughout treatment (Silva et al., 2017). Many of the examples participants listed of experiencing discrimination were not direct assaults on their experience as immigrants, but rather microaggressions such as being left out of conversations, excluded in activities, or not asked how their experience may differ from that of non-immigrants in important conversations. Based on the report from participants, psychological intervention calls for a space where the conversations about differences in experience from non-immigrants is brought up by the clinician in continuous assessment and organically in conversation to assure attention is paid to the impact of immigration and not diminished due to silence on the topic because it may not be directly spoken about by clients.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

Little research has been completed that examines first and second-generation individuals’ experience with acculturation, meaning-making and immigration from their perspective. Further, research has not focused on the family meaning-making versus individual meaning making process. This study sought to understand the participants’ lived experience of immigrating and living in a new setting, how they made sense of the experience and what strengths and challenges they faced in immigrating. The study further sought to understand acculturation from an individual and family lens of the participants to better understand the definition and application of the construct of acculturation. As the United States continues to expand with individuals who come to the country from all over the world, it is crucial that mental health providers, researchers and educators better understand the lived experience of immigration and acculturation thereafter. This study provides the perspective of one family, through the lens of both family and individual
interviews who have successfully obtained citizenship in the United States. This choice of participants provides a multifaceted account of two women who have had to navigate different challenges in immigrating, such as geographical access, stereotyping, language barriers, bi-culturalization, relationship conflicts and separation from their native culture and family members. The participants were also chosen based on high scores in well-being to provide insight into the resiliencies and strengths of immigration and meaning-making informed by those who have adapted successfully. A qualitative approach was chosen to allow for rich information from a phenomenological perspective of the participants to explore their personal experience of immigration and meaning-making. This method facilitated a depth of data and reflection that cannot be obtained using qualitative methodology.

An area of consideration for future studies would be incorporating a more intentional narrative lens. The researcher began with a meaning-focused coping and phenomenological analysis structure to the interviews. However, much of the data was related to personal accounts and stories. Literature on narrative meaning making points to the usefulness of studies that consider longitudinal meaning made and the examination of the participants’ experience over time and life span (Fivush, Booker, & Graci, 2017; Habermas & Kober, 2015). Future studies would benefit from utilizing a narrative framework to evaluate qualitative data from interviews to gain information over time and lifespan of participants.

In conclusion, immigration is a topic that clinicians may recognize impacts individuals and families, yet these topics may be overlooked in therapeutic settings unless specifically assessed in an ongoing process. The participants in this study shared hardship, triumph and trauma associated with their experience adapting to life in the United States. Clinicians that are attentive to the relationship between these shared hardships, triumphs and trauma as it relates to immigration history will have increased understanding of the interplay between migrant
experience (current, pre-migration and post migration) and the impact on psychological health. This study illuminated the need for contextualized, informed treatment that examines pathology as well as resilience and strengths associated with acculturation.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Summary Table of Selected Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Abbreviated Title</th>
<th>Focus (Variables, Keywords, Population, etc.)</th>
<th>Source (Article, Chapter, Book, Presentation, etc.)</th>
<th>Type (Conceptual, Review, Empirical, Biography, etc)</th>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Understanding Acculturation Among Second-Generation South Asian Muslims in the United States.</td>
<td>Acculturation and immigration, stress</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Study on Second-generation South Asian Muslims. Author discussed acculturation as a dynamic process, rather than a more linear process wherein individuals become increasingly acculturated over time. Author posited that individuals can become less acculturated or &quot;de-acculturate&quot; based on peer group involvement. Author conceptualized and defined the terms acculturationists, partial acculturationists and de-acculturationist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arends-Toth &amp; Van de Vijver</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Acculturation Attitudes: A Comparison of Measurement Methods</td>
<td>Acculturation, acculturative strategies</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Authors examined the differences in acculturation strategies of Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands in Public versus private domains. Study found that Turkish culture was favored in private domains while both cultures were valued in public domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger &amp; Weiss</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Immigration and Post-Traumatic Growth: A Missing Link</td>
<td>Meaning-Making, immigration as opportunity</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Conceptual review</td>
<td>Authors note tendency of research that focuses on pathology rather than immigration emphasized as an opportunity for personal growth. Authors provide a conceptualization of immigration as opportunity for increased social and personal freedom, increased autonomy, increased understanding of the world, increased empathy and increased self-respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berger &amp; Weiss</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Posttraumatic Growth in Latina Immigrants.</td>
<td>Meaning-Making, posttraumatic growth, Latinx</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Study of Latina immigrants the measured levels of stress and posttraumatic growth. Findings suggests moderate levels of stress and high endorsement of posttraumatic growth. Authors found level of posttraumatic growth was related to participation in counseling services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottrell</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Understanding &quot;marginal&quot; perspectives towards a social theory of resilience.</td>
<td>Resilience and well-being, children, culture</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Conceptual Review</td>
<td>Author challenges the dominant approaches to resilience research, suggesting that the focus on the individual and the dichotomizing of responses to risk as resilient or psychopathological in an attempt to find normative criteria fails to recognize the importance of cultural diversity and social positioning in resilience making. Looking at research and testimony of kids, the author suggests that certain behaviors that may otherwise be considered dysfunctional serve to protect an individual in certain cultural circumstances, meaning more traditional analysis of resilience would fail to recognize the individuals adaptivity. Author further pushes for a refocusing of research on how larger social context affects individual resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Latinos, Acculturation and Acculturative Stress: A Dimensional Concept Analysis</td>
<td>Immigration, Immigrant Paradox, and acculturation</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Conceptual review</td>
<td>Author discussed the Immigrant Paradox-A phenomenon noted in public health where recent Latino immigrants show better health outcomes than Latino immigrants who have resided in the U.S for a longer period. Author examines acculturation and acculturative stress within the context of race and ethnicity and notes how acculturation experiences differ based on ethnic identification. New immigrants cited family separation and lack of community as primary sources of acculturative stress as well as discrimination based on ethnicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Because You’re</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>The author attempts to establish the extent to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mine I Walk the Line: The Trials and Tribulations of the Family Visa Program**

