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Abstract

This study was a longitudinal quantitative study of the acculturation, psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of Vietnamese arriving in Finland in 1979 to 1991 as children and adolescents. The first phase was carried out in 1992 on a random nation-wide sample of 97 Vietnamese comprehensive school students, matched with Finnish classmates and a follow-up of 59 of the original Vietnamese participants, now aged 20 – 31, took place in 2004. The aim of this study was to establish the causal effects of important predictors of acculturation outcomes, while duly acknowledging the impact of age and context on psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation.

Individual acculturation dimensions (language, values and identity) were found to be more significant for psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation than ethnic, national, or bicultural profiles that were composites of the relevant languages, values and identities. Identity change occurred in the (ethnic) Vietnamese direction over time, while value change occurred in the (national) Finnish direction. Language proficiency in both Finnish and Vietnamese increased over time with favorable impacts on both psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation. Initial psychological well-being predicted well-being (depression and self-esteem) as an adult, but sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) as a child or adolescent did not predict educational attainment as an adult.
The greater Finnish proficiency as an adult, not having been depressed in childhood or adolescence, perceiving less discrimination as a child or adolescent, and identifying less as Finnish as an adult distinguished those with better psychological well-being (not depressed) in adulthood from those who were depressed. In predicting greater educational attainment in adulthood, perceiving less discrimination as a child or adolescent, on the one hand, and better Finnish language proficiency as an adult, more adherence to national (Finnish) independence values as an adult, but less of a Finnish identity as an adult, on the other hand, were the most important factors.

The significance of perceived discrimination, especially in childhood and adolescence, for psychological well-being, as well as for long-term effects on both psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation as an adult, shows the need for early psychological intervention and for policies focusing on improving inter-group relations.

**Key words:** acculturation, psychological well-being, sociocultural adaptation, language, values, identity, Vietnamese, Finland, children, adolescents, young adults
Là người Việt Nam lớn lên và trưởng thành ở Phần Lan: Nhìn lại sau 12 năm - Đời sống và sự hội nhập văn hóa xã hội của người Việt Nam qua các lứa tuổi thiếu nhi, thanh thiếu niên và thành niên trẻ tuổi

Tóm lược


Đối với tình trạng tâm lý và sự thích nghi về văn hóa xã hội, thì tất cả những chỉ số về sự hội nhập văn hóa của mỗi cá nhân (ngôn ngữ, giá trị, bản sắc) đều cho thấy đây là những yếu tố quan trọng hơn so với những yếu tố như cơ nguồn, dân tộc hay sự hấp thụ cả hai nền văn hóa, tục trưởng hợp mà những yếu tố như ngôn ngữ, giá trị cuộc sống và bản
sắc văn hóa bị pha trộn. Theo dòng thời gian, sự thay đổi về văn hóa được xây ra theo chiều hướng (cơ nguyên) Việt Nam tức "lá rung về cơi". Nhưng sự thay đổi về giá trị cuộc sống thì lại xây ra theo hướng (quốc gia) Phần Lan tức "nhập gia tùy tục". Khách nằng về nguồn gốc cả về tiếng Việt lẫn tiếng Phần Lan đều được khá len theo thời gian, và điều này đã có tác động tích cực đến tình trạng tâm lý cũng như sự thích nghi với văn hóa xã hội mới. Tình trạng tâm lý ở thời điểm ban đầu của các em lúc còn nhỏ đã giúp ta tiến đoán trước được tình trạng tâm lý (sự trầm mặc và lông tử tin) sau này của các em ở tuổi trưởng thành. Tuy nhiên, việc sớm thích nghi về văn hóa xã hội (thành đạt trên ghế nhà trường) ở tuổi thiếu nhi hay thành thiếu niên không giúp cho ta biết trước về con đường học văn sau này của các em ở tuổi trưởng thành.

Trong số những người tham gia cuộc nghiên cứu này, những người biết tiếng Phần Lan tốt hơn ở tuổi trưởng thành, những người mà ở tuổi thiếu niên hoặc thanh thiếu niên không bị trầm cảm, ít cảm thấy là mình bị kỳ thị và đến khi trưởng thành thì ít có nhu hướng muốn trở thành người Phần Lan, có tình trạng tâm lý tốt hơn (họ không bị trầm cảm) so với những người bị trầm cảm. Trong việc dự đoán về con đường học văn sau này ở tuổi trưởng thành, thì những yếu tố quan trọng nhất là một mặt là ở tuổi thiếu niên hoặc thanh thiếu niên, ít có mắc cảm bị kỳ thị và mặt khác là đến tuổi trưởng thành thì biết tiếng Phần Lan tốt hơn, linh hội được nhiều hơn những giá trị cuộc sống tự lập của người bản xứ (Phần Lan) và ít có xu hướng muốn trở thành người Phần Lan.
Việc đã từng bị người khác kỳ thị, nhất là khi đang còn ở trong lúc tuổi thiếu nhi hoặc thanh thiếu niên cùng như những ảnh hưởng lâu dài của việc này đến tình trạng tâm lý và sự hấp thụ văn hóa xã hội sau này ở tuổi trưởng thành cho ta thấy là cần phải đưa ra những can thiệp và biện pháp kịp thời nhằm cải thiện mối quan hệ giữa các nhóm có nên văn hóa khác nhau.

Từ khóa: hội nhập văn hóa, tình trạng tâm lý, sự hấp thụ văn hóa xã hội, ngôn ngữ, giá trị cuộc sống, bản sắc văn hóa, người Việt, Phân Lan, thiếu nhi, thanh thiếu niên, thành niên trẻ tuổi
Varttuminen vietnamilaisena Suomessa: 12 vuoden seurantatutkimus – Vietnamilaisen hyvinvointi ja sosiokulttuurinen sopeutuminen lapsena tai nuorena sekä nuorena aikuisena

Abstrakti

Yksittäiset akkulturaatiodomensiot (kieli, arvot ja identiteetti) osoittautuivat tärkeämmiksi psykykiselle hyvinvoinnille ja sosiokulttuuriselle sopeutumiselle kuin etniset, kansalliset tai bikulttuuraaliset profiilit, joissa yhdistyivät arvot, arvot ja identiteetti. Identiteettimuutuosta tapahtui (etniseen) vietnamilaiseen suuntaan ajan kuluessa, kun taas arvomuutosta tapahtui (kansalliseen) suomalaiseen suuntaan. Sekä suomen että vietnamin kielen taito
lisääntyivät ajan myötä, millä oli myönteisiä vaikutuksia sekä psyykkiseen hyvinvointiin että sosiokulttuuriseen sopeutumiseen. Lähtökohtatilanteen psyykkinen hyvinvointi ennusti hyvinvointia (masennuksen puutetta ja itsetuntoa) aikuisena, mutta sosiokulttuurinen sopeutuminen (koulumenestys) lapsena tai nuorena ei ennustanut kouluttautumista aikuisena.

Parempi suomen kielen taito aikuisena, masentuneisuuden puute lapsena tai nuorena, vähemmän koettua syrjintää lapsena tai nuorena sekä vähemmän identifioitumista suomalaiseksi aikuisena  erottelivat osallistujat, jotka voivat psyykkisesti paremmin aikuisina (eivät olleet masentuneita) heistä, jotka olivat masentuneita. Ennustausen parempaa kouluttautumista aikuisena, tärkeimmät tekijät olivat toisaalta vähemmän koettua syrjintää lapsena tai nuorena ja toisaalta parempi suomen kielen taito aikuisena, suurempi kansallisten (suomalainen) itsenäisyysarvojen kannattaminen aikuisena, mutta kuitenkin vähemmän identifioitumista suomalaisiin aikuisena.

Koetun syrjinnän merkitys psyykkiselle hyvinvoinnille, erityisesti lapsena tai nuorena, sekä sen pitkääikaisvaikutukset psyykkiselle hyvinvoinnille ja sosiokulttuuriselle sopeutumiselle aikuisena, osoittaa tarpeen varhaiselle psyykkiselle interventiolle ja toimenpiteille, jotka parantavat ryhmien välisiä suhteita.

**Avainsanat:** akkulturaatio, psykkkinen hyvinvointi, sosiokulttuurinen sopeutuminen, kieli, arvot, identiteetti, vietnamilainen, Suomi, lapset, nuoret, nuoret aikuiset
Att växa upp som vietnames i Finland: Tillbakablick 12 år senare – Vietnamesers välbefinnande och sociokulturella anpassning som barn eller unga och som vuxna

Abstrakt


Målet för studien var att utreda de kausala följderna av de viktiga faktorer som förutspår ackulturationens slutresultat och att samtidigt beakta ålderns och kontextens effekter på psykiskt välbefinnande och sociokulturell anpassning.

Enskilda ackulturationsdimensioner (språk, värderingar och identitet) visade sig vara viktigare för det psykiska välbefinnandet och den sociokulturella anpassningen än etniska, nationella eller bikulturella profiler som kännetecknades av respektive kombinationer av språk, värderingar och identitet. Med tiden skedde identitetsförändringar i riktning mot det (etniskt) vietnamesiska, medan en värdeförändring skedde i (nationell) finländsk riktning. Både kunskaper i finska och
Vietnamesiska ökade med tiden vilket hade positiva effekter både på det psykiska välbefinnandet och den sociokulturella anpassningen. Psykiskt välbefinnande i utgångsläget förutsådde välbefinnande (depression och självkänsla) som vuxen, men sociokulturell anpassning (skolfamgång) som barn eller ung förutsatte inte utbildningsnivån som vuxen.

Bättre kunskaper i finska som vuxen, avsaknad av depression som barn eller ung, mindre upplevd diskriminering som barn eller ung samt lägre identifikation som finländare i vuxen ålder åtskiljde deltagarna som mådde psykiskt bättre som vuxen (icke deprimerade) och dem som var deprimerade. När det gällde att göra prognos med avseende på utbildning som vuxen var de avgörande faktorerna å ena sidan en lägre nivå av upplevd diskriminering i barndomen och å andra sidan bättre kunskaper i finska i vuxen ålder, större uppskattning av nationella (finländska) värden avseende självständighet i vuxen ålder och mindre identifiering med finländare.

Betydelsen av upplevd diskriminering för psykiskt välbefinnande, särskilt som barn eller ung, samt dess långtidseffekter för psykiskt välbefinnande och sociokulturell anpassning som vuxen visar att det finns behov av tidig psykisk intervention och åtgärder som förbättrar grupprelationer.

**Nyckelord:** ackulturation, psykiskt välbefinnande, sociokulturell adaption, språk, värderingar, identitet, vietnames, Finland, barn, unga, unga vuxna
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1 INTRODUCTION

This is a longitudinal quantitative study of acculturation. The study focuses on two acculturation outcomes, the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of Vietnamese who arrived in Finland as refugees in the 1970s and 1980s as children or adolescents and who are now young adults in their twenties. The first phase of the study (Time 1) was carried out in 1992 on a national random sample (97 students) of one third of the Vietnamese students in comprehensive school at the time. The psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation (operationalized as school achievement) of the 8-20–year-old Vietnamese students were compared to that of their Finnish classmates in order to delineate the possible additional strains on the well-being and school achievement of acculturating immigrants. Questionnaire data was collected on factors known to be crucial to the acculturation process and to influence well-being and school achievement among immigrant children and youth, i.e. perceived discrimination, ethnic and native language proficiency, family values and identity.

Twelve years later, in the follow-up (Time 2) phase in 2004, 59 (61%) of the original Vietnamese participants from
1992 participated in the study, now as young adults aged 21-31. Measures corresponding to those used at Time 1 were included in the questionnaire data gathered at Time 2. The aim was twofold: first, cross-sectional analyses of predictors of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation in both childhood/adolescence and in adulthood allowed comparison of the findings in order to find age-relevant differences in the predictors of acculturation. Second, the longitudinal study of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation made it possible to see (a) what changes have occurred in these outcome variables in twelve years and to (b) establish the causal effect of Time 1 predictors on psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation at Time 2.

Apart from focusing on age-relevant predictors of acculturation and the establishment of causal factors in the process of acculturation, this study also emphasizes the necessity to acknowledge contextual factors in acculturation. As acculturation of immigrants is, in essence, a result of the interaction between immigrants and the host society (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001), factors leading to successful acculturation outcomes are bound to vary according to context (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003).

This study was made in a small country of 5.5 million inhabitants with only 2.5 percent of the population foreign-born (Statistics Finland, 2008a). Traditionally a country of emigration rather than immigration, Finland’s history of
immigration is also very recent, and spans only a few decades (e.g., Alitolppa-Niitamo, 2004; Paananen, 2005; Pentikäinen, 2005). All of these factors differ greatly from the context in which most previous acculturation studies have been made. The Vietnamese were one of the first groups of immigrants coming to Finland in recent history and their acculturation has occurred in a context only slowly becoming multicultural. National and local policies and attitudes are only gradually beginning to react to the ethnic changes in the population (e.g., Pentikäinen, 2005).

Research results on what impacts on the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of immigrants in the Finnish context are needed to inform policy and practice – where, when, and what kind of interventions are needed to improve well-being and adaptation for both immigrants and, ultimately, all of Finnish society. However, previous research has provided us mainly with results from cross-sectional studies in multicultural countries with large ethnic communities. In addition, age-relevant predictors of acculturation outcomes have not been sufficiently specified. The aim of this study is to establish the causal effects of important predictors of acculturation outcomes while duly acknowledging the impact of age and context on psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation.

Before presenting the results of the study, the following presentation will first introduce Finland’s immigration history and current situation and that of the Vietnamese in Finland. This will be followed by a literature review of theory and studies on the acculturation process, the
acculturation outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation and their predictors: perceived discrimination, language proficiency, values, and identity. Next, the aims, research questions, and hypotheses of the study will be presented in detail. Three contributions of this study are outlined; the longitudinal approach, the acknowledgment of age-specific predictors, and the importance of context. Finally, the results will be discussed and further research as well as implications for policy will be suggested.

1.1 Immigration to Finland – multiculturalism comes to a monocultural society

The first group of 100 refugees from Indochina arrived in Finland in 1979, on humanitarian grounds through the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). They had already been granted official refugee status by the UNHCR in the Malesian refugee camp they had been living in. An official Finnish delegation interviewed people in the camp and chose those who were to come to Finland, on the basis of a separate agreement made with the UNHCR. Starting in 1985, Finland began to accept refugees according to a quota system, as quota refugees, one of 15 countries in the world to do so. Finland’s initial refugee settlement quota of several hundred had grown to 750 quota refugees per year by 2008. The refugee quota is verified each
Before the arrival of the Vietnamese refugees, Finland had received only 182 political refugees from Chile in 1973 (Liebkind, 1996a). The first few hundreds of Vietnamese refugees came in several waves in 1979 - 1986 to the Helsinki region and later to other areas of Finland (Ekholm, 1994; Nguyen, C., 2001). At that time Finland was a very monocultural country compared to the other countries of Europe, and had been so for most of the 20th century (e.g., Forsander & Ekholm, 2001). Finland thus had relatively little experience with multiculturalism. The few historical minorities existing before the Vietnamese came have been small in number: Romas since the 1500s and Tatars, Jews and Russian émigrés from the late 1800s and early 1900s (e.g., Forsander & Ekholm, 2001). The number of other recent immigrants at this time was negligible, and the total number of foreign citizens in 1979, when the first Vietnamese arrived, was around 0.3 % of the population (Niemin, 2003).

The miniscule foreign-born population in Finland began to change radically and grow rapidly in the 1990s with the global recruiting by Finnish IT-companies, the coming of new refugee groups, including Somalis, ex-Jugoslavians and Iraqi and the large numbers of Finnish-ethnic repatriates coming from the former Soviet Union. At the end of 2007 foreign citizens living in Finland totaled 103,682, equaling 2.5% of the total population (Statistics Finland, 2008a), a large increase in regard to the 0.3% of twenty years
previously. By 2008 the number of residents speaking Vietnamese as a native language was nearing 5,000, making it the tenth-largest language group after Finnish and Swedish, the national languages, and Russian, Estonian, English, Somali, Arabic, Kurdish, Albanian, Chinese, and German (Statistics Finland, 2008b).

Traditionally and legally there has been strong support for bilingualism and biculturalism in Finland because of the large Swedish-speaking population in Finland and the position of Swedish as an official language. Until the 1990s, Swedish speakers were the only significant linguistic minority in Finland. The country’s strong tradition of Swedish-Finnish bilingualism and biculturalism is visible in the dual (Finnish- and Swedish-language) systems of education up to and including the university level, cultural activities such as the theater, television and radio, as well as newspapers and literature (Liebkind, Moring, & Tandefelt, 2007).

Finland’s bicultural ethic was one of the foundations for the Integration Act first enacted in 1999 and amended several times, most recently in 2007 (“Act”, 1999; “Laki”, 2007) to improve the integration of the new minorities and Finnish society, with a stated dual aim: integration into society and the retention of minority culture and language. In practice, this has meant government support for training courses for adults to provide work skills, Finnish or Swedish language skills, and an introduction to how Finnish society functions (“Laki”, 2007). Children and adolescents are provided an introductory class for immigrants, lasting
usually one year, and subsequent instruction in Finnish as a second language (National Board of Education, 2005).

The second cornerstone of the Act, minority language and culture maintenance, actualizes as government funding for a voluntary two hours of native (mother tongue) language and culture instruction per week, usually after regular school hours, for students in comprehensive school (ages 7-16) and senior secondary school (17-19) (Ikonen, 2008; National Board of Education, 2004). Instruction is also available for 6-year-old preschoolers (e.g., Ikonen, 2008). The availability of instruction depends on the availability of teachers capable of providing native language instruction, in reality usually possible only for larger language groups. Nevertheless, a total of 49 different native languages were taught in Finnish schools, in addition to Finnish and Swedish, in 2005 (Ikonen, 2008). The majority of those eligible for these classes do attend when classes are offered. The Vietnamese, for example, form a relatively large language group and Vietnamese language teachers are available in the largest cities. A total of 564 comprehensive and senior secondary school students participated in Vietnamese instruction in the fall of 2005 (Ikonen, 2008).

In the early 2000s the Finnish job market began to undergo a change. The large age groups (the baby boomers) began to retire and the new age groups replacing them are much smaller, which has led to a decreased supply of workers, especially in municipal social and health services. An about-face has occurred in workplace attitudes, at least among recruiters and trade associations. Now workers are
actively recruited from neighboring countries and health care workers, for example, from as far away as the Philippines (“Filippiineiltä”, 2008). A new level of ethnic diversity in society is now visible in day care centers, schools, the daily life of metropolitan area suburbs and to some extent in the workplace in the larger urban centers of Southern Finland (e.g., Kaikkonen, 2007; Pyykkönen, 2007). There have been signs of slow progress toward the integration of society: in the increase in students with an immigrant background in higher education, in middle management positions and as successful entrepreneurs, as active members of the performing arts and in the election of immigrants as members of municipal councils and local governing boards.

However, despite the official political aims of multiculturalism, the practical measures taken to implement them and some progress toward the integration of immigrants into Finnish society, this integration has not been all that smooth. Typically, immigrants suffer from unemployment and ethnic discrimination (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006; see section 1.2 below). Among the adult immigrant population, unemployment has been a major obstacle to integration. Although the immigrant unemployment rate has declined since the 1990s, at pace with the general unemployment rate, it is still roughly three times that of Finnish citizens. (Forsander, 2002.) This is so despite the fact that currently one third of arriving immigrants come for reasons of employment and have a job awaiting them (e.g., Mikkonen, 2008). Unemployment has been a problem especially for those coming as refugees.
Ekholm (1994) made a study of Iranian, Kurdish, Somali and Vietnamese refugees in Finland and found that only a few had been able to fully participate in the economic, social and political life of the Finnish society. Ethnic group support facilitated integration, on a general level, but unemployment slowed down integration into the workplace. In the 1990s, Ekholm (1994), as well as Valtonen (1999b), who made a study of Vietnamese in Finland, noted that refugees were counteracting the dysfunctional aspects of unemployment by focusing on their family, their children's well-being, future studies and religion.

Berry (2003, 24) has described the basic tenets of integration in society as the following:

- adoption of basic values by the nondominant group
- adaptation of institutions to the needs of all groups
- an explicit multicultural ideology
- low levels of prejudice
- positive mutual attitudes among ethnocultural groups
- attachment to the larger society
- a collectivistic strategy for cultural maintenance in the nondominant group
The context in which immigrants are acculturating and adapting depends on how these tenets are being followed and realized in society by the minority and majority groups. These conditions vary depending on the country’s immigration history. As a consequence, acculturation research must duly acknowledge context when studying immigrant adaptation (Berry et al., 2006a).

1.2 Majority attitudes in Finland toward ethnic minorities

Majority attitudes towards minorities have been monitored in Finland for about two decades. Surveys of the Finnish population have shown that in 1987 8%, in 1993 24%, in 1998 14%, and in 2003 13% of the population had very negative attitudes towards refugees (Jaakkola, 2005). Jaakkola’s study included attitudes towards Vietnamese in 1987-2003 (see Figure 1). Answering a question on how happy the participant would be to see Vietnamese move to Finland, about half of those surveyed (a random sample in major cities) held positive attitudes in the late 1980s and in the early 2000s, with a decline midway, in 1993, when Finland was in the throes of a recession with high unemployment and unforeseen and unprecedented new groups of immigrants and refugees were arriving in the
country. In this longitudinal comparison of the attitudes of Finns towards immigrants, attitudes towards the Russians and the Somali refugees were systematically more negative, while those towards Swedes, Estonians, and ethnic remigrants were more positive than those towards the Vietnamese. Comparing the attitudes of Finns towards immigrants from 24 different countries, the most positive attitudes were held towards the British and the most negative ones towards the Somalis. The Vietnamese ranked 18th from the top. (Jaakkola, 2005.)

**Figure 1** The willingness of Finns to have Vietnamese immigrants to Finland in 1987-2003 (%)
1.3 Refugees and other migrants – many reasons to come to a new country

The first Vietnamese came to Finland as refugees. Refugees are a form of migrant, a category defining people who live in a country not that of their birth. Migrants can also be asylum seekers, immigrants or sojourners. Refugees are defined by Article 1 of the United Nations’ 1951 Refugee Convention as persons living outside their country with a well-founded fear of persecution in that country because of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion (United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees, 2008).

Asylum seekers travel to a receiving country in hope of international protection on the basis of serious human rights violations they have experienced in their home country, literally seeking asylum in that country and then refugee status, so as to be allowed to stay in that country (e.g., Allen, Vaage, & Hauff, 2006; Finnish Immigration Service. (2008b). Both refugees and asylum seekers are involuntary migrants and have typically experienced trauma and stress, before and during migration and during encampment (e.g., Allen, Vaage, & Hauff, 2006).

Immigrants, in turn, settle in a new country of their own free will and for long periods, usually permanently (e.g., Van Oudenhoven, 2006). Sojourners are short-term voluntary migrants who move to another country for a specific period and for a given goal as tourists, international
students, expatriate workers, international civil servants or as military personnel, and then return to their country of origin (e.g., Bochner, 2006).

This study’s participants are Vietnamese, who arrived in Finland as refugees, and whose background as involuntary migrants with possibly traumatic loss of family, friends and country can have its own specific impact on acculturation and its outcomes. However, the acculturation processes and outcomes referred to in the theoretical and research review below concern all migrants. The acculturation process and outcomes of the participants in this study can, as well, have implications for all migrants, regardless of category.

In Finland the term *immigrant* is often used as an overall category and as an almost permanent label for all people of foreign birth moving to Finland more or less permanently. What people were *de facto* on arrival and what they, or their native-born children, want to be called after living here for decades may be quite different (e.g., Honkatukia & Suurpää, 2007; Pentikäinen, 2005). In this study, the participants, while they arrived here originally as Vietnamese refugees, will be referred to as Vietnamese.

1.4 The Vietnamese community in Finland – from newly arrived refugees to a model minority?

Finland’s Vietnamese community in 2008 consists of close to 5,000 members (Statistics Finland, 2008a), dispersed in
over 30 – 40 municipalities and their environs throughout Finland, with the largest settlements in the metropolitan area around the capital of Helsinki and in Turku, Finland’s fifth-largest city, the first two areas where Vietnamese refugees were resettled in the 1970s and 1980s. Some secondary migration within the country has occurred over the years toward the larger urban centers from the smaller, more isolated areas, but the Vietnamese appear to have “rooted” locally better than many other immigrant groups, such as those coming from African countries, that have congregated in the Helsinki metropolitan area (e.g., Joronen, 2005).

The first group of 100 Vietnamese refugees resettled in Finland in 1979 had grown to 2,300 members by 1994 (Valtonen, 1999a). By 2004, the number of persons with Vietnamese as a mother tongue totaled 4,034 and by the end of 2007 they totaled 4,645 (Statistics Finland, 2008b). The Vietnamese live interspersed with the rest of the population, and not in ethnic enclaves (Pohjanpää, Paananen, & Nieminen, 2003, 132).

The Vietnamese refugees in Finland fled their native country in the aftermath of the Vietnam War in several waves starting in 1975, because of political persecution (Tran, M., 1990). There was no previously existing Vietnamese community when the first group of one hundred Vietnamese refugees, "boat people", came to Finland in 1979 from Southern Vietnam via a refugee camp in Malesia, where they were chosen to come by a Finnish delegation. The next larger group, from a refugee camp in Thailand, arrived in 1983 and subsequent groups, originally from
North Vietnam, came to Finland from refugee camps in Hong Kong in the later 1980s and early 1990s (e.g., Nguyen, C., 2001). The Vietnamese refugees formed an ethnically heterogeneous (North, South and Sino-Vietnamese) but socially rather homogeneous (predominantly lower class) group, and since 1987 they were dispersed in small groups throughout the country in more than 100 municipalities (Liebkind, 1996a). Family members of refugees already settled in Finland came directly from Vietnam through the UNHCR family reunification program. Finland chose whole families from the refugee camps, not just those of working-age, and during one of the early waves, Finland defended the small number (100 - 150) being chosen from the refugee camps on the grounds that Finland was providing special services for those being resettled, because at least one member of each family had a physical handicap needing treatment and rehabilitation (Nguyen, C., 2001).

In the United States (Lee & Zhan, 1998; Zhou & Bankston, 1998) the Vietnamese have been seen as a "model minority", assumedly integrating easily into the majority society, when measured by school achievement and workforce participation. Vietnamese cultural and community support for education and for the work ethic have been seen as key factors in promoting integration, and this ethic is very compatible with the Lutheran values of the majority population in Finland. President Halonen of Finland, in her speech to the president of Vietnam in February 2008, extolled the Vietnamese in Finland as being one of the best integrated immigrant communities in Finland, with Finns
and Vietnamese both placing a value on hard work and competence ("Tasavallan", 2008).

In 2001, 58% of working-age Vietnamese were employed (Pohjanpää et al., 2003), compared to the 87.5% in the total work force (Statistics Finland, 2008b). There have been many Vietnamese success stories, favored by the Finnish media, a Ministry of Education award winner (Stenbäck, 1993) and an Idols-song contest finalist (Aronen, 2006; Kinnunen, 2005), but also news of gangs, crime (“Tytön autoonsa”, 2006) and drug dealing. Finland has both valedictorians and the villains found in Long’s (1996) descriptions of Vietnamese gangs, the outcasts of the ethnic communities in the United States.

In immigrant-rich countries, ethnic communities can be sources of support and social capital for their members (e.g., Zhou & Bankston, 1994). In Finland, and in other European countries, such as Norway, that have become immigrant-receiving countries only in the past few decades (e.g., Prieur, 2002), ethnic communities and networks are still rather small. The question can be raised whether the pressure toward ethnic conformity and, on the other hand, the support provided by the ethnic networks in these countries are as strong as in countries where the minority groups are larger and have been established for a longer time. In their analysis of the large Vietnamese community in New Orleans, Zhou and Bankston (1998) speak of a watchful and ever-vigilant community where there is a consensus of norms as well as provision of tangible and intangible supports for its members. On the other hand, Võ (2000)
notes that although the Vietnamese have formed communities and ethnic organizations in the United States, they do not form a cohesive group, with divisionary factors such as politics, religion, and the former home region in Vietnam dividing and separating members internally. The same divisions were found in the Vietnamese community in Finland in the decade or so after the first arrivals (Ekholm, 1994). The Finnish Vietnamese community also represents people from the North and the South, city people, farmers and fisherman, ethnic Vietnamese and Sino-Vietnamese, both Buddhists, Catholics and agnostics, and those who have spent years in a closed refugee camp in Hongkong or an open camp in Malesia or Thailand, or have come directly from Vietnam as long-separated and now reunited family members. Family histories and adherences are thus many. Some of the newest members of the community have arrived as brides or grooms of young Vietnamese who have grown up in Finland (Nguyen, C., 2001).