Immigration legislation theoretical which the current visa program in America puts extra stress on immigrant families and exacerbates its own undocumented immigrant situation. The prodigious backlog of visa applicants, along with the difficulty and capriciousness with which one can qualify for a visa, leads to increased stress on immigrant families, increased chances of separation for long periods, and an increased chance of illegal immigration. The author suggests that short of whole-scale immigration reform, the emphasis should be on more expansive interpretation of current immigration legislation. The author admits that eventually a full-scale reform of the visa petition process will be needed and makes suggestions for approaches to this. One being to push to be able reinstate a petition after the petitioner is deceased. And another to redefine unlawful presence to protect minors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>An Overview of Stressors faced by immigrants and Refugees</td>
<td>Immigration, generation status</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Education outcomes affected by generation status. These impacts also differ based on race and ethnicity. First and second-generation youth significantly outperformed future generations in educational outcomes (third, fourth, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>Reprint of 1903: The Soul of Black Folks: Essays and Sketches</td>
<td>Biculturation, African American</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Author discussed biculturation and the concept of split selfhood experienced as “double consciousness” in one of his essays. Author discussed his experience as an African American man living in the post-slavery era of the United States and negotiating bicultural identity through collected sketches and essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falicov</td>
<td>Immigrant Family Processes: A Multidimensional Framework</td>
<td>Immigration, culture, positive adjustment</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>Author proposes an alternative to the common deficit-oriented model of immigrants living between their old and their new world, suggesting there are ‘both/and’ solutions to the personal, familial, and social choices forced by cultural change. Rather than gradual acculturation or biculturation, the author suggests that many families can live between their two worlds by altering their practices, rituals, and cultural codes depending on their current context, forming a sort of hybrid culture. This is helped along by the highly connected modern world, where immigrants are no longer forced to abruptly leave their home but can rather maintain strong ties to the family and culture that they left. The author also recognizes the emergence of what she calls “immigrant resilient practices” or “spontaneous rituals” which help to form these hybrid cultures by ritualizing attempts at familial, social and cultural restitution in the family’s new context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falicov</td>
<td>Latino Families in Therapy: 2nd Edition</td>
<td>Migration and Meaning-making, family</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>Conceptual Review</td>
<td>Author lays out three of the more concrete and observable disruptions to families' and individuals' sense of meaning or belonging that occur during migration as well as the concomitant psychological and potential clinical manifestations that result. Author claims migration threatens an entire system of meaning, namely in three ways: Physically, socially, and culturally. Physical replacement destroys the idea of a “home base”, where even people's faces and voices are familiar, and disrupts the individual and family processes which are affected by physical location. All of these things would normally affect a sense of “rootedness, empowerment, ownership, safety, and identity.” Socially, migration rips one out of their network and relationships, furthering a sense of alienation, isolation, and marginality. Culturally migration threatens meaning by stripping away one's way of thinking and acting in the world and demanding they take on a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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new way of being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title of Publication</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folkman &amp; Moskowitz</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Coping: Pitfalls and Promise</td>
<td>Stress and coping</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>García, Coll, Lamberty, Jenkins, McAdoo, Crnic, Wasik, &amp; Vázquez García</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children</td>
<td>Family, Marginality, Social Stratification</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstein</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Methods of Family Research</td>
<td>Research Methods, family, qualitative research</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Family worlds and qualitative family research: Emergence and prospects of whole-family methodology.</td>
<td>Family, Meaning making, Qualitative research</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the family. This is a switch to an essentially qualitative approach to whole-family research, which the author argues is essential due to the multi-faceted nature of a family’s meaning-making and the larger social context within which it resides. The author suggests that this whole-family methodological approach has had the benefit of provide some framework to use in thinking about whole-family research, namely the five family processes laid out in Family Worlds.

Hess & Handel 1959 Family Worlds: A psychosocial Approach to Family Life. Family, Family processes, meaning-making Book Chapter Conceptual Review The authors discuss how their research led to their theory of five family processes which constitute how a family develops their unique identity. Authors posit that no one member of a family - or even one relationship within a family - is a sufficient source of information for that family, but rather family identities come from 1) working out a pattern of individuality and connectedness 2) Developing a congruence of image for each family member based on shared testimony 3) Establishing a family theme or locus of concern 4) Establishing family boundaries 5) And learning to deal together and alone with other biosocial issues; e.g. age and sex.

Hussain & Bhushan 2011 Posttraumatic Stress and Growth Among Tibetan Refugees: The Mediating Role of Cognitive-Emotional Regulation Strategies. Meaning-Making, refugees, stress, positive psychology Article Empirical Study of first and second-generation Tibetan refugees living in India. Females in this sample scored higher on measures of trauma, posttraumatic stress and posttraumatic growth. First generation participants scored significantly higher on personal strength, positive re-appraisal and spiritual change indices. Second generation participants scored significantly higher on the "new possibilities" index.

Kia-Keating 2009 Immigrants and Refugees in the U.S.: Overlaps and Distinctions Immigration, stress, acculturation APA bulletin Conceptual Review Bulletin reviews phases of immigrant and refugee experience including, pre-migration, migration and post-migration. Author discusses differ stressors at each stage. Such as reasons for leaving home country in the pre-migration stage, difficulty meeting needs during migration due to difficulty of process, and economic and social stressors in the post-migration stage. Author notes each stage has unique challenges and increases risk for mental health problems related to stress and migration.

Kitayama & Cohen 2007 Handbook of Cultural Psychology Acculturation, multicultural identities, biculturation Book Review Chapter 13 addresses multicultural identities as well as acculturation. The author notes the multidimensional nature of acculturation and that acculturating can be navigated through many strategies including integration, alternation or synergy. Author notes that individuals can employ these strategies in different contexts to adapt to changing environments. Integration refers to the blending of identities into one coherent identity. Alternation refers to switching between cultural identities depending on context. Synergy refers to the creation of new identities based on the intersection of other held identities.

LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton 1993 Psychological impact of biculturalism: evidence and theory Biculturation, cultural adjustment, stress, well-being Article Conceptual Review Authors review cultural acquisition models and suggest researchers and clinicians depart from linear models of cultural adjustment. Authors completed a review of the literature on the psychological impacts of being bicultural. Authors address the past research that assumed living between two cultures was difficult; creating identity confusion and psychological discomfort. Authors suggest creation and maintenance of a relationship with both cultures can be healthy and demonstrate competency in both cultures. Authors suggest bicultural competence will lead to well-
**Lueck & Wilson 2010**  
**Acculturative Stress in Asian Immigrants: The Impact of Social and Linguistic factors**  
Asian immigrants, Acculturation, discrimination  
Article  
Empirical  
Study on sample of over 200 Asian immigrants and Asian Americans, researchers found high English language proficiency and native language proficiency, preference for bilingual language, and family cohesion were predictive of low acculturative stress. High levels of discrimination were predictive of high acculturative stress.

**Massey 2010**  
**Immigration Statistics for the 21st century**  
immigration, statistics, and data collection  
Article  
Review  
Author discussed difficulty of calculating statistics due to census data lacking appropriate questions. Birthplace questions were removed in 1970, making it difficult to identify second generation immigrants in the data. Cited the need for questions concerning parental birthplace, better understanding of undocumented population and impact on census data. Author provides history of authorized and unauthorized immigration from Mexico.

**McCubbin & McCubbin 1988**  
**Typologies of Resilient Families: Emerging Roles of Social Class and Ethnicity**  
Resilience, family stress, coping, health  
Article  
Review  
The authors seek to further the line of theory and research of resilience in family by analyzing the research done in the Family Stress, Coping and Health project conducted at the university of Wisconsin. Looking at one study, the authors conclude that normative family stresses are best facilitated by the individual strengths of the family member but with an underlying theme of family ritual and routine serving to characterize and stabilize the family unit. The authors also examined family typologies, specifically rhythmic typologies and regenerative typologies. Rhythmic families are high in family ritual and routine, while also being high in valuing that ritual and routine time together. Families tend to become less rhythmic as children go from children to adolescents. Regenerative families are high in family hardiness and cohesion and appear to be evenly distributed across typology and life stage. Authors conclude that there is an unfortunate dearth of research focused on ethnic differences or prevention.

**Oetting & Beauvais 1991**  
**Orthogonal Cultural Identification Theory: The Cultural Identification of Minority Adolescents**  
Biculturation, Native American and Mexican American Adolescents, development  
Article  
Conceptual, theoretical  
A theory of cultural identification with different cultures is orthogonal. Theory suggests cultural identification dimensions are independent of one another and not opposed to one another where one identification must decrease for the other to increase. Studies were conducted of Native American and Mexican American adolescents showed: “identification to Anglo (White American) culture is related to having Anglo friends and to family acceptance of an Anglo marriage, (2) identification with either the minority or the majority culture is a source of personal and social strength, and (3) this greater strength, however, does not translate automatically into less drug use, because drug use is related to how much the culture that the person identifies with approves or disapproves of drugs.”

**Padilla 2006**  
**Bicultural Social Development**  
bicultural, cultural competency, acculturation  
Article  
Review  
Author discussed bicultural development and early conceptualizations of cultural competency. Author posited that exposure to two cultures does not necessarily lead to pathology, though adjusting may be difficult. Author discussed Park-Stonequist model of the “marginal man” and compared it to a model of biculturation that emphasized possibility of positive outcomes, rather than mental health problems. Author discussed bicultural competence, wherein an individual can participate in both cultures equally and competently. Author suggested when conflict or maladjustment arises it
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Study Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pan, Wong, Chan, &amp; Joubert</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Meaning of Life as A protective Factor of Positive Affect in Acculturation: A Resilience Framework and cross-Cultural Comparison</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Chinese Migrants, Resilience, acculturative stress, and well-being are important to re-affirm bicultural identity rather than assume irreparable pathology. Authors studied mainland Chinese migrants in Hong Kong and Australia and found that meaning in life predicted positive affect. Meaning of life also mediated the relationship between acculturative stress and positive affect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Making Sense of the Meaning Literature: An Integrative Review of Meaning Making and its effects on adjustment to stressful life events.</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Meaning making, stress, coping. Author discusses and how stressful life events challenge global meaning of belief, values and thoughts that have endured over time. Author notes distress stems from appraisal of discrepancy between global meaning and event. A subsequent meaning making process occurs to reduce discrepancy and restores a sense of global meaning (meaning made outcome). Article provides evidence for the model and limitations to the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Folkman</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Meaning in the Context of Stress and Coping</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Meaning making, stress, coping. Author proposes an integrative model of meaning making by extending the transactional model of stress and coping to include Meaning Focused Coping. Authors note differences in global meaning: enduring beliefs, values and assumptions about the world and situational meaning: meaning formed in the relationship between current life circumstances and global meaning. Authors note situational appraisal is the initial appraisal and is influenced by global meaning. Authors discuss three components of situational meaning: appraisal of meaning, search for meaning, and meaning as an outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbaut</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ages, Life Stages and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States.</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Generation, immigration, terminology. Author defines terms &quot;first&quot; and &quot;second&quot; generation immigrants and discussed use in empirical research. Author discusses lack of consensus in literature regarding identifying &quot;second&quot; generation immigrants and the distinction between children of immigrants and those who immigrated to the U.S as children. Author discussed age at immigration and developmental stage upon immigration as factors to consider when conceptualizing and labeling immigration generations. Author concludes more precise definitions are needed in the empirical literature for generation status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga &amp; Szapcznik</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rethinking the Concept of Acculturation: Implications for Theory and Research</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Generation, Immigration, stress and biculturation. Authors argue for a reconceptualization of acculturation that provides a multidimensional view and considers the confluence of home culture and host cultural values. Authors argue that both unidimensional and dimensional models are outdated in conceptualizing cultural interactions bidirectionally. Authors argue an effective model of acculturation would be one that takes types of migration (immigration, refugee, asylum seeker), ethnicity, and cultural similarity to host culture into consideration. They also discuss the importance of considering age of immigration, language, and context of reception by host culture or community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprey</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Extending the Range of Questioning in Family Studies Through Ideas from the Exact Sciences</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Family, social relationships. Article discusses the field of family studies and theoretical abstraction to move the research base forward. Authors suggest implementing focus of questioning from individual to social relationships. Authors define and discuss potential benefits in three concepts: attractors, nonlinearity and chaos to lead conversation to process the underpinning beliefs and concepts beneath family and marriage through questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suarez-Orozco</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Migration Between and within Countries: Implications for Families and Acculturation.</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suarez-Orozco and Carhill</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>New Directions in Research with Immigrant Families and their Children</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Conceptual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teodorescu, Siqveland, Heir, Hauff, Larsen, &amp; Lien</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Posttraumatic growth, depressive symptoms, posttraumatic stress symptoms, post-migration stressors and quality of life in multi-traumatized psychiatric outpatients with a refugee background in Norway.</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas &amp; Hoffman-Goetz</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Defining and Measuring Acculturation: A systematic Review of Public Health Studies with Hispanic Populations in the United States</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2015 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics</td>
<td>Immigration statistics</td>
<td>Overview of 2015 immigration stats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The Concept of Family Resilience: Crisis and Challenge</td>
<td>Resilience, family dynamics, social context</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dysfunctional had characteristics of solidity and consistency that aided in the child’s development of resilience and healthy relational skills, and, in a second instance, how dysfunction and lack of resiliency brought about by catastrophe was abated by encouraging the family to share about their loss and repair their fragmented relationship. Both further supports the notion that family and social context have a strong impact on individual and familial resilience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeh &amp; Inose</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>International Students' Reported English Fluency, Social Support, Satisfaction, and Social Connectedness as Predictors of Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>Acculturation, international students, stress</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Background Questionnaire