1.5 Studies on the Vietnamese in Finland

The bulk of the research on the Vietnamese in Finland has concentrated on their ethnic identity and psychological well-being during acculturation (e.g., Liebkind, 1996a,b) and these will be reviewed in more detail below when dealing with these issues. Only a few studies have addressed other
issues, such as, for example, social support networks. In her study of elderly Vietnamese immigrants in a suburb of Turku, with a relatively densely settled Vietnamese population by Finnish standards, Valtonen (2002) found that the interaction patterns in the Vietnamese community formed robust informal and available networks. There was a weekly Vietnamese language club for children, sports and other activities and shared neighborhood activities (Valtonen, 2002). This study found that supportive Vietnamese neighborhood networks exist also in Finland.

Repercussions due in part to lacking ethnic networks can also be found in Finland. In their study of the well-being of Vietnamese adolescents in Finland, Liebkind and Kosonen (1998), found that the density of co-ethnics and support from the Vietnamese community was especially important for girls, who reported more depression when this community was missing. Ekholm (1994) also found that in the early 1990s the Vietnamese in Finland were still divided by political lines and conflicts between North and South Vietnamese, going back to the war which had ended in 1975. Time appears to be a healing factor, however. Valtonen (1999a) found in the later 1990s that a longer resettlement period and greater distance from the source of conflict appeared to have modified these differences in the Vietnamese community.

There is typically a considerable cultural distance between refugees coming to Finland and the host population. In particular, gender and generation roles differ, as refugees, including the Vietnamese, often come from cultures with
male domination and strict parental (and community) control (Pentikäinen, 2005; Tran, M., 1990). A qualitative interview study made with Vietnamese in Finland in the mid-1990s showed that, over time, the importance of the family and collective culture continued, but their meanings changed. The family no longer included several generations. Social networks were thinner, but with an added transnational dimension. Having possibilities to combine the new and the original culture felt positive, but the process of identity change and finding a place for oneself seemed never ending, with Finnish society making them feel not a part of the majority, forever being the “other”. (Pentikäinen, 2005.)
2 ACCULTURATION - A LONGITUDINAL PROCESS INVOLVING CONDITIONS, ORIENTATIONS, OUTCOMES - AND DIMENSIONS

In the classical definition of acculturation, the concept refers to “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural pattern of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, 1936, 149). As a process, acculturation often lasts all of an immigrant’s lifetime and implies changes over time in beliefs, emotions, attitudes, values, behavior, identification patterns etc. of persons in first-hand contact with persons representing another culture. This perspective encompasses a range of different conceptual frameworks and includes the antecedents, mediators, moderators and adaptational outcomes of the dynamic acculturation process (Berry et al., 2006; Ward, 1996; 2001).

Acculturation changes and experiences, including those of perceived discrimination, are key elements in understanding the psychological well-being of immigrants (Berry et al., 2006; Liebkind, 2001). Theoretical frameworks of acculturation have been borrowed from mainstream
psychology. Major influences in acculturation research have been drawn from work in stress and coping, social learning and skills, social cognition, and intergroup perceptions (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2006; Liebkind, 2001). The acculturation variables used in acculturation research can be broadly divided into three groups: those pertaining to the acculturation conditions (context), those pertaining to acculturation orientations, and those pertaining to acculturation outcomes.

To understand acculturation conditions it is essential to establish the context within which the acculturation process takes place. Relevant aspects of the context include characteristics of the immigrant group as well as the host society in terms of mono- or multiculturalism, degree of ethnic discrimination, etc. The acculturation orientations or profiles of the immigrants, in turn, are critical to understanding the acculturation process, as they link conditions to outcomes. (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2006; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001.) Profiles refer to specific combinations of preferred or adopted languages, values and identities. For example, immigrants can orient themselves towards their heritage culture and/or to the majority culture in regard to, for example, language, values and identity.
2.1 Unidimensional and bidimensional models of acculturation

Theoretical models of cultural orientations in acculturation are traditionally uni- or bidimensional; the former posits a unidirectional change towards the mainstream society and implies an eventual disappearance of the original ethnic/cultural identity. In contrast, the latter emphasizes cultural pluralism and is bidimensional in the sense that it recognizes that ethnic groups and their members preserve, although in varying degrees, their heritage cultures while adapting to the mainstream society. (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2006; Liebkind, 2001; Sam, 2006.) Unidimensional models assuming change only toward the majority culture, an assimilationist view, have been replaced in most current psychological thinking by bidimensional models that see adoption of majority elements as not necessitating loss of the original culture. (Sam, 2006.)

Bidimensional models of adaptation styles are based on the premise that acculturation can take several paths. Adoption of the majority identity, culture, values or language does not necessarily mean rejection of one’s own ethnic minority identity, culture, values, or language. Acculturation may also vary from one domain of behavior and social life to another.

In Berry’s (1990, 1997, 2006a,b, see Figure 2) bidimensional model of cultural orientations, the two dimensions allow for a fourfold classification of
acculturation orientations or profiles: If an individual answers yes to both of the two questions, the Integration option is chosen, implying that some degree of cultural integrity is maintained while the individual simultaneously seeks to participate as an integral part of the larger society. If an individual answers no to the first question and yes to the second, the Assimilation option is chosen, whereby the individual does not wish to maintain his or her cultural identity while moving into the larger society. If the answer is yes to the first question and no to the second, Separation is the preferred strategy, where the individual wants to hold on to his or her original culture but avoids interaction with the larger society. Finally, Marginalization results from answering no to both questions, as there is little possibility for or interest in cultural maintenance or intergroup relations.

**Figure 2** Acculturation orientations at the individual level, according to Berry (2006a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should I seek a positive relationship (contact)/get involved with (participate in) the larger society?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are my own ethnic/cultural identity and customs of value and should they be retained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berry’s early 1990 model has been criticized by Sayegh and Lasry (1993) for being inconsistent by accounting for acculturative change along two cultural dimensions that are not orthogonal – one measuring attitudes (identification with the heritage culture) and the other behavior (contact with members of the host society). Berry’s newer, 2006a model also includes attitudes toward one’s culture in addition to one’s identity, but it is still basically an attitude-and-behavior model.

Bourhis, Moïse, Perrault, and Senécal (1997) developed Berry’s fourfold identity/culture-and-contact model further, because they wanted to make a symmetrical model, recognizing that one of Berry’s dimensions was social and the other cultural. Bourhis and his colleagues (1997) focused on the two essential questions of whether or not it was valuable to 1) maintain one’s immigrant cultural identity and/or 2) adopt the cultural identity of the receiving society, resulting in the same three categories above of integration, assimilation, separation and the fourth (Berry’s marginalization) with the dual name of anomie or individualism, maintaining that individuals can choose to disassociate themselves from both categories either because they are marginalized /experiencing anomie or prefer being individualists and not ascribed to a given group. In addition, Bourhis and his colleagues (1997) proposed an Interactional Acculturation Model (IAM) depicting acculturation orientations as relational outcomes of the interaction of minority and majority acculturation orientations as influenced by state integration policies.
Hutnik’s (1986) bidimensional model of acculturation is also a model of in-group and out-group identity attitudes, as is that of Bourhis and his colleagues. Hutnik’s model results in four categories, similar to Berry’s, but concerning identity alone: 1) assimilative, 2) dissociative (Berry’s separation), 3) acculturative (Berry’s integration), and 4) marginal. As Sayegh and Lasry (1993) note, however, Hutnik’s model is biased, in that heritage culture has a negative connotation and the majority society a positive one.

Despite the criticism of asymmetry, Berry’s model of acculturation orientations has the advantage of recognizing both identity/culture and contact/participation. In addition, Berry (2006b) has developed his bidimensional model to incorporate orientations at the society level (Figure 3), recognizing the context where individuals are acculturating, as he also sees that individual orientations react to and interact with the orientations, integration policies, of the surrounding society.

**Figure 3**  *Acculturation orientations at the societal level, according to Berry (2006b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should relationships among groups be sought?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should heritage culture and identity be maintained?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Melting pot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berry (1990) stated very early that acculturation orientations can depend on the situation in many different ways. For example, one may seek assimilation at work (economic assimilation), speak the languages of the country of heritage and settlement (linguistic integration), and maintain traditional relationships in family and marriage (separation in private relationships) (Berry, 1990; 1997). Since then, different domain-specific acculturation models have been based on the assumption that an individual’s preference for adaptation and cultural maintenance can (and often will) vary across life domains or situations (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2006).

Another asset of Berry’s (2006b) acculturation theory is that it also includes a process model of acculturation (Figure 4) depicting the individual-level process of acculturation, which incorporates the orientations described above (Figure 2 and 3). The process starts with the context and individual experiences of acculturation and ends with some long-term adaptation that can be psychological, cultural, social, and health-related (Berry, 2006b). The acculturation orientations or profiles of the acculturating individuals – called acculturation attitudes or strategies by Berry (2006b) - form the central variables. These orientations are the attitudes and behaviors pertaining to the individual’s maintenance and development of his or her ethnic/cultural distinctiveness and identity in society and the desirability of intergroup contact and participation (Berry, 2006a).
Berry’s models (2006a,b, see Figure 2, 3, and 4) were chosen for this study as they are the most comprehensive ones, as they include both a social dimension (contact and
participation) and a cultural one (degree of maintenance of own culture and identity), while the process model (Figure 4) also explicitly acknowledges the important role of the individual’s own acculturation experiences, primarily perceived discrimination. Bourhis and his colleagues’ (1997) model is comprehensive in another respect in that it acknowledges the acculturation preferences of the dominant society and the fit between the preferences of the society at large and those of the minority members, but as this study does not include majority members, the acculturation experiences of the individual immigrants become crucial and that is why Berry’s model was chosen for this study.

What has not been established in research, however, is the proportionate importance of different acculturation dimensions in the acculturation process: under what circumstances and in what kind of settings will changes in language, values or identity be most crucial for acculturation outcomes? As Phinney and Flores (2002) have noted, acculturation can be better understood when distinct aspects are examined. Although existing acculturation theories take for granted that several dimensions of acculturation influence acculturation outcomes, their relative importance for these outcomes is rather under-researched.
3 PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND
SOCIOCULTURAL ADAPTATION AS OUTCOMES
OF ACCULTURATION

The successful outcomes of acculturation have been defined in different ways, as mental (e.g., lack of psychological distress) and physical health, psychological satisfaction, high self-esteem, feelings of acceptance and satisfaction, positive and extensive interaction with hosts, the acquisition of culturally appropriate behaviors and skills, academic performance (e.g., school achievement), and competent work performance (Arends-Tóth & Vijver, 2006; Liebkind, 2001). The outcomes of acculturation, particularly psychological well-being, have generally proved to be most positive when the acculturation orientations or profiles are integrational or bicultural (Berry et al., 2006a,b; Jasinskaja-Laht, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003). In such orientations, one's original culture is retained while one simultaneously adopts elements of the majority culture, thus showing a flexibility in living in two cultures (Verkuyten, 2005).

Individual-level adaptation occurs on two levels. According to Ward and her colleagues (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward, 2001; Ward & Kennedy, 1994; Ward & Rana-
Deuba, 1999), acculturation outcomes can be divided into *psychological* (emotional/affective) well-being and *sociocultural* (behavioral) competence in the mainstream culture (Berry, 2003; Searle & Ward, 1990). Consequently, psychological adaptation affects one’s sense of well-being or self-esteem and sociocultural adaptation links the individual to others in the new society (Searle & Ward, 1990). Berry (2003, 2006b) states that these two forms of adaptation are empirically related, but they have different time courses and different experiential predictors, with psychological adaptation predicted by personality variables, life change events and social support, and sociocultural adaptation predicted by cultural knowledge, degree of contact and positive intergroup attitudes. Both forms of adaptation are generally predicted by the successful pursuit of the integration orientation and a minimal distance between the receiving culture and the new arrival’s own culture. (Berry, 2003, 2006b.)

However, the importance of the ideological and social context to the acculturation and adaptation of immigrants should not be underestimated. Which orientations or profiles turn out to be most beneficial for acculturation outcomes may depend on the fit between the acculturation orientations of the immigrants and the preferences and policies of the host society. As stressed by Bourhis and his colleagues (Bourhis et al., 1997) in their Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) and by others (e.g., Phinney et al., 2001), the orientations or profiles of the immigrants interact with the actual and perceived levels of acceptance of them in the host
society, and the relationship of these profiles to adaptation will likewise be influenced by the interaction of characteristics of specific immigrant groups with those of particular settings. This is generally accepted at the theoretical level, and some studies have looked at the impact of context cross-sectionally in a comparative perspective (for one of the largest studies, see Berry et al., 2006). Another way is to do a thorough longitudinal case study on a specific acculturating group in a specific acculturation context, linking contextual factors to the process and its outcomes. This study represents the latter approach.

3.1 Psychological well-being

Acculturative stress is a response by people to life events that are rooted in intercultural contact. Frequently, these reactions include heightened levels of depression (linked to the experience of cultural loss), and of anxiety (linked to uncertainty about how one should live in the new society) (Berry, 2006b). Berry’s (1990; 1997) acculturation model adopts the stress and coping framework in emphasizing that acculturation experiences can be advantageous (such as providing opportunities and interesting experiences), as well as undermining life’s chances (such as limiting opportunities and diminishing experiences that provide meaning to life). When acculturation experiences are judged to be
problematic, *acculturative stress* results and ultimate adaptation depends on the personal appraisal of the stressors and the coping resources available for dealing with residual stress. (Berry, 2006b.)