1. Your Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other ___

2. Your current age in years: ___

3. Were you born in the United States? Yes
   No

3a. If YES, have you lived in any other countries outside of the US for more than
    a year?
    Yes No
    - What was the additional country of longest residence? ___
    - How old were you when you moved to this country? ____
    - How many years did you live there? ____

3b. If NO, what is your country of birth? ___
3c. If you were not born in the United States, how old were you when you first came here? ______

3d Have you lived in any other countries (besides your birth country and the US) for more than a year? Yes No

If yes:

- Additional country of longest residence: _

- How many years did you live there? ______

3e: Do you plan to live in the US permanently? Yes No

3f. If no, please share briefly your reasons for living in the US at this time:

4. Was your mother born in the United States? Yes

No

4a. If YES, has your mother lived in any other countries outside of the US for more than a year?

Yes No

- What was the additional country of longest residence? _

- How old was he when he moved to this country?_

- How many years did she live there? _____
4b. If NO, what is your Mother’s country of birth? _____

4c. Does your mother currently live in the US?

Yes No

4d. If Yes, your mother currently lives in the U.S. How old was your mother when she moved to the United States? ___

4e. How would you describe your mother’s racial, ethnic, cultural identity?

________________________

5. Was your father born in the United States? Yes

No

5a. If YES, has your father lived in any other countries outside of the US for more than one year?

Yes No

- What was the additional country of longest residence? _
- How old was he when he moved to this country? _
- How many years did he live there? _____
5b. If NO, what is your Father’s country of birth? 


5c. Does your father currently live in the US? 

Yes No

5d. If Yes, your father currently lives in the U.S. How old was your father when he moved to the United States? ___

5e. How would you describe your father’s racial, ethnic, cultural identity? ____

6. Please provide a brief descriptive summary of the immigration history of your family:

7. Which ONE of the following broad categories BEST describes your general racial-ethnic group identification at this time in your life?

a. Native America/American Indian/First Nations

b. North American White

c. Other White (European, South African, Australian, Russian, etc.)

d. White Multiethnic- Please specify:
e. Black African (continental)
f. African/Black American
g. Afro-Carribean (Jamaican, Haitian, Trinidadian, etc.)
h. Afro-Latino (Dominican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.)
i. Mexican/Mexican American
j. Latino/Hispanic- Central or South American (El Salvador, Guatamala, Brazilian, Peruvian, Columbian, etc.)
k. White Latino/Hispanic
l. Middle Eastern/Arab descent
m. Pacific Islander (Tongan, Samoan, etc.)
n. South Asian/Indian/Pakistani
o. Chinese/Chinese American
p. Korean/Korean American
q. Japanese/Japanese American
r. Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, etc.)
s. Other- Please specify: _

8. In your own words, please describe your racial-ethnic-cultural identity:
   (please be specific; Examples: “Afro Brazilian born and raised in the United States”, “Chinese Canadian”, “Multiracial with Black and Korean”, “Iranian American identifying primarily Jewish”, etc.)
9. At this time in your life, how strongly connected do you feel to each of the following? 0-not at all 1=a little 2=somewhat 3 = a lot 4= very strongly

a. American/USA culture

b. Your father’s racial/ethnic heritage or national culture Specify:

c. Your mother’s racial/ethnic heritage or national culture Specify:

d. A different racial/ethnic heritage or national culture: Specify:

10. How fluent are you in English?

a. Speaking? Excellent Good Fair Not Much

b. Reading?

c. Writing?

11. How frequently do you speak a language other than English?

At home? Always Most of the time Sometimes Never With family?
12. How much stress have you experienced related to immigration, acculturation, or other challenges related to culture?
   a. During the past year? None A Little Some A Lot Extreme
   b. Over your lifetime? None A Little Some A Lot Extreme
   c. Within your family?
   d. In relationships or social situations outside of your family?
   d. At school and/or work?

13. Which one of the following BEST describes your general religious/spiritual affiliation at this time in your life (Please circle only ONE response)

14. How religious would you say you are?
   a. 0- Religion is irrelevant to me; I do not believe in God or a Higher Power
   b. 1- Not religious/spiritual; I do believe in God or a Higher Power but I am not religious
   c. 2- A little bit religious/spiritual; I have some specific religious/spiritual
beliefs but do not participate or practice at all

d. 3- Somewhat religious/spiritual; I have some religious/spiritual beliefs but do not participate or practice regularly

e. 4- Very religious/spiritual; I actively practice my religious and spiritual beliefs

f. 5- Extremely religious/spiritual; my life is centered around my religion or spiritual beliefs

15. What is the highest level of education that you have achieved?

a. Some high school or less

b. High school degree or equivalent

c. Community college, vocational or trade graduate (e.g. Cosmetology, Electrician, etc.)

d. College/University degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)

e. Graduate or Professional Degree (e.g. MBA, MD, PhD)

16. Which of the following best describes your situation?

a. full-time student, not working

b. part-time student, not working

c. full-time student, working

d. part-time student, working
e. not a student, not working
f. student, working

17. Are you currently working for pay?
   a. Working full-time for pay
   b. Working part-time for pay
   c. Not working for pay currently, but looking for a job
   d. Not currently working for pay by choice

18. Please check any or all of the following that apply to you:
   a. Single, never married
   b. Currently married
c. Living together with my spouse or life partner

d. Separated from my current spouse or life partner

e. Divorced

f. Widowed

19. Which of the following best describes your financial situation at this time?

a. My basic needs like food and shelter are **not** always met

b. My basic needs are met (food, shelter, clothing) but no extras

c. I have everything I need and a few extras

d. I am able to purchase many of the things I want

e. Within limits, I am able to have luxury items like international vacations, new cars, etc.

f. I can buy nearly anything I want, anytime I want
APPENDIX C

Multidimensional Well-Being Assessment
APPENDIX C
Multidimensional Well-Being Assessment

These questions are about the positive things that people sometimes feel and do.

During the past, how frequently or strongly has each of the following statements been true about you?

0= NEVER/NOT AT ALL True for me (Not even one time) 1= RARELY/A LITTLE True for me (A few times)

2= SOMETIMES/SOMEWHAUT True for me (About half the time) 3= PRETTY OFTEN/MOSTLY True for me (Most Days)

4=VERY FREQUENTLY/VERY STRONGLY True for me (Usually Everyday) 5=

ALWAYS/EXTREMELY True for me (All Day Everyday)

The Collective Wellness Context (4 Dimensions, 35 items) COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING: Sociocultural Identity (CWB-I; 12 items)

1. I was a respectable member of my culture (or another group in society that I most identify with) and represented them well.

2. I felt secure and grounded by my roots in my culture or another group in society important to my identity.

3. I felt strongly and emotionally connected to my culture or another group in society that is important to me. (e.g., religious, disability, sexual orientation, military, large
extended family, etc.)

4. I felt that my family was well-respected in our cultural community or another important community.

5. I displayed my identification with my culture or other important identity group (symbols, clothing, language, artwork, home decor, bumper stickers, etc.).

6. I did things during my free time that reflected my culture or another group in society very important to my identity (e.g., movies, music, books, websites, social activities).

7. I observed or learned something positive about my culture (or another group in society that is very important to my identity).

8. I felt good putting the needs of my family, culture (or other group in society most important to me) above my own personal needs and wants.

9. I felt proud of my cultural heritage (or the history/background of another group in society important to my identity).

10. I felt like I was “home” when I was with people from my culture (or another group in society important to my identity).

11. I felt accepted by many people in my culture (or another group in society that is very important to me).

12. I felt good about how I was fulfilling my role in my family, culture, or in another group in society most important to me.

**COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING: Community Connectedness (CWB-C; 10 items)**

1. I enjoyed spending time in my neighborhood or local community.

2. I felt a strong sense of belonging in my neighborhood (e.g., it felt like “home” to me).
3. People in my neighborhood know each other and can depend on each other.

4. My neighborhood or local community was an important part of my life.

5. I made sure I was informed about things happening in my neighborhood community.

6. I felt a strong sense of belonging at my workplace, school, or another place where I spend a lot of time.

7. I felt supported by people at my workplace, school, or other place where I spend a lot of time.

8. I felt accepted and welcomed by people at my workplace, school, or other place where I spend a lot of time.

9. I was valued and respected at my workplace, school, or other place where I spend a lot of time.

10. I looked forward to being at work, school, or another place where I spend a lot of time (other than where I live).

COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING: Participatory (CWB-P; 8 items)

1. I actively participated in an organization related to my culture or another community that is important to me.

2. I participated in or contributed to positive change on a social justice issue or cause.

3. I worked together with others on an issue of mutual concern in my community, workplace, school, or other setting.

4. I did something to help make the world a better place.

5. I intervened or stood up for someone in a situation involving injustice or unfairness.
6. I gained a greater knowledge and understanding of a local, national, or global issue.

7. I volunteered my time in service of people in need, animals, the environment or another cause important to me.

8. I was a leader or took initiative to start some action for change in my community or organization.

**COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING: National Context Dimension (CWB-N; 5 items)**

1. I felt good about the direction my home country was going in.

2. My home country was strong and stable in terms of leadership and political matters.

3. I felt a lot of national pride in my home country.

4. I felt committed to making my home country a better place.

5. I have positive feelings about my home country.

**The Transcendent Wellness Context (2 Dimensions, 27 items) TRANSCENDENT WELL-BEING: Meaning-Purpose-Flow (TWB-M; 14 items)**

1. I felt guided by a vision or mission for my life.

2. I lived with integrity, was true to myself and my values (“walked my talk”).

3. I was “in the zone,” got totally lost or immersed in an activity that I enjoyed.

4. I had an amazing or “peak” experience (e.g., heightened awareness, awe, intense connection with another person, a creative burst, a revelation).

5. I felt a strong sense of gratitude, an appreciation for both the ups and downs in my life.

6. I had a strong sense of my values, what is most important to me.
7. I felt connected to a purpose larger than my personal life.