Among the factors found to mediate between acculturation experiences and outcomes are the acculturation orientations or profiles of the immigrants. Research findings within the unidimensional model of acculturation on psychological well-being outcomes among immigrants are to a large extent conflicting: “high” acculturation has been found to lead both to well-being (e.g. Beiser, Hou, Hyman, & Toussignant, 2002) and to a lack of well-being (e.g., L. Nguyen & Peterson, 1993). To complicate matters further, some research reveals a curvilinear relationship (where biculturalism is linked to adaptation), while other studies reveal no relationships at all (H. Nguyen, 2006). The paradoxical patterns of adaptation extend across ages, ethnic groups and national contexts (Nguyen, H., 2006; Sam, Vedder, Liebkind, Neto, & Virta, 2008).

In a Norwegian study (Sam & Berry, 1995) of 10-17-year-old third-world immigrants from 25 different countries, psychological and somatic symptoms and depressive

\[\text{In unidimensional models of acculturation, high levels of acculturation are equivalent to assimilation, whereas lower levels can indicate either separation or integration profiles. The mixed use of uni- and bidimensional models may account for some of the inconsistent findings (Nguyen, H., 2006).}\]
tendencies were found to be related to the acculturation orientations of the immigrants, with the most adaptive mode of acculturation being integration. In a Finnish study (Kosonen, 1994), compared to Finnish children and adolescents, Vietnamese participants reported significantly more symptoms of depression, felt more excluded, more pressure to conform, and were more often victimized by peers. The younger the children on arrival, the less depressed they were, while especially the depression found among girls who had been in Finland longer went unrecognized by their teachers (Kosonen, 1994). In another Finnish study, stress was found to be linked to strong traditional Vietnamese values (Liebkind & Kosonen, 1998). A moderate acculturation process proved best, with both rapid integration and not integrating at all detrimental pathways leading to stress for older girls – while boys were more easily allowed to act like Finns (Liebkind & Kosonen, 1998).

In contrast to numerous studies suggesting the adaptiveness of biculturality, however, H. Nguyen, Messé and Stollack (1999) found in their study that only the U.S. cultural dimension was related to better outcomes for the different indices of adjustment used. The results obtained by Sanchez and Fernandez (1993) point in the same direction. They found that identification with the U.S. culture was related to lower levels of acculturative stress and perceived discrimination, while the Hispanic identification was related to neither (Sanchez and Fernandez, 1993). H. Nguyen and her colleagues (1999) concluded that this was due to the particular context of their study; for their Vietnamese
participants who lived in a predominantly Anglo-American community with only 703 Vietnamese inhabitants, it was not ethnic involvement as such which was maladaptive but the inconsistency between the individual's skills and the demands of his or her context.

3.2 Sociocultural adaptation

Research on sociocultural adaptation as an outcome of acculturation has yielded perhaps more straightforward and less conflicting results than those concerning psychological well-being as an outcome. National language proficiency has been shown time after time to be a key predictor of sociocultural adaptation (e.g. Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008). However, especially regarding language proficiency, it seems that support can also be found for the beneficial impact of ethnic and bilingual language proficiency on educational attainment (Vedder, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Nickmans, 2006a; see section 5).

What is often referred to as the “immigrant paradox” is the counterintuitive finding that immigrants often show even better adaptation outcomes, particularly sociocultural outcomes, than their national peers in spite of poorer socioeconomic status (Sam et al., 2008). What has been disenheartening in the results of research in the United States, however, is that although immigrant children have
been found to do well, even exceptionally well, the longer immigrant children reside in the US, the worse their sociocultural adaptation becomes (Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). The general finding that over time the adaptation of immigrants may decline or converge towards the level of the nationals or even surpass it in the negative direction has been referred to as the convergence hypothesis (Sam et al., 2008). As Suárez-Orozco (2001) has found, acculturation today seems to lead to negative outcomes such as detrimental health, more ambivalent attitudes toward school, and lower grades, with initial immigrant optimism giving way to lowered educational goals. Here, again, context may be an explanation – outcomes may depend on the kind of interactions with the host population and the co-ethnics that are available to the acculturating immigrant in his or her particular social environment.
4 PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION, WELL-BEING, AND SOCIOCULTURAL ADAPTATION

Perceived discrimination can be considered to be a basic starting point in the acculturation process; it represents the kind of acculturation experiences, the kind of context, likely to cause acculturative stress and potentially decrease immigrants’ psychological and sociocultural adaptation (Berry, 2006b; Vedder, Vijver, & Liebkind, 2006b). Acculturating individuals often experience discrimination and racism, which is expected to have a profound impact on their level of acculturation, level of acculturative stress, and how individuals identify with their original culture and the majority culture (Trimble, 2003). As Phinney and her colleagues (2001) have noted, immigrants’ desire to become part of the larger society will be thwarted if they meet discrimination or rejection of their efforts toward inclusion.

A consistent and robust finding is that perceived discrimination as a contextual factor has a direct, strong, long-lasting, and negative impact on psychological well-being and adaptation (Edwards & Beiser, 1994; Berry, 2006b; Birman & Trickett, 2001; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind
& Perhoniemi, 2006; Rumbaut, 1994; Williams, Neighbors & Jackson, 2003) among immigrants and ethnic minorities. Acceptance or discrimination can be defining aspects in a newcomer’s life. In their five-year longitudinal study of immigrant students in school in the United States, Suárez-Orozco and her colleagues (2008) found relationships with peers, teachers, and school staff to be significant both for the students’ well-being and for their academic trajectories, so that the students would remain engaged in school learning activities.

As Sam (2006) has noted, it is common for immigrant children to feel alienated from school peers. In Krupinski’s 1986 Australian study (as cited in Almqvist & Broberg, 1999), isolation and a lack of peer friendships were, however, not found to affect the immigrant children’s school achievement, with the author calling alienation “the price of freedom”. This is in contradiction with the above findings from Suárez-Orozco and her colleagues’ (2008) long-term study of immigrant students’ adaptation, where relationships and the welcoming ethos of the school environment were found to be keys to both well-being and sociocultural adaptation.

A recent Finnish study of immigrant adolescent male criminals (Honkatukia & Suurpää, 2007) revealed that for young offenders, the experience of belonging and having ties to society was important: belonging to a group and having friends were essential, and giving up a life of crime would have meant the need to break up with their only network of friends while other close communities were fragile or non-
existent. Their experiences were of being outsiders and of being stigmatized as being different and of experiencing daily manifestations of racism (Honkatukia & Suurpää, 2007).
5 LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY, PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING, AND SOCIOCULTURAL ADAPTATION

Understanding and being able to communicate in the national language of one’s new country is one of the first needs an immigrant newcomer needs to address. National language proficiency has been found to be a key factor in lessening acculturative stress and in easing adaptation to the new country (e.g., Beiser & Hou, 2001). In their study of stress and language proficiency among Southeast Asian adult refugees, Nicassio, Solomon, Guest, and McCullough (1986) found a lack of English proficiency associated with depression, so that English proficiency significantly reduced the impact of acculturative stressors on depression.

National language proficiency has been shown to lead also to sociocultural adaptation, measured as school achievement (e.g., Rumbaut, 1994; Suárez-Orozco, 2001) or employment (Beiser & Hou, 2001). However, also ethnic language proficiency has also been found to have a favorable impact on sociocultural adaptation: literacy in one’s own ethnic language has been shown to have long-lasting positive effects on achievement (Bankston & Zhou, 1995) and also to
be positively related to identification with the ethnic group (Vedder et al., 2006a). When it comes to the relationship between language proficiency and educational attainment among immigrant children, research shows that different proficiencies or combinations of proficiencies may work in different conditions (Vedder et al., 2006a). While several studies support the notion that immigrant students’ proficiency in the national language is a better predictor of academic performance than their proficiency in the ethnic language (e.g., Driessen, 2000; Vedder, 2005), research also supports the expectation that ethnic language proficiency affects adolescents’ ethnic identity and that a strong ethnic identity is related to positive adaptation of minority youth (Horenczyk & Ben-Shalom, 2001). Yet other studies suggest that immigrant students who are proficient in both their ethnic and the national language are more socioculturally adapted than students who are less balanced in their bilingualism or who lack proficiency in either language (Vedder & Virta, 2005). Collier (1992) found in her research synthesis of studies on language-minority students’ academic achievement that the greater was first language instructional support in school, combined with balanced second language support, the higher was academic achievement compared to that of minority students taught monolingually in the majority language.

In their five-year immigrant school adaptation study (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008) found that both age of arrival (being younger) and length of residence (residing longer) correlated with higher levels of majority language
proficiency. According to Suárez-Orozco and her colleagues’ study, cognitive/academic majority language acquisition takes an average of 7 - 10 years of systematic language training and exposure to reach an abstraction level necessary for academic learning, reading, writing and argumentation to occur in that language, with interrupted schooling and previous native language literacy affecting the rate of acquisition. Earlier research findings on second language acquisition such as those of Cummins (1990, cited in Suárez-Orozco et al, 2008) showed this academic level, CALP (cognitive academic language proficiency in a second language), as being reached in 5 - 7 years, but, as Suárez-Orozco and her colleagues note, Cummins’ findings were made in a favorable Canadian language-immersion context not typical for immigrant youth.

In a ten-year follow-up of the language proficiency, employment and psychological well-being of Southeast Asian adults in Canada (Beiser & Hou, 2001), majority language proficiency was found to lead to employment, as well as to increase psychological well-being. Ward & Kennedy (1999) found majority language fluency associated with positive sociocultural adaptation.
Traditional Vietnamese family values are based on centuries-old Confucian teachings on filial piety, authority, respect, and mutual assistance: family members are expected to be loyal to each other, children are obliged to show respect for and be obedient to parents, sibling rivalry and aggression is discouraged, and wives are expected to be nurturant caretakers of both husband and children (Ho, 1987; Liebkind, 1996b). In the Vietnam of the 1960s and 1970s, children were brought up according to strict expectations concerning gender-specific behavior (Tran, M., 1990). Girls were taught to be the guardians of the home, to be dependent on others and boys that they would be the breadwinners and active in society outside the home. Girls’ behavior was controlled more than that of boys. The hierarchical order was age, gender and sibling order, with girls and women acquiescing to males, be they grandfathers, fathers or older or younger brothers. (Tran, M., 1990). In addition to the
traditional age and gender hierarchies, young adult Vietnamese interviewed in the United States (Kibria, 1993) and in Finland (Oinonen, 1999) also identified the cooperative and caring relations between kin as essential features of Vietnamese family life.

People move to a new country with hopes for a better future, for opportunities not as readily available in their native country (e.g., Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). The children of immigrants epitomize parents’ hopes in many ways, both hopes for that better future, but also for carrying on family traditions and one’s ethnic heritage and its values (e.g., Kibria, 1994; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). In immigrant families, the expectations parents have for their daughters and sons can represent their wishes to optimize the benefits anticipated from immigration (such as educational and career opportunities for their children), while at the same time maintaining continuity in the transmission of important values and behaviors from the parents' society of origin (Dion & Dion, 2001).

In immigrant families, expectations about gender-related roles are challenged in the new society, resulting in the renegotiation of these roles (Dion & Dion, 2001). These researchers found in their review of gender and cultural adaptation research that there is evidence of different socialization demands on daughters compared to sons in immigrant families, with potential implication not only for parent-child relationships, but also for the development for ethnic identity among adolescents and young adults. It is likely that parents will be more restrictive and monitor their
daughters' behavior more than their sons' behavior, especially concerning peer relations. (Dion & Dion, 2001.)

Finland is a country where gender equality, specifically concerning the independence of women and political representation, is highly regarded and women have a major role in national and local politics and administration. Vietnamese cultural expectations, however, have traditionally been different for women and for men - women are the nurturers of cultural traditions, carers of the home, while men are more active in life outside the home (e.g., Kibria, 1993; Zhou & Bankston, 1998).

In an ethnographic Finnish study, Oinonen (1999) found that young Vietnamese were critical of traditional gender role models and the concept of family, but that they were still considered self-evident and useful for the future. There were signs that the younger generation was beginning to break away from the tight Vietnamese community by using more Finnish, not wanting to learn Vietnamese, having a more Finnish group of friends and acting confrontational toward parental authority. In Norway, among children of immigrants from patriarchal societies, now in their twenties, Prieur (2002) found that new gender constructions are being wrought through negotiation and accommodation, leading to more equality between the genders as well as to greater autonomy for the younger generation. Considering the prevailing norms of gender equality and egalitarian parent-child relationships in Finland as well as in the other Nordic countries, the cultural distance between Vietnamese and Finns is considerable (Liebkind, 1996b).
6.2 Values, psychological well-being, and sociocultural adaptation

The research on the impact of values and intergenerational value discrepancies on the immigrant younger generation has reported conflicting results. As Szapocznik & Kurtines (1993) have noted, there are acculturational differences across generations linked to problems among the young: parents want family connectedness and their teenage children want autonomy. Szapocznik and Kurtines (1993) see biculturalism as the answer for both parties. Sam, Kosic and Oppedal (2003), however, have raised the issue of there being a danger of pathologizing the value discrepancies between the older and younger immigrant generation, as this may be a normal developmental issue and not related to being an immigrant. As Sam (2006) notes, earlier researchers from the 1990s suggested that intergenerational conflict could be behind the maladaptation of young immigrants. More recently (Berry et al., 2006), it has been suggested that such conflict is found not only in immigrant families, but in national groups also and that it does not always lead to psychological problems.

Immigrant children’s psychological well-being has been found to be strengthened by a commitment to traditional family values of hard work and obedience to the family (e.g. Fuligni, 1998; Zhou & Bankston, 1994) and by ethnic community and family support (e.g. Zhou & Bankston, 1994). Also among the Vietnamese in Finland, it
has been found that adherence to traditional values decreased acculturative stress and behavioral problems, while acceptance of parental authority increased life satisfaction (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000). It was also found that those Vietnamese, Turkish, Russian and Somalian adolescents who are fairly traditional in terms of parental authority, who perceive parental support but also reject the limitation of children's rights, have the best chance of successful acculturation outcomes (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000). Similar results have been obtained for adults; in V. Tran's (1987) study of the psychological well-being of 160 Vietnamese adult refugees in the United States, support from the ethnic community, self-esteem and income were found to have significant direct effects on psychological well-being.