8. I was guided positively by my intuition about things.

9. I felt like my life had meaning, like I’m here for a purpose.

10. I had a feeling of wisdom, insight or understanding about life.

11. I felt connected to all of humanity regardless of race, nationality, social class, etc.

12. I felt connected to the rhythms and patterns of nature (e.g., animals, trees, oceans, stars, mountains, or other living things).

13. I was “moved” by creative expression, had a strong emotional connection or experience related to music, art, dance, etc.

14. I spent time in meditation, personal reflection, or deep contemplation.

TRANSCENDENT WELL-BEING: Spiritual-Religious (TWB-S; 13 items)

1. My faith and spiritual beliefs were strong.

2. I felt loved by and in close relationship with a Higher Power/God in my life.

3. I felt positively connected with the soul or spirit of another person (living or deceased).

4. My faith or spirituality was strengthened through reading, classes, or discussions.

5. The beauty and miracles of nature made me feel closer to a Higher Power/God.

6. How I lived my daily life was consistent with my spiritual or religious beliefs.

7. I was comforted by the presence of a Higher Power/God in my life.

8. My spiritual/religious beliefs and activities gave me strength and guidance through the challenges I faced.
9. I enjoyed expressing and sharing my spirituality with other people or in a faith community.

10. I witnessed or experienced spiritual healing.

11. I spent time praying, reading religious/spiritual books, or listening to spiritual music.

12. Someone prayed or said blessings for me.

13. I received valuable counsel from a minister, rabbi, imam, priest, guru, pastor, or other religious leader.
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Recruitment Email
Hello,

My name is Jem Powell. I am a graduate student with the research group from Pepperdine University that is conducting the study that you recently participated in on immigration and well-being.

You indicated that you would be willing to be contacted about a follow-up interview study about immigration experiences in your family.

I am emailing to give you information about the interview study and inquire if you would be interested and willing to participate in our follow-up interview study where we would speak in person about your personal and family experiences with immigration and living in/getting settled into the United States.

This part of our research involves interviewing you individually and then doing an interview with your family together. You would therefore have one individual interview and one family interview, and your family would have one family interview.

Each interview will be approximately one hour to an hour and a half in duration and each person interviewed will receive a $10 Visa Gift Card at the end of each interview.

Attached to this email is further information about the study.

Once you have examined the information may I contact you again to ask if you are interested in being involved in this study?

Thank you for your time with the previous studies and I look forward to discussing the opportunity to participate at (scheduled call date). Please provide me with a telephone number to contact you to discuss your interest if you would like to continue participation.

Below is my contact information if you would like further information or need to contact me.

Best Regards,

Jem Powell, MA
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX E

Informed Consent
APPENDIX E

Informed Consent

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Education and Psychology
INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES
Meaning-Making and Immigration Across Generations
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer Esfandi, M.A., Jacob Stein, M.A., Jem Powell, M.A., and Shelly Harrell, Ph.D. at Pepperdine University, because you are between the ages of 18 and 75, either born or are the child of an immigrant from a non-European country (e.g., Central or South America, Asia, Africa, Middle East, etc.), and that you speak English fluently. Your participation is voluntary. You should read the information below, and ask questions about anything that you do not understand, before deciding whether to participate. Please take as much time as you need to read the consent form. You may also decide to discuss participation with your family or friends. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form. You will also be given a copy of this form for your records.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to bring attention to generational status in understanding the immigration process and to examine how first and second generation immigrants cope with stress and make meaning of their experiences. Furthermore, the study seeks to explore the body of research that explores immigration and meaning-making related coping among generational statuses in a single family.

STUDY PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a face-to-face interview. The meeting will involve having you be individually interviewed and your family members be interviewed as a whole in one interview. The interview will be semi-structured with pre-written questions regarding your immigration experience. The interview is expected to last 90 to 120 minutes in length so in total the meeting would last for three to four hours. Scheduling of interviews will be conducted by phone to request participation and informed consent as well as information on the study will be emailed to participants. You will have the option to be interviewed in a private location of their choice to maximize comfort of disclosure. Options suggested to participants include a private room in the family home, a room at their place of worship or employment, a room reserved at a library or community center, or a room in one of the three Pepperdine clinics (West Los Angeles, Encino, or Irvine). Interviews may also be conducted via Skype if one member of the family is not in the Southern California area or unable to attend the interview. Prior to beginning the interview, participants will be given the opportunity to ask any questions or request clarifications from the researcher regarding the Pepperdine University Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) Informed Consent content of the informed consent document. Participants will be allowed to either choose a pseudonym or have one assigned to be used during the interview process in order to enhance confidentiality of the recorded interview. The researcher will assist in the process of choosing a pseudonym if necessary. The researcher will have interview questions prepared prior to the interview. Audio from the interview will be recorded using a digital recorder that is kept in a secure location. Participants will be given the option of receiving a transcript of their responses via email or post, so that they
may review the transcript and modify or clarify their responses. Family participants will not receive transcripts of the individual interview with other family members. Requests for modification of responses will be communicated to the research via email, postal mail or phone conversation with the researcher.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
The potential and foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study include feelings of fatigue, boredom, and distress or discomfort as a result of the nature of the questions that may be asked or the topics that may surface over the course of the interview. It should be noted that the risks involved in the present study are not viewed as greater than that experienced during the course of ordinary discussion of personal life experiences. Your involvement in the study and completion of the study is strictly voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question you choose not to answer or refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time with no adverse consequences.

In the case, you experience discomfort or stress during the interview, you will be encouraged to take breaks, discuss the discomfort with the interviewer, and/or will be provided with referrals for centers where culturally appropriate support or mental health services may be available.

● Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health Services
Mental health services provided include assessments, case management, crisis intervention, medication support, peer support and other rehabilitative services.
550 S. Vermont Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 900220
(213) 738-4949
24/7 Helpline: 1-800-854-7771
www.dmh.co.la.ca.us

● Hollywood Sunset Free Clinic
3324 Sunset Blvd,
Los Angeles, CA 90026
(323) 660-2400

● Pepperdine University Counseling Clinics
Sliding scale clinics that provide psychological services for children, adolescents, adults, couples, and families.
  o West Los Angeles location
    (310) 568-5752
  o Encino location
    (818) 501-1678
  o Irvine location
    (949) 223-2570

● The Maple Counseling Center
Provide low cost comprehensive mental health services to individuals, couples, families, and groups throughout Los Angeles County.
9107 Wilshire Blvd
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
310-271-9999
http://www.tmcc.org/

● National Suicide Prevention Line (24hrs/7days)
POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY
While there are no direct benefits to the study participants, there are several anticipated benefits to society which include: The acknowledgement of their immigration experiences or their family's immigration experiences by participating and contributing to research on a topic that may feel relevant to their lives. The study may benefit psychological literature and society in general because it will contribute to our understanding of immigration and coping. The researchers hope that the findings will contribute to the literature on immigration, generation status, and coping. Additionally, we hope that the findings will contribute to the understanding of this population's needs, in hopes of increasing future funding and interest in research. Further, researchers hope that the findings can inform interventions and policy regarding well-being of first and second generation immigrants. Moreover, findings may be used to form how psychologists and other therapists help client's cope with challenges of immigration and acculturation and assist professionals in understanding the importance/significance of the immigration experience.

PAYMENT/COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION
You will be compensated with a $10 gift card for your participation in the interview. The gift cards will be provided to you at the conclusion of the interview.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The records collected for this study will be confidential as far as permitted by law. However, if required to do so by law, it may be necessary to disclose information collected about you. Pepperdine University Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) Informed Consent Examples of the types of issues that would require me to break confidentiality are if disclosed any instances of child abuse and elder abuse. Pepperdine’s University’s Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) may also access the data collected. The HSPP occasionally reviews and monitors research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research subjects. Data from the in-person interview will be audio recorded to assure accuracy of information in data analysis. All transcriptions of the audio will be kept on a password-protected computer, which only the researchers and their supervisor, Shelly Harrell, Ph.D. will have access to. A copy of the transcripts will be kept on a USB drive that will be stored in a locked file cabinet with the audio files. Throughout the course of the study, all written material and audio recordings will only be viewed or listened to in a private and secure setting. At no time will any personally identifying information be paired with any of the research data. At the end of the study, the audiotapes will be destroyed. The transcribed and content analyzed data will be kept a minimum of 5 years; when data are no longer required for research purposes, it will be destroyed. The data will not be archived for future research.

SUSPECTED NEGLECT OR ABUSE OF CHILDREN
Under California law, the researcher(s) who may also be a mandated reporter will not maintain as confidential, information about known or reasonably suspected incidents of abuse or neglect of a child, dependent adult or elder, including, but not limited to, physical, sexual, emotional, and financial abuse or neglect. If any researcher has or is given such information, he or she is required to report this abuse to the proper authorities.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
Your participation is voluntary. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. Additionally, there might be
circumstances in which the researcher may decide to discontinue my participation in the study. This would occur if it is determined that you do not meet eligibility criteria.

**ALTERNATIVES TO FULL PARTICIPATION**
The alternative to participation in the study is not participating or only completing the items for which you feel comfortable.

**EMERGENCY CARE AND COMPENSATION FOR INJURY**
If you are injured as a direct result of research procedures you will receive medical treatment; however, you or your insurance will be responsible for the cost. Pepperdine University does not provide any monetary compensation for injury.

**INVESTIGATOR’S CONTACT INFORMATION**
Pepperdine University Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) Informed Consent
You understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries you may have concerning the research herein described. You understand that you may contact Jennifer Esfandi, Jacob Stein, Jem Powell, and Shelly Harrell, Ph.D. at Shelly.Harrell@pepperdine.edu if you have any other questions or concerns about this research.

**RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT – IRB CONTACT INFORMATION**
If you have questions, concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant or research in general please contact Dr. Judy Ho, Chairperson of the Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board at Pepperdine University 6100 Center Drive Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90045, 310-568-5753 or gpsirb@pepperdine.edu.

**SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT**
You have read the information provided above. You have been given a chance to ask questions. Your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you agree to participate in this study. You have been given a copy of this consent form.

Name of Participant
Signature of Participant Date

**SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR**
You have explained the research to the subjects and answered all of his/her questions. In your judgment the participants are knowingly, willingly and intelligently agreeing to participate in this study. S/he has the legal capacity to give informed consent to participate in this research study and all of the various components. The subject has also been informed participation is voluntarily and that s/he may discontinue s/he participation in the study at any time, for any reason.

Name of Person Obtaining Consent
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent Date

Pepperdine University Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) Informed Consent
Pepperdine University
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Meaning-Making Interview First Generation Immigrant

**Semi-Structured Interview Guide**

**Section A: General Story and Motivation**

Let’s start by talking a bit about your thoughts about participating in this study on immigration in your family.

As indicated in the informed consent, participating in this study means remembering, speaking about, and reflecting on you and your family’s experiences, some pleasant and some not so pleasant.

a.1 What is it like for you to be discussing details about your life experiences?

a.2 What motivated you agree to participate in this study?

a.3 In what ways have you explored and expressed your thoughts and feelings about your immigration experience?

**Section B: Immigration Story**

b.1 Tell me your immigration story from beginning through to the middle to where you are now.

b.2 How might the way you’re telling the story differ from how other family members tell the story?

b.3 Are there differences of opinion within your family regarding your family’s decisions to move to the United States and remain living here?

b.4 What was your experience like coming to the U.S?

b.5 What has life been like since living here for you? For your family?

**Section C: Specific Memories and Situations**

c.1 If you look back, what was your first encounter with adjusting to this country? Could you please recount that situation for me?


c.2 Are there any other important incidents or situations that stand out for you in your adjustment?


c.3 What sort of stereotypes have you encountered from others or do you think about as an immigrant?


c.4 What has been most difficult about immigrating? What continues to be difficult as you have lived in the United States?
c.5 How do you understand some of the experiences you had immigrating or being an immigrant in the U.S?