In regard to self-esteem, however, Liebkind and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2000) found that adherence to family-based values did not have a significant impact on self-esteem. On the other hand, they found that greater self-esteem was associated with less perceived discrimination, better skills in Finnish, more experienced support and more understanding provided by the parents (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000). In studying life-satisfaction, another measure of psychological well-being, Phinney and Ong (2002) raised the question that a feeling of lack of understanding from their parents may be what leads to poor life satisfaction among adolescents, rather than intergenerational conflict.

In her ethnographic study of Vietnamese families in the eastern United States, Kibria (1993) found that
Vietnamese in their early twenties or younger were more conflicted in their feelings toward the traditional Vietnamese family system than were their elders. However, for most of these younger Vietnamese the traditional family system was a source of cultural pride and self-esteem, particularly the cooperation and collectivism manifested in it (Kibria, 1993).

One could assume that among the Vietnamese with a strongly age- and gender-based authoritarian heritage, there is a possibility for a strong conflict in values and behavior expectations, and especially for girls, for whom the expectations regarding obligations and independence differ greatly between traditional Vietnamese upbringing and the Finnish ethos of independence and gender equality. On the other hand, Vietnamese Buddhist culture also teaches accommodation, changing and fitting in (e.g., Detzner, 1996). Vietnamese families change and adapt in diaspora, the older generation as well as the younger (Kibria, 1993).

Social context should be taken into consideration and not just isolated factors: In contrast to the predominant result that “higher” acculturation and time leads to a lessening of acculturative stress and thus improved mental health, L. Nguyen and Peterson (1993) found that acculturation in the direction of the majority culture is associated with increased depression symptoms among Vietnamese American college students. One could speculate that for these young college students a possible growing value difference and thus tensions between the generations could be generating poorer mental health (Nguyen, L. & Peterson, 1993; Balls Organista, Organista, & Kurasaki, 2003).
Detzner (1996, 45-48) speaks of an accommodation of values between Vietnamese generations in diaspora:

the important lesson of accommodation: on the one hand, centrality of family structure, hierarchy, filial piety (Confucian philosophy) – on the other, acceptance of fate and the values of bending with the winds of change and survival (Buddhist religious beliefs) – although [these] may appear contradictory, [they] may also be seen as fostering a continuing and useful dialectical process between generations in which they can address fundamental values in the dramatically altered contexts of their lives.

Detzner (1996, 45-48)

Accommodation, change and a better fit, may result in a better outcome than clinging to traditional patriarchal values: Zhou and Bankston (2000) have predicted that patriarchal norms may ultimately lead to their own undoing in that heightened pressure and control of behavior can lead to rebellion.

Regarding specifically the relationship between values and sociocultural adaptation, a study of Vietnamese adolescents in the United States (Zhou & Bankston, 1994) found that students who adhere strongly to traditional family values, have a strong commitment to a work ethic, and a high degree of personal involvement in the ethnic community, tend to receive a disproportionate amount of high grades, to have definite college plans, and to be highly
academically oriented. This suggests that strong positive immigrant cultural orientations, values, can serve as social capital that promotes value conformity and constructive forms of behavior (Zhou & Bankston, 1994). However, strong familial ties may also be seen as confining when they lead to vigilant control of behavior (Oinonen, 1999). Control can also have another negative aspect, in that those seen as acting too much like the majority population and not conforming to Vietnamese expectations concerning social relations can be stigmatized and Vietnamese families idealized because they are such a strong source of emotional and financial support (Bankston, 1998).
7 IDENTITY IN ACCULTURATION

7.1 Identity, identification, and the acculturation process

Ethnic identity is a salient part of the acculturation process. The distinction between the constructs of ethnic identity and acculturation has not always been very clear, and sometimes these two concepts have been used interchangeably (Liebkind, 2001; Nguyen, H. et al., 1999; Phinney, 1990). However, acculturation is a broader construct, encompassing a wide range of behaviors, attitudes, and values that change with contact between cultures, while ethnic identity is that aspect of acculturation that focuses on the subjective sense of belonging to a group or culture (Phinney et al., 2001).

Identity and identification are terms often used “in the same breath”, as Verkuyten states (2005, 64), so that conceptual distinctions are not always made. Mostly, identification corresponds to an existing social identity, as people tend to identify with the group to which they (and others) consider them to belong. However, identification
with the group to which one belongs can also be resisted or denied; a distance is kept from the ethnic in-group and the expectations and demands that follow from the group membership. In the same vein, it is also possible to identify with an ethnic group that one does not – or is not considered by others to – belong to. (Verkuyten, 2005.)

Verkuyten (2005) also distinguishes between identification as and identification with. Defining oneself as a member of a group does not necessarily mean that one identifies with that group. Self-categorization as a member of a group can be an unemotional category one uses, because of clearly visible features, for example, but categorization with a group, identifying with a group, involves emotions, both negative and positive, and involves a feeling of oneness with that group. Identification with has an emotional significance for the individual. (Verkuyten, 2005).

In the literature, identity has been viewed as a rather stable individual difference characteristic, but also as a highly contingent process that varies in time and across contexts. The debate about stability and variability in any social identity is often conducted in an either/or fashion, with some stressing the flexible and ever-changing self-definitions and others accentuating the emotional investments and loyalties that make identity changes difficult. Ethnic identity is for many people a substantial source of self-understanding and meaningfulness in life. At the same time, however, the understanding of who and what one is depends on those who are present and on the way in which the context is interpreted. (Verkuyten, 2005)
Ethnic identity has been defined (Phinney, 2003a) as a dynamic, multidimensional construct referring to one’s identity or sense of self as a member of an ethnic group sharing a culture, phenotype, religion, language, kinship or place of origin. It has also been defined as "embracing various aspects, including self-identification, feelings of belongingness and commitment to a group, a sense of shared values, and attitudes toward one’s own ethnic group” (Phinney et al., 2001, 496). Ethnic identity is a core of one’s being, shaped by one’s surroundings. This corresponds to Verkuyten’s (2005, see above) concept of identification with a group, which is much more than just a label. As Verkuyten (2005) writes, ethnic identity is constructed and defined socially and forms a foundation for self-understanding and for positive or negative feelings about oneself. It is especially young people from ethnic minority groups who try to redefine the relationship of their background to their identity, as opposed to their parents whose identity is strongly embedded in their home country background (Verkuyten, 2005). In adolescence, when questions of “Who am I?” and “Where do I belong?” are essential issues of existence, ethnic identity is especially important for one’s sense of self (Birman, 2006).

Changes in self-identification during acculturation involve issues similar to the issues used to identify acculturation attitudes, such as whether or not to adopt the host country label and whether or not to retain the ethnic label. Generally, ethnic identity and national identity can be perceived as two dimensions of group identity that may vary
independently; each identity can be either secure and strong or undeveloped and weak (Phinney et al., 2001). However, the role of each of these identity dimensions in the integration process should be considered separately. Specifically, depending on the strength of each and the intergroup context, they may interact and/or have differing consequences (Phinney, Berry, Vedder, & Liebkind, 2006).

In addition to considering identity dimensions separately, the relationship between ethnic and national identity should also be considered. Although usually statistically independent, their correlations can be positive, negative, or close to zero, indicating the quality of cultural identity in a given context when combined with the means of the identities. A positive correlation would indicate a bicultural or integrated identity, if both are high, and an alienated identity if both are low, while a negative correlation would mean identification only with the culture with a higher mean (Phinney et al., 2006).

A general finding is that identity may acculturate at a slower pace than other acculturation dimensions and be relatively unrelated to them; even for individuals who have adopted cultural features of the host society, self-categorization as an ethnic minority member is very resistant to change (Hutnik, 1991; Snauwert, Soenens, Vanbeselaere, & Boen, 2003). Acculturating individuals may identify strongly with their cultural ingroup and also have a positive attitude towards maintenance of their heritage culture, yet fail to endorse that culture themselves (Liebkind, 2006). Change as a result of acculturation is a factor essential in
understanding ethnic identity among immigrants, as Phinney (2003a) writes: in addition to change over generations, we should consider change within an individual over time, and change not only in the strength of a given ethnic identity but also change toward a bicultural identity. Phinney (1990) also found in her review of ethnic identity research that a positive self-concept may be related to the process of identity formation, in how one understands and accepts his or her ethnicity.

7.2 Identity, psychological well-being, and sociocultural adaptation

There appears to be a complex relationship between ethnic identity and well-being among the Vietnamese. Although a bicultural identity has generally been found best linked to psychological adjustment among immigrant youth (Berry et al., 2006), for the Vietnamese, identification and involvement with their own culture has been found both more positively linked (Berry et al., 2006; Nguyen, L. & Peterson, 1993) and more negatively linked (Nguyen, H. et al., 1999) to well-being than the national orientation.

Nesdale and Mak (2003) also found ethnic identification to be a negative predictor of personal self-esteem and suggested that adherence to ethnic cultural values may impede the development of a strong sense of self-worth in the new country. In contrast, a bicultural, integrated
identity was closely linked to psychological adjustment in a four-country comparison of immigrant adolescents (Phinney et al., 2001). However, in Phinney and her colleagues’ study, Vietnamese and Turkish adolescents in Finland were found to have largely marginalized identities, which is usually considered to be detrimental to well-being (Berry, 2006a,b).

A bicultural identity is a new, hybrid identity. Empirical research on hybrid identities lags behind theoretical thinking: Verkuyten (2005) refers to theories of hybridity that reject the idea of uniformly defined identities and promote heterogeneity and multiple identities, but calls for more empirical studies to clarify whether these new identities really are multiple and fragmented. Identity construction can be seen as an ongoing process of choice and negotiation (Verkuyten, 2005). As Persky and Birman (2005) have noted, the construal of self-identity is a lifelong task with a longitudinal research design the only means of studying how identity transforms over time.

The contradictory results regarding the relationship between identity and well-being may depend on the context. Phinney and her colleagues (2001) point out that context is important in identity formation, which depends both on the immigrant’s characteristics and on how the receiving society responds to the newcomer, moderated by the ethnic group’s circumstances. Support for ethnic maintenance and the pressure to assimilate appear to be contending forces in this development. An outcome of a combined strong ethnic identity and strong national identity is usually considered to be the most adaptive one (Phinney et al., 2001), but it is
possible that different contexts provide a different extent of “fit” between the immigrants’ orientations or profiles and the demands of the host society, making some orientations more adaptive than others, in that particular context (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2003).

Much of the research on Vietnamese acculturation has been carried out in the United States, Canada or Australia in Vietnamese ethnic enclaves (e.g., Beiser & Hou, 2001; Rumbaut, 2005; Zhou & Bankston, 2000), where there is the opportunity for frequent co-ethnic relations, support, identity models and chances to ”act and be Vietnamese” among Vietnamese – a situation much in contrast with that in Finland where the Vietnamese live widely interspersed with the rest of the population and not in same-ethnic neighborhoods, with some minor exceptions (Pohjanpää et al., 2003; Valtonen, 2002). As noted above, the number of people in Finland identifying themselves as having Vietnamese as their mother tongue was close to 5,000 in 2008 (Statistics Finland, 2008b), although the Vietnamese community is somewhat greater than this when those who now have Finnish as their first language are included.

Among Vietnamese adults in Australia ethnic identity was found to be a significant but not strong predictor of migrants' distress, via self-esteem (Nesdale, Rooney & Smith, 1997). Nesdale and his colleagues (1997) maintain that the connection between social identity and self-esteem may be more complicated in the case of adult migrants: immigrant adults seem to gain little self-esteem from their
ethnic identification, while among adolescents self-esteem has been reported to be closely tied to identification.

Regarding the relationship between identity orientations and sociocultural adaptation, the results are equally contradictory as those regarding psychological well-being; in some cases, ethnic identity is related to higher, in other cases to lower academic achievement, but few studies have directly examined the link between ethnic identity and academic adaptation in a comprehensive manner among a large sample of adolescents (Fuligni, Witkow & Garcia, 2005). Fuligni and his colleagues (2005) did precisely that. They assumed that the ethnic labels that adolescents choose may not matter as much as the strength of their identification with those labels and found no association between ethnic labeling and academic adaptation in their study. These results differed from those reported by Rumbaut (1994), who found that those immigrant adolescents who identified themselves in terms of their ethnic group did worse in school than those who identified themselves in national terms. In the study by Fuligni and his colleagues (2005), only the strength of the participants’ ethnic identification had a modest but positive impact on their educational achievement.
Cross-sectional research provides information on associations between factors and possible predictive models at one point in time. In order to predict acculturative change, well-being and sociocultural adaptation over a longer time span, and in order to see whether effects in childhood last into adulthood, longitudinal research is called for (Fuligni, 2003; Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005). Yet, only a handful of such studies have been conducted (e.g., Beiser & Hou, 2001; Jasinskaja-Lahtī, 2008; Jasinskaja-Lahtī, Liebkind, & Solheim, in press; Rumbaut & Portes, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). The relationship between changes in psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation has also been seen to vary (Ward, Okura, Kennedy, & Kojima, 1998), and to strengthen over time with increased contact with the receiving society.

Many of the still few longitudinal studies have covered only a short period of 12 months or a two- to three-year time span (e.g., Almqvist & Broberg, 1999; Hinton, Tiet, Tran &
Chesney, 1997). However, as Suárez-Orozco (2001) has noted, longitudinal research is essential, especially for understanding and serving the children of immigrants, in order to be better able to consider the multiple factors contributing to their adaptational outcomes. In addition, there has been a relative paucity of longitudinal studies that track the same immigrants from youth into adulthood. Longitudinal studies have tended to be concentrated either on children and adolescents (e.g., Rumbaut & Portes, 2001; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008) or adults (e.g., Beiser & Ho, 2001; Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008). An exception is The Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study being carried out in California and Florida, now reaching from adolescence into early adulthood for members of the first and second generation (e.g., Rumbaut, 2005). No longitudinal studies of immigrant children and adolescents have been carried out previously in Finland.

Results from the longitudinal studies do not show any coherent pattern, but rather seem to show that adaptation follows different time courses, with greater variations in the development of psychological well-being than in sociocultural adaptation, which follows a more linear course (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008). Suárez-Orozco and her colleagues (2008) found in their longitudinal study of first-generation immigrant children and adolescents in the United States from different parts of the world, aged 9 - 14 at the beginning of the study, that all started out with dreams and hopes and respecting school. What happened over time was that some did well and went on to further education – they had support
from teachers and able parents – while others became frustrated and no longer believed in their future. The majority learned the national language, but for some it was the language of the street, not the academic language necessary to do well in school (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Critical adaptation periods may be different for adolescents than for adults (Birman & Trickett, 2001), with four to five years after resettlement a watershed for adolescents and six or seven years after resettlement the significant period for adults.

In her 8-year follow-up of young immigrant adults in Finland, Jasinskaja-Lahti (2008) found that they had improved their Finnish language skills and their position in the labor market, but no differences were observed in their levels of psychological well-being between the two assessments. An initial high degree of psychological well-being at Time 1 did not predict sociocultural adaptation at Time 2. Sociocultural adaptation, however, measured as proficiency in the national language, turned out to be the most significant predictor of their socioeconomic and psychological adaptation outcomes after 8 years of residence. (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008). In contrast, Beiser and Hou (2001) found in their longitudinal study on adult refugees from Southeast Asia that depression and unemployment decreased dramatically over time. In addition, they found that initial depression was a strong predictor of subsequent depression. However, the predictors of psychological well-being as well as sociocultural adaptation varied over time; in the initial period of
resettlement, proficiency in English had no effect on depression or on employment, but almost a decade later, English language fluency was a significant predictor of both depression and employment (Beiser & Hou, 2001). It is thus likely that different factors predict acculturation outcomes at different stages of the life span.
9 THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS STUDY

The main contributions of this study include proper acknowledgement of context, age, and various dimensions of acculturation in predicting long-term psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, as well as the relationship between these two adaptational outcomes.

As noted in section 8, because of the multitude of factors contributing to the outcomes of acculturation, longitudinal research is essential for identifying the key factors predicting psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation over time. Cross-sectional studies can highlight essential factors entangled in this process, but to establish the direction of cause and effect, longitudinal designs are necessary (e.g., Fuligni, 2001). One of the most difficult issues in acculturation research today is the entanglement of age and the acculturation process: are the same factors associated with psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation in childhood and adolescence as in adulthood? Moving and acculturating to a new country can signify
different issues of gain, loss, and change, depending on the immigrating person’s age and generation. Those who migrate as adults have grown up in their ethnic culture and environment, adopted the ethnic society’s values, formed an ethnic identity, and learned the ethnic language to the level of an adult. A child or adolescent who migrates is in a different position from the adult – she or he is at the beginning or midway in value enculturation, in forming an identity, and in learning a language. A still-developing child or youth may be more or less susceptible to the impact of the new society, possible more resilient, and possibly more open to forming ties with the members of the majority population (Garmezy, 1986).

Ideally, longitudinal studies should be able to isolate acculturative changes from shifts that would have occurred through the course of the children’s development had they not immigrated, and one possibility is that native children and immigrant children are followed together, comparatively, and for a long time span (Fuligni, 2001; Sam, 2006). While this is seldom feasible, a minimum requirement could be to distinguish between predictors of acculturative outcomes at different points in the life-span of immigrants. As suggested by Phinney (2003b), when studying immigrant children, specific developmental issues associated with the culture of the parents, such as the role of cultural values in the dual socialization process, should be addressed.

Another factor determining relevant research and the application of research results is context, concerning the attitudes inherent in the majority population and the
existence of ethnic communities viable enough to provide support for their members (e.g., Phinney et al., 2001). Until the 1990s, most of the acculturation research on immigrants was carried out in multicultural societies such as the United States, Canada and Australia, countries with a long history of immigration, several post-immigration generations and decades of experience with conflicting values, racism and discrimination, and developing policy concerning multicultural issues (Thomson & Crul, 2007). Europe is very diverse, and while some countries have a multicultural tradition, Finland had a decades-long history of monoculturalism and very slight and recent immigration, primarily in the last two decades (see sections 1.1 and 1.2).

Ethnic minority communities are small and dispersed within the country and within municipalities, thus not leading to densely-populated ethnic communities. Proximity to ethnic community support has been found to increase well-being and sociocultural adaptation (e.g., Tran, V.T., 1987; Zhou & Bankston, 1994) and its lack to decreased well-being (e.g., Liebkind & Kosonen, 1998). Some studies have also been made in countries that are only beginning the transformation from a monocultural state to the first vestiges of multiculturalism, such as Norway and Finland (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008; Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000; Sam & Berry, 1995).

Context may be a key issue in the complex relationship between ethnic identity, cultural involvement, and well-being among the Vietnamese. Although a bicultural identity has generally been found best linked to psychological
adjustment among immigrant youth (e.g., Berry et al., 2006), for the Vietnamese, identification and involvement with their own culture has been found both more positively linked (e.g., Berry et al., 2006; Nguyen, L. & Peterson, 1993) and more negatively linked (e.g., Nguyen, H. et al., 1999) to well-being than the national orientation. H. Nguyen and her colleagues (1999) suggested that this negative link between ethnic involvement and well-being, contrary to the predominant research findings of the adaptiveness of biculturality, could be explained by the salience of the context: for adolescents, especially, involvement with the ethnic culture may not act as a positive buffer for psychological adjustment, because the majority context (school and peers) is more salient and minority involvement provides no advantage in that context. On the other hand, strong involvement with the national culture has also been found to have negative consequences for young adult Mexican immigrants (Kaplan & Marks, 2002) and Vietnamese immigrants (Nguyen, L. & Peterson, 1993). H. Nguyen and her colleagues (1999) found that for first-generation Vietnamese college students, identification with U.S. society was associated with more depressive symptoms.

It is also important to consider the relationship between different adaptational outcomes; being well and doing well may be entirely different matters, but they do seem to influence each other: in the large comparative study on ethnocultural youth called ICSEY (Berry at al., 2006), sociocultural adaptation explained variations in psychological well-being significantly, but not vice versa
(Vedder et al., 2006b). Vedder and his colleagues (2006b) concluded that indicators of psychological well-being such as self-esteem and life satisfaction are influenced by sociocultural adaptation outcomes. In contrast, Zhou and Bankston (2000) noted that the two adaptational outcomes may be unrelated to each other: Vietnamese children were doing better scholastically, but psychologically they were doing poorer than their national peers, having self-doubts, being depressed and having a poor image of themselves.

However, in cross-sectional studies like these, the long-term effect of psychological distress on sociocultural adaptation outcomes (and vice versa) could not be established. The longitudinal design of the current study allows analysis of temporal cause-and-effect. It is also designed to compare factors in childhood and adolescence with those in adulthood to bring out possible age-specific predictors of adaptational outcomes. It considers the impact of context by analyzing how perceived discrimination as well as ethnic and national language proficiency, values, and identity contribute to psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation in the acculturation process. In addition, and as noted in section 2, the current study also addresses the relative importance of different acculturation dimensions (language, values, and identity) for the acculturation process.

The participants are now young adults, the first Vietnamese generation having grown to adulthood in Finland. They have grown up in an environment for identity and role development completely different from that of their
parents, who grew up in Vietnam. The younger generation has only a small pool of other Vietnamese role models available to them. Finland as a society has also become much more multicultural during the time they have lived here, with concurrent changes toward more positive majority attitudes to newcomers, more positive visibility of minorities in the media, and a relatively large increase in the absolute numbers of minorities and in visibility in the everyday life of the larger cities and towns.

Although the analysis of the participants’ thematic interviews was not used in this study, some excerpts from the interviews, which covered the same themes as those in the quantitative questionnaire, will be used to illustrate the discussion in the participants’ own words.
10 AIMS OF THE STUDY, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND HYPOTHESES

The aims of this study are threefold: first, to predict the long-term effects of acculturation experiences, dimensions and ethnic, national, and bicultural profiles or orientations on the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of immigrants, using data from a 12-year follow-up study on Vietnamese in Finland. Particularly, the relative importance of the different acculturation dimensions studied (language, values, and identity) will be analyzed. Second, the aim is to identify specific age-related factors in predicting acculturation outcomes and the extent to which predictors vary for children or adolescents, on the one hand, and adults on the other. Third, the aim is to employ an in-depth longitudinal study in order to specify the impact of the acculturation context on the predictors of acculturation outcomes. An additional focus will be the relationship between the outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation.

Disentangling developmental from acculturative changes will remain a challenge in this study, as no Finnish
children were followed up during the same time period. However, some baseline comparisons between Vietnamese and Finnish children can be made for Time 1. The aim of the initial study in 1992 was to examine the school achievement, Finnish (and Vietnamese) proficiency, and the psychological well-being of Vietnamese comprehensive school students compared to Finnish students, in relation to gender, age, time in Finland, and age on arrival and also to examine how Finnish schools, which previously had rarely had foreign-born students in their midst, had adapted to having these new students in their student body – operationalized as perceived discrimination. In this follow-up study, the Time 1 data was used together with the Time 2 data in order to clarify the following research questions and test the following hypotheses:

I What characterizes the acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination), dimensions (language, values, and identity/identification), and profiles (ethnic, national, and bicultural) of the Vietnamese participants at Time 1 (1992) and at Time 2 (2004)?

II What are the levels of psychological well-being (depression at Time 1, depression and self-esteem at Time 2) and sociocultural adaptation (school achievement at Time 1, educational attainment at Time 2) among the Vietnamese participants at Time 1 and Time 2?
III What are the long-term changes in the acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination), the acculturation dimensions (language, values, and identity), and the acculturation outcome of psychological well-being?

IV To what extent is the outcome of acculturation, that is, the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of first-generation immigrants predicted cross-sectionally and longitudinally by acculturation experiences, in this case, perceived discrimination, and the following:

acculturation dimensions:
- language proficiency (Finnish and Vietnamese)
- values (Vietnamese and Finnish) and
- identity (Vietnamese and Finnish)

acculturative profiles:
- an ethnic profile (Vietnamese language proficiency, Vietnamese values, and a Vietnamese identity (self-categorized identity and strength of identification, cf. section 11.3)
- a national profile (Finnish language proficiency, Finnish values, and a Finnish identity/identification)
- a bicultural profile (bilingual language proficiency, bicultural values, and a bicultural identity/identification)
Hypotheses concerning the outcome of psychological well-being:

Acculturation experiences:

**Hypothesis 1** It is assumed that psychological well-being (depression at Time 1, depression and self-esteem at Time 2) will be enhanced by less perceived discrimination (PD).

Acculturation dimensions:

**Hypothesis 2** It is assumed that psychological well-being will be enhanced by

a) greater Finnish language proficiency
b) greater Vietnamese language proficiency
c) greater bilingual language proficiency

**Hypothesis 3** It is assumed that psychological well-being will be enhanced by smaller (actual in 1992, perceived in 2004) discrepancies between one’s family obligation values and independence values and one’s parents’ corresponding values.

As most previous research results give cause to predict that ethnic values will enhance psychological well-being, while some, as well as the particular context of this study (a small and dispersed ethnic community in a traditionally monocultural country), suggest that
national values would be more beneficial for psychological well-being, no hypotheses will be made here on the direction of the effect of values on well-being. Instead, this effect will be only explored.

Hypotheses concerning the outcome of sociocultural adaptation:

Acculturation experiences:
As research results concerning the impact of perceived discrimination on sociocultural adaptation are contradictory, this impact will be only explored.

Acculturation dimensions:

Hypothesis 4 It is assumed that sociocultural adaptation (school achievement at Time 1 and educational attainment at Time 2) will be enhanced by greater Finnish language proficiency.

In addition, the impact of ethnic or bilingual language proficiency on sociocultural adaptation will be explored.

Acculturation profiles:
As most previous research results give cause to predict that ethnic values will enhance sociocultural adaptation, while the particular context of this study
suggest that national values would be more beneficial for sociocultural adaptation, no hypotheses will be made here on the direction of the effect of values on sociocultural adaptation. Instead, this effect will be only explored.

As most previous research results give cause to predict that ethnic identity will enhance sociocultural adaptation, while the particular context of this study suggest that national identity would be more beneficial to sociocultural adaptation, no hypotheses will be made here on the direction of the effect of identity on sociocultural adaptation. Instead, this effect will be explored.

V What is the cross-sectional relationship between psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation?

**Hypothesis 5** It is assumed that psychological well-being will be enhanced by greater sociocultural adaptation.

**Hypothesis 6** It is assumed that sociocultural adaptation will be enhanced by greater psychological well-being.

VI To what extent do the relationships between acculturation experiences, acculturation dimensions, acculturation profiles, and psychological well-
being/sociocultural adaptation depend on whether the individual is still a developing child or adolescent (Time 1) or has already reached adulthood (Time 2)?

**Hypothesis 7** The discrepancies between one’s family obligation values and independence values and one’s parents’ (actual/perceived) values will be more significant for psychological well-being at Time 1 (childhood and adolescence) than at Time 2 (adulthood).

In addition, the similarities and differences in the impact of acculturation experiences, dimensions and profiles on the **psychological well-being** and **sociocultural adaptation** of children/adolescents and young adults will be explored by comparing the best cross-sectional predictors at Time 1 and Time 2.

**VII** To what extent do initial levels of acculturation experiences, acculturation dimensions, acculturation profiles and psychological well-being/sociocultural adaptation predict long-term (12-year) psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation from childhood/adolescence into adulthood?

**Hypothesis 8** It is assumed that psychological well-being will be greater at Time 2,

- the less perceived discrimination is at Time 1
- the greater Finnish proficiency is at Time 1
• the greater sociocultural adaptation is at Time 1
• the greater psychological well-being is at Time 1

In addition, the impact of other acculturation variables at Time 1 on psychological well-being at Time 2 will be explored.

**Hypothesis 9** It is assumed that sociocultural adaptation will be greater at Time 2,

• the greater Finnish proficiency is at Time 1
• the greater psychological well-being is at Time 1
• the greater sociocultural adaptation is at Time 1

In addition, the impact of other acculturation variables at Time 1 on sociocultural adaptation at Time 2 will be explored

The effect of initial Time 1 perceived discrimination and ethnic identity/identification on sociocultural adaptation at Time 2 will be explored and no hypotheses will be made.

Figure 5 below shows the variables hypothesized in this study to predict psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation or relationships that were explored.
Figure 5  What predicts psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation? Hypothesized and exploratory relationships at Time 1 and Time 2, with Time 1 factors and outcomes also predicting outcomes at Time 2.