Section D: Impacts

d.1 Did you notice any barriers as you immigrated and once you got here?
d.2 Did you notice change or growth in family members after you migrated?
d.3 What were the costs (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?
d.4 What were the benefits (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?
d.5 What strengths did you and your family begin immigration with, how have you seem them transform over time?
d.6 Do you have any members of family who had a particularly difficult time adjusting after migrating or any who adjusted well? How do you understand those differences?

Section E: General Questions

e.1 What would you want Americans to know about immigration? What would you want those in your home country to know about immigration?
e.2 What differences or similarities in culture have you experienced between your culture of origin and United states culture?
e.3 What does culture mean to you-and your family members?
e.4 Is there information this interview missed or seems important to share about yourself or your family?
e.5 Is there anything you want to add or clarify regarding what you have shared in this interview?

(Review all questions)

Section F: The Experience of the Interview

f.1 What has the experience of sharing your experiences with immigration and acculturation been like for you?
f.2 What feelings have you experienced from the beginning of the interview to this moment?
f.3 How important is your experience or identity being an immigrant/in an immigrant family?
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Semi-Structured Interview Guide

Section A: General Story and Motivation
Let’s start by talking a bit about your thoughts about participating in this study on immigration in your family.

As indicated in the informed consent, participating in this study means remembering, speaking about, and reflecting on you and your family’s experiences, some pleasant and some not so pleasant.

a.1 What is it like for you to be discussing details about your life experiences?

a.2 What motivated you agree to participate in this study?

a.3 In what ways have you explored and expressed your thoughts and feelings about your immigration experience?

Section B: Immigration Story

b.1 Tell me your immigration story from beginning through to the middle to where you are now.

b.2 How might the way you’re telling the story differ from how other family members tell the story?

b.3 Are there differences of opinion within your family regarding your family’s decisions to move to the United States and remain living here?

b.4 Please tell the events, thoughts and feelings that you have experienced as a product of living in a family who chose to migrate?

b.5 How has life been different or similar between yourself and the family member who chose to immigrate here?

b.6 What has it been like for you to live with the family’s primary or “home” culture in conjunction with the culture of the United States?

b.7 How do you understand your experiences living in the U.S. as a person whose family immigrated?

b.8 What has life been like living in the United States?
Section C: Specific Memories and Situations

c.1 If you look back, what was your first experience realizing you were from an immigrant family? Could you please recount that situation for me.

c.2 Are there any other important incidents or situations that stand out for you in your adjustment?

c.3 What sort of stereotypes have you encountered from others or do you think about as a family member of an immigrant?

c.4 What has been most difficult about immigrating?

c.5 How do you understand some of the experiences you had as an immigrant in the U.S?

Section D: Impacts

d.1 Have you observed any barriers for immigrants and their families?

d.2 What were the costs (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?

d.3 What were the benefits (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?

d.4 What strengths did your family migrate with? How have those strengths impacted your life living in the U.S?

d.5 Do you have any members of family who had a particularly difficult time adjusting after migrating or any who adjusted well? How do you understand those differences?

Section E: General Questions

e.1 What would you want Americans to know about immigration? What would you want those in your home country to know about immigration?

e.2 What differences or similarities in culture have you experienced between your culture of origin and United States culture?

e.3 What does culture mean to you and your family members?

e.4 Is there information this interview missed or seems important to share about yourself or your family?

e.5 Is there anything you want to add or clarify regarding what you have shared in this interview?

Section F: The Experience of the Interview

f.1 What has the experience of sharing your experiences with immigration and acculturation been like for you?
f.2 What feelings have you experienced from the beginning of the interview to this moment?

How important is your experience or identity being an immigrant/in an immigrant family?
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Meaning-Making Interview Family Interview

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

SECTION A: General Story and Motivation
Sometimes families have a shared story that differs from and overlaps in different ways about shared events in their lives. I would like to ask you some of the questions I asked before together.
This interview allows me to hear the collective story of your family in addition to your individual stories.

A.1 What led you to agree to answer questions about immigration and its impact on your family?

A.2 What led you to agree to participate in a study examining the meaning you have made from a family member immigrating?

A.3 How important is the word “immigrant” and what does it mean to who your family identifies as?

SECTION B: Immigration Story
B.1 What led your family to immigrate? How was the decision made to migrate to the United States?

B.2 How does your family understand moving to the United States and all the events, struggles and success you may have faced choosing to remain in the United States?

B.3 How has life been for your family living in the United States?

SECTION C: Specific Memories and Situations
C.1 What sort of stereotypes have you encountered or do you think about as a family with a member who immigrated to the United States?

C.2 What has been most difficult to make sense of or what still doesn’t make sense to you about being a part of a family with a member who immigrated?

SECTION D: Impacts
D.1 What challenges has your family faced as you have lived in the United States?

D.2 What were the costs (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?

D.3 What were the benefits (physical, mental, financial, and social) to migrate?
D.4 In your opinion, what strengths did you and your family begin immigration with?

D.5 Are there any strengths the family gained in general from immigrating?

D.6 Are there specific family members who gained strengths or had specific struggles?

Section E: General Questions

E.1 What does culture mean to your family?

E.2 How does your family discuss the history of how they came to be in the United States?

E.3 What is important to discuss when talking about immigrating, living in, and adjusting to the culture of your family and American culture?

E.4 Is there information this interview missed or seems important to share about yourself or your family?

E.5 Is there anything you want to add or clarify regarding what you have shared in this interview?

(Review all questions)

SECTION F: The Experience of the Interview

F.1 What has the experience of answering these questions as a family been like for you all?

F.2 What feelings have you experienced from the beginning of the interview to this moment?

F.3 What makes sense to you about this study and the different interviews?

F.4 What does not make sense to you about the study?
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Dear Stein:
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Based upon review, your IRB application has been approved. The IRB approval begins today March 20, 2017, and expires on November 17, 2017.
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