1NP = National profile  2EP = Ethnic profile  3BP = Bicultural profile

• Sociocultural adaptation is measured as school achievement at Time 1 and educational attainment at Time 2.
• Psychological well-being is measured as depression at Time 1 and as depression and self-esteem at Time 2.
11 METHODS

11.1 Population, sample, and data collection

Data collection at Time 1 (1992)

In the initial Time 1 study, carried out in spring 1992 (Kosonen, 1994), the participants included 97 Vietnamese comprehensive school students (39 girls and 58 boys, mean age = 13.4 years, range 8.5 – 20.5 years) and 97 randomly-chosen Finnish classmates (39 girls and 58 boys, mean age = 12.6 years, range 8 – 16 years). In addition, 194 Finnish teachers, 14 Vietnamese teachers, and the parents of both groups (42 Vietnamese mothers, 41 Vietnamese fathers, 79 Finnish fathers, and 87 Finnish mothers) answered written value questionnaires. Because 34 of the Vietnamese students were siblings, the maximum number of potential Vietnamese parents for participating in the study was lower than that for the Finnish parents.

The structured interview sessions, where the student participants filled out the questionnaire, were carried out by
the researcher in a total of 32 elementary level comprehensive schools and 25 secondary level comprehensive schools in 16 municipalities throughout Finland. The 97 Vietnamese participants were from a nation-wide representative sample of 122 Vietnamese students chosen from among all the Vietnamese students \( (N = 292) \) in Finnish-language schools in the 1990/91 school year (National Board of Education, 1991). The Vietnamese students had arrived in Finland between 1979 and 1991 as refugees with their families or relatives.

An introductory letter in Vietnamese had been sent to each home through the school, explaining the purpose of the study and asking for the parent’s or guardian’s consent to the interview. A similar letter in Finnish went to the Finnish homes of the Finnish classmates chosen randomly to correspond in age and gender to the Vietnamese participant. Of the Vietnamese participants chosen, 97 received permission from their parents to participate in the study and were themselves willing to participate. Data loss was thus 25 individuals (20%), but a large initial sample had been chosen to compensate for possible attrition, and the final sample equaled 33% of the original population. The high participation rate was due in part to the active support the Vietnamese language teachers gave to the study by personally contacting the parents, explaining the purpose of the study and emphasizing the importance of their children participating. The majority of the Vietnamese students had a Vietnamese teacher: 79.4% \( (N = 77) \) participated in
Vietnamese language classes at school, while 20.6% \((N = 20)\) did not or did no longer.

In 1991 there were only about 5,000 immigrant students in Finnish schools (National Board of Education, 1991). The Vietnamese in the 1992 study attended schools where the entire student body included 2 to 38 other immigrant students, most of whom were Vietnamese, with an average number of 14 immigrant students. Thus the context of the schools in Finland at the time was not very multiethnic. In comparison, in 2005, in the largest cities, the percentage of students with an immigrant background was already 6 - 10% of all the students in the public education system (National Board of Education, 2005).

**Pre-arrival background and family composition**

Among the participants, 75.3% \((N = 73)\) had lived in a refugee camp before arriving in Finland, while 24.8% \((N = 24)\) had come directly to Finland from Vietnam via the UNHCR family reunification program. Camp stays varied from 1 to 72 months, under two years for 18.6% \((N = 18)\), 2 – 4 years for 45.3% \((N = 44)\), and 4½ - 6 years for 8.2% \((N = 8)\). Information was not available for 3% \((N = 3)\). The majority of the participants, 91.8% \((N = 89)\) were now living or had arrived with an intact, nuclear family, while 8.2% \((N = 8)\) of the participants were still waiting for family reunification of immediate family members from Vietnam.

**Data collection at Time 2 (2004)**
For the 2004 follow-up, an attempt was made to reach all ninety-seven of the Vietnamese students who took part in the first phase in 1992. Current addresses for 88 individuals living in Finland were found through the National Population Register, 90.7% of the original group. Five had moved abroad, no information at all was available about two, and two were still living in Finland, but with no permanent address. The 88 persons with known addresses were contacted first by an introductory letter, inviting them to take part in the follow-up study. A second contact was then made by phone with 70 of those who had been sent the first letter to explain more about the purpose of the study and to arrange for sending the written questionnaire and to set up the interview.

The study was carried out using quantitative and qualitative methods between May and December 2004. The questionnaire was mailed beforehand to the interviewee to be returned during the interview or in the mail. A total of 59 questionnaires were returned and a total of 55 interviews were carried out. All of the interviews were carried out in Finnish and the questionnaires were also in Finnish. In this study, excerpts from the thematic interviews will be used to illustrate the quantitative results, while a more thorough analysis of the qualitative data will take place in the future.

Fifty-nine persons (60.8% of the original group) returned the questionnaire and fifty-five (56.7%) participated in the interview. Six persons answered the questionnaire but did not want to be interviewed, while two of those
interviewed did not return the questionnaire. Otherwise all those interviewed also answered the questionnaire, usually returning the filled-in questionnaire to the researcher at the beginning of the interview. In total, 61 of the original 1992 sample (62.9%) either answered the questionnaire and/or participated in the interview.

Of those contacted in person by phone, 60 persons (87%) participated in the interview and/or returned the questionnaire. Of the additional 19 who received the introductory letter and later a follow-up letter with the questionnaire, because no phone number was available, only one person returned the questionnaire. Personal contact was thus absolutely necessary for raising the participation rate, which was very satisfactory, considering the 12-year interim.

The Finnish classmates who participated in the first stage of the study in 1992 were not included in the 2004 follow-up, because there was not enough background information on them available to find them in the National Population Register.

11.2 Procedures

At Time 1 the Vietnamese and Finnish participants were interviewed in their schools, usually individually, but also twice in a group of two or three students at the same time. All the questionnaires had been translated into Vietnamese,
and questionnaire forms were available in both Vietnamese and in Finnish. Only a few students chose to fill in the Finnish-language questionnaires. In two of the sessions, a Vietnamese teacher acted as an interpreter for students whose Finnish was not sufficient for communication with the researcher. Information about the Vietnamese student’s background, arrival in Finland, family composition and previous education in Finland, Vietnam and/or a refugee camp was collected orally at the beginning of the session, after the researcher explained about the study. The sessions took from 30 minutes to two hours.

After filling out the questionnaire, the participants were given an envelope containing two family value questionnaires and a stamped return envelope, for the mother and the father (or guardians) to fill in and return to the researcher directly to the Department of Social Psychology at the University of Helsinki. Seventy-eight percent (N = 249) of the parents’ questionnaires were returned. The only material provided by the parents consisted of their answers to the family value questionnaire, for mothers and fathers separately. The parents’ answers were used to compare family values among Finns and Vietnamese, parents and children, and to analyze parent-child value discrepancies.

The Time 2 questionnaires were finalized in spring 2004 with several trials. The structure and contents of the questionnaire were also informed by two trial interviews held in 2003, the first with two Vietnamese men in their mid- and late twenties and the second with two Vietnamese women just turning twenty.
The introductory letter sent to the potential study participants explained the purpose of the study, and that it was a follow-up of a study they had participated in twelve years earlier. It was emphasized that their questionnaire responses and interviews were confidential and participation was voluntary.

The majority of the participants reacted favorably to the questionnaire and interview request. Most participants returned the questionnaire on arriving for the interview. The interviews were pleasant, although often very emotionally intense experiences for both the interviewer and interviewee. The themes had a bicultural focus and included Vietnamese and Finnish language use, identity, Vietnamese and Finnish cultural differences, gender roles, and social support and control from friends, family, and community, all issues also covered in the questionnaire with preset questions and answers.

The interviews took 45 minutes to four hours and were carried out between May and December 2004. They were held at the Helsinki University Social Psychology Department, in homes, workplaces, colleges, libraries and cafés, two by telephone, and in nine different municipalities in different parts of Finland. The interviews were recorded on tape and transcribed. At the end of the interview, the researcher let the participants go over their own questionnaire answers from 1992, for self-comparison with what they had answered to the current questionnaire. Most wished to do so and were often surprised at their earlier responses, commenting especially on how their views
concerning family values had changed. After returning their 2004 questionnaire, each participant received a copy of the report written on the first study in 1992 (Kosonen, 1994).

The qualitative data from the interviews will be analyzed more fully at a later date and only a number of excerpts will be used here to illustrate some of the quantitative results. The questionnaires also included questions on ethnic and national language use, ethnic and national social networks and social support. These variables would potentially add to an understanding of the acculturation process and its outcomes among these participants, but as it was not possible to include them in the analyses in the current study, they will be analyzed and reported at a later date.

11.3 Measures

The name of the following variables are shown below in **bold** with the subscript \( \text{Time 1} \) or \( \text{Time 2} \) in the form they are referred to in the Results tables in section 12.

**Demographic background variables**

**Age on arrival**
Age on arrival was one of the background variables asked in the initial Time 1 questionnaire, in addition to age, gender, length of residence, family composition, and time spent in a refugee camp. In addition, at Time 2, information about marital status and occupation was gathered. Age on arrival is the only demographic variable that will be used in the analyses, because preliminary examination of correlations revealed that it correlated more frequently than the other time-related variables (age, length of residence) with the other predictive and outcome variables (see Appendix 3, Tables 1 and 2), and it has often been found in previous research to be significantly related to acculturation outcomes (e.g., Berry, 2006b).

Psychological well-being

Depression

Time 1
Depression\textsubscript{Time 1}

A 32-item self-assessed Finnish version (Tamminen, Almqvist, & Piha, 1991) of the Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI) developed by Kovacs (1980/81, 1985) for use with 6-17-year-olds was used. Sample items include “I’m often sad” and “I do lots of things wrong”. The participant chose one of three alternatives per item he or she agreed with and the sum of these alternatives, weighted 0 – 2, formed the depression score. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the
inventory was .85. A second depression variable for use in certain analyses was constructed by dichotomizing the CDI score, using a cut-off point of ≥ 11 for non-depressed/depressed (Moilanen, Almqvist, Piha, Räsänen, & Tamminen, 1988). A higher score indicated more depression.

**Time 2**

**Depression**

The Finnish version of the Beck Depression Inventory Short Form (Beck, A., & Beck, R., 1972) for adults was used, because the Children’s Depression Inventory, used at Time 1 was developed by Kovacs (1980/81) using the Beck Inventory as a basis. Sample items in the adult inventory are “I’m dissatisfied with everything” and “I’m no longer able to make decisions”. The participant chose one, two, or all three alternatives per item that he or she agreed with and the sum of these alternatives, weighted 0 – 3, formed the depression score. Cronbach’s α for the inventory was .88. A second depression variable for use in certain analyses was constructed by dichotomizing the Beck Depression Inventory score, using a cut-off point of ≥ 9 for non-depressed / depressed (Furlanetto, Mendlowicz, & Romildo Bueno, 2005). A higher score indicated more depression.

**Self-Esteem**

**Time 1**
Self-esteem was not measured at Time 1.

**Time 2**

**Self-Esteem**

Global self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg’s (1986) 10-item Self-Esteem Inventory. Sample items included: “On the whole, I am satisfied with myself” and “I feel I have not much to be proud of”, with response options ranging from (1) I totally agree to (5) I totally disagree. The Rosenberg Scale is a well-established measure with known reliability and validity. In this study, Cronbach’s α for the scale was .83. A higher score indicated more self-esteem.

**Sociocultural adaptation (school achievement / educational attainment)**

**Time 1**

**School achievement**

The latest grade average in the school records was used to measure school achievement. For the 30 participants who had not yet been given a numerical grade assessment, the average of their Finnish and math skills, which the teacher had reported for the study, was used as an approximation of school achievement.
Time 2

Educational attainment

The last completed level of education was used to measure educational attainment. First, the seven initial alternatives were combined into three levels: (1) basic education or less (had not completed comprehensive school, or had completed comprehensive school) \( (N = 12) \), (2) secondary level degree (matriculation examination from senior secondary school, or basic vocational school degree) \( (N = 41) \), and (3) tertiary level degree (bachelor degree/polytechnic degree, master’s degree, licentiate or doctorate) \( (N = 6) \). Because the distribution into levels was not on an interval scale, the three level –variable could not be used as a dependent variable. As a consequence, it was dichotomized: (1) basic education (comprehensive school completed) or less \( (N = 12) \) and (2) more than a basic education \( (N = 47) \).

Perceived discrimination (PD)

Time 1

Perceived discrimination

An original scale with seven items on acceptance, exclusion and discrimination at school was used (see Appendix 1). Sample items included “I’m called names at school because I’m Vietnamese”, “I get laughed at when I speak Finnish”, and “I feel like an outsider at school”. Response options ranged from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. Items
were reversed so that a higher score indicated more perceived discrimination. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the scale was .77.

**Time 2**

**Perceived discrimination**

Three items modified from items in the perceived discrimination scale used in the ICSEY study (Berry et al., 2006) were used. The items were: “I feel that Finns accept me”, “I’m treated as well as the others at work or where I’m studying”, and “I feel like an outsider in Finland because I’m Vietnamese”, with response options ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. The third item was reversed so that a higher score indicated greater perceived discrimination. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the scale was .62.

**Language proficiency**

**Vietnamese language proficiency**

**Time 1**

**Vietnamese proficiency**

The participant’s Vietnamese teacher assessed the participant’s Vietnamese language proficiency as ability to (1) understand and speak in Vietnamese and to (2) read and write in Vietnamese. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) very good to (5) very poor. In the 14 cases where the teacher’s assessment was unavailable, the participant’s age
on arrival and years of schooling in Vietnam were used to make an approximation of the ability to understand, read, and write in Vietnamese. The items were reversed so that a higher score indicated greater proficiency. The two items formed a composite measure with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .77$.

**Time 2**

**Vietnamese proficiency**

The participant’s Vietnamese language proficiency was measured on the basis of self-reported ability to (1) understand, (2) speak, and (3) write the language. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) very good to (5) very poor. The items were reversed so that a higher score indicated greater proficiency. The three items formed a composite measure with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .84$.

**Finnish language proficiency**

**Time 1**

**Finnish proficiency**

The participant’s Finnish teacher assessed the participant’s Finnish language proficiency as ability to (1) understand and speak in Finnish and to (2) read and write in Finnish. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) very good to (5) very poor. In the four cases where the teacher’s assessment was unavailable, the participant’s latest grade in Finnish was used as an approximation. The items were reversed so that a
higher score indicated greater proficiency. The two items formed a composite measure with Cronbach’s α = .65.

**Time 2**

**Finnish proficiency**

The participant’s Finnish language proficiency was measured on the basis of self-reported ability to (1) understand, (2) speak, and (3) write the language. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) very good to (5) very poor. The items were reversed so that a higher score indicated greater proficiency. The three items formed a composite measure with Cronbach’s α = .84.

**Bilingual language proficiency**

**Time 1**

**Bilingual proficiency**

Using a mean split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish proficiency, a new variable with four options was created: (1) marginally bilingual (low Vietnamese proficiency and low Finnish proficiency) \( N = 17 \), (2) monolingual in Vietnamese (high Vietnamese proficiency and low Finnish proficiency) \( N = 26 \), (3) monolingual in Finnish (high Finnish proficiency and low Vietnamese proficiency) \( N = 20 \), and (4) fluently bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish (high Vietnamese proficiency and
high Finnish proficiency \((N = 34)\). This variable was used in the ANOVAs using acculturation dimensions as independent variables.

**Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency**

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bilingual variable for the profile regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, a three-option split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish proficiency was first created: (1) monolingual in Vietnamese (high Vietnamese proficiency and low Finnish proficiency) \((N = 26)\), (2) monolingual in Finnish (high Finnish proficiency and low Vietnamese proficiency \((N = 51)\), and (3) bilingual (either fluent or marginal) in Vietnamese and Finnish (high Vietnamese proficiency and high Finnish proficiency, or low proficiency in both) \((N = 20)\). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monolingual option.

**Time 2**

**Bilingual proficiency**

Using a mean split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish proficiency, a new variable with four options was created: (1) marginally bilingual (low Vietnamese proficiency and low Finnish proficiency \((N = 16)\), (2) monolingual in Vietnamese (high Vietnamese proficiency and low Finnish proficiency) \((N = 18)\), (3) monolingual in
Finnish (high Finnish proficiency and low Vietnamese proficiency \(N = 13\), and (4) fluently bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish (high Vietnamese proficiency and high Finnish proficiency \(N = 12\)). This variable was used in the ANOVAs using acculturation dimensions as independent variables.

**Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency**

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bilingual variable for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, a three-option split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish proficiency was first created: (1) monolingual in Vietnamese (high Vietnamese and low Finnish proficiency) \(N = 18\), (2) monolingual in Finnish (high Finnish and low Vietnamese proficiency \(N = 13\)), and (3) bilingual (either fluent or marginal) in Vietnamese and Finnish (high Vietnamese and high Finnish proficiency, or low proficiency in both) \(N = 28\). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monolingual option.
Family values

Time 1

Family obligation values

Independence values

N. Nguyen and William’s 29-item Family Value Questionnaire (1989) was used to measure the adherence of Vietnamese and Finnish students and their parents to family-related values. Sample statements are “The oldest girl in the family should help her parents take care of the house and the younger children whether she wants to or not”, “Their should be a clear line of authority in the family and no question about who is in charge”, “It is all right for boys to choose their own career”, and “When a girl reaches the age of 16, it is all right for her to decide whom to date and when to date”. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) I totally agree to (5) I totally disagree.

To simplify the measure for further analysis, a factor analysis of the responses of all the participants, 97 Vietnamese students, 97 Finnish students, 41 Vietnamese fathers, 42 Vietnamese mothers, 79 Finnish fathers and 87 Finnish mothers was carried out (see Appendix 2, Table 1). In accordance with the original N. Nguyen and Williams’ study (1989), three factors were extracted: Family Obligation Values, Independence Values and Family Togetherness Values. For simplification and because the third factor had a low reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .59$), only the first two factors, Family obligation values and Independence values
were used in this study. Scores on the items loading on each factor were averaged to provide new variables.

The Family obligation values –variable encompassed traditional Vietnamese values concerning authority, gender-related roles and obligations in the family. The Independence values –variable encompassed typical Finnish or Western values related to children’s independence. Thus, a higher score on the former scale indicated stronger adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values and a higher score on the latter indicated stronger adherence to (national) Finnish independence values. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the (ethnic) Vietnamese Family obligation values –variable was .85 and Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the (national) Finnish Independence values –variable was .74.

Intergenerational discrepancies (Family obligation values)
Intergenerational discrepancies (Independence values)

The mother’s and father’s value scores on each of the two value scales were averaged. Intergenerational value discrepancy scores were then calculated for both adherence to family obligation values and adherence to independence values by subtracting the parents’ score from the participant’s score for each value scale.
Time 2

**Family obligation values**<sub>Time 2</sub>

**Independence values**<sub>Time 2</sub>

N. Nguyen and William’s (1989) *Family Value Questionnaire* was used to measure the participants’ adherence to family obligation values and to independence values also at Time 2. In order to enable a direct comparison with Time 1, the same factors were used (see Time 1, above). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the (ethnic) Vietnamese Family Obligation Values –variable was .76 and for the (national) Finnish Independence Values –variable it was .56.

**Intergenerational discrepancies (Family obligation values)**<sub>Time 2</sub>

**Intergenerational discrepancies (Independence values)**<sub>Time 2</sub>

As the parents of the participants did not participate at Time 2, the participants were asked for their perceptions of their mother’s and father’s values. For each participant, these perceptions were averaged for each scale. Intergenerational value discrepancy scores were then calculated for both adherence to family obligation values and adherence to independence values by subtracting the perceived parents’ score from the participant’s score.
Bicultural values

Time 1
Bicultural values

Using a mean split of the scale scores on the Vietnamese and Finnish value scales at Time 1, a new variable with four options was created by dividing the participants into four groups according to their adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values and (national) Finnish independence values: (1) marginal adherence to both Vietnamese values and Finnish values ($N = 29$), (2) monocultural Vietnamese adherence to both values (strong family obligation value adherence and weak independence value adherence) ($N = 20$), (3) monocultural Finnish adherence to both values (weak Family obligation value adherence and strong Independence value adherence) ($N = 25$), and (4) strong bicultural adherence to both Vietnamese family obligation values and Finnish independence values ($N = 23$). This variable was used in the ANOVAs using acculturation dimensions as independent variables.

Mono- vs. bicultural values

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bicultural variable for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, a second, three-option split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish values was first created: (1) monocultural adherence to Vietnamese values
(high on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values and low on national/Finnish independence values \(N = 20\)), (2) monocultural adherence to Finnish values (low on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values, high on national/Finnish independence values \(N = 25\)), and (3) bicultural (either strong or marginal) adherence to both Vietnamese and Finnish values (high on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values and high on national/Finnish independence values, or low on both \(N = 52\)). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monocultural option.

**Time 2**

**Bicultural values**

Using a mean split of the scale scores on the Vietnamese and Finnish value scales at Time 2, a new variable with four options was created by dividing the participants into four groups according to their adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values and (national) Finnish independence values: (1) marginal adherence to both Vietnamese values and Finnish values (weak family obligation value adherence and weak independence value adherence) \(N = 11\), (2) monocultural Vietnamese adherence to both values (strong family obligation value adherence and weak independence value adherence) \(N = 19\), (3) monocultural Finnish in adherence both values (weak family obligation value adherence and strong independence value adherence) \(N = 18\), and (4) strong bicultural adherence to both Vietnamese values and Finnish values (strong family obligation value
adherence and strong independence value adherence) \((N = 11)\). This variable was used in the ANOVAs using acculturation dimensions as independent variables.

**Mono- vs. bicultural values**

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bicultural variable for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, a three-option split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish values was first created: 1) monocultural adherence to Vietnamese values (high on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values and low on national/Finnish independence values \((N = 19)\), (2) monocultural adherence to Finnish values (low on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values, high on national/Finnish independence values \((N = 18)\), and (3) bicultural (either strong or marginal) adherence to both Vietnamese and Finnish values (high on ethnic/Vietnamese family obligation values and high on national/Finnish independence values, or low on both \((N = 22)\). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monocultural option.

**Identity**

Identity is here used as the broader overall concept that includes both self-categorization and the strength of identification with/emotional attachment to a membership group. It was necessary for reasons of comparison to make
this distinction as at Time 1 only self-categorization was measured.

**Time 1**

**Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity**

A one-dimensional self-categorized identity measure indicating whether the participant considered her/himself (1) Vietnamese \((N = 42)\), (2) both Vietnamese and Finnish \((N = 53)\), or (3) Finnish \((N = 2)\) was used. This measured “identifying as” a member of a group (see Verkuyten, 2005).

**Mono- vs. bicultural identity**

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bicultural variable for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, options (1) Vietnamese and (3) Finnish in the above variable Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity were combined, resulting in two options (1) monocultural identity \((N = 47)\) and (2) bicultural identity \((N = 53)\).

**Time 2**

**Vietnamese identification**

**Finnish identification**

Ethnic identification and national identification at Time 2 were both measured with scales developed for the ICSEY project (Berry et al., 2006). These identification measures
incorporated the strength of the identification and emotional attachment to the group, measuring “identifying with” a group (see Verkuyten, 2005). Ethnic identification was measured with eight items. Sample items are “I consider myself Vietnamese” and “I am proud of being Vietnamese”. National identification was measured with four items. Sample items are “I consider myself Finnish” and “I am happy to be Finnish”. The 5-point response scale ranged from (1) I totally agree to (5) I totally disagree. Cronbach’s α was .89 for the (ethnic) Vietnamese identification scale and .81 for the (national) Finnish identification scale. Items were reversed so that a higher score indicated stronger identification.

**Vietnamese identification (one item)**

**Finnish identification (one item)**

Two shorter variables incorporating only the first items: “I consider myself Vietnamese” and “I consider myself Finnish” on the identification scales were found often to be better predictors of outcomes than the longer forms containing eight (Vietnamese identification) and four (Finnish identification) items.

Both the short and long Vietnamese and Finnish identification measures were used throughout the analyses, however, as alternative predictors.
Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity<sub>Time 2</sub>

In order to construct a one-dimensional self-categorized identity measure for comparison with Time 1, a new variable with three options was created from the scores on the first items on the Vietnamese and Finnish identification scales described above: “I consider myself Vietnamese” and “I consider myself Finnish”. First, each of the two identification measures was transformed into a new variable with only three options, (1) low, (2) moderate, and (3) high, according to the frequency distribution on the five-point response scale. They were then combined and recoded into one variable with three options: (1) high Vietnamese and low Finnish identity ($N = 37$), (2) moderate Vietnamese and moderate Finnish identity ($N = 17$), and (3) low Vietnamese and high Finnish identity ($N = 5$). This variable thus represents the Time 2 one-dimensional appropriation of the self-categorized identity measured at Time 1.

Mono- vs. bicultural identification<sub>Time 2</sub>

In addition, in order to obtain a mono- vs. bicultural variable for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, a three-option split of the scale scores on Vietnamese and Finnish identification was created. Using a mean split of the scale scores on the Vietnamese and Finnish identification scales, a new variable with three options was created: (1) monocultural Vietnamese identification (high Vietnamese identification and low
Finnish identification \((N = 20)\), (2) monocultural Finnish identification (low Vietnamese identification and high Finnish identification \((N = 14)\), and (3) bicultural (strong or marginal) identification (high Vietnamese identification and high Finnish identification or low Vietnamese identification and low Finnish identification \((N = 25)\). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monocultural option.

**Mono- vs. bicultural identification (one item)**

A second, shorter form of mono- vs. bicultural identification was formed for the regression analyses using acculturation profiles as independent variables, using only the first two identification questions concerning strength of identification. This had the following distribution: (1) monocultural Vietnamese identification (high Vietnamese identification and low Finnish identification \((N = 18)\), (2) monocultural Finnish identification (low Vietnamese identification and high Finnish identification \((N = 16)\), and (3) bicultural identification (high Vietnamese identification and high Finnish identification, or low Vietnamese and Finnish identification \((N = 25)\). Options (1) and (2) were then combined for the monocultural option.

Both the short and long mono- vs. bicultural identification measures were used throughout the analyses, however, as alternative predictors.
11.4 Plan of analysis

First, research questions I, II and III (see section 12.2) concerning acculturation outcomes (psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation), experiences (perceived discrimination), dimensions (language, values, and identity) and profiles (ethnic, national, and bicultural) will be answered with descriptive statistics at Time 1 and Time 2. Paired-samples t-tests will be carried out, when possible, to compare changes in the predictor and outcome variables over time. Next, research questions IV-VII will be answered separately for psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, starting with the former.

Research question IV on the cross-sectional impact of acculturation experiences, dimensions and profiles on the two outcome variables will be answered and hypotheses 1 and 2 tested separately for Time 1 and Time 2 (see section 12.3). The impact of each acculturation dimension (language, values, or identity/identification) on psychological well-being will be analyzed by conducting one hierarchical regression analysis with one demographic variable, age on arrival, entered in the first step, acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination) entered in the second step and two predictors representing the ethnic and the national aspect of the particular dimension entered in the third and fourth steps. The other analysis for each acculturation dimension is a one-way ANOVA on the outcome variable with one grouped variable composed of
four classes: (1) marginally bilingual/bicultural, (2) monolingual/cultural Vietnamese, (3) monolingual/cultural Finnish, and (4) fluently bilingual/strongly bicultural as a predictor.

The order in which variables are entered into the hierarchical regression analyses reflects the temporal order of change according to theory and previous research. In accordance with Berry’s acculturation process model (see Figure 4 in section 2), the demographic variable (age on arrival) is entered first, in the analyses where it is being used. Perceived discrimination is entered next, as it comes next in the process, as an acculturation experience variable describing context. Following are the language, values, and identity variables, as changes in language acquisition, use and loss can be seen to occur more rapidly than changes in values, while identity changes can be theoretically seen to be the slowest and most resistant to change over time (e.g. Hutnik, 1991; Snauwert et al, 2003).

The impact of each acculturation profile (ethnic, national, or bicultural) on psychological well-being will be explored by conducting a hierarchical regression analysis with acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination) entered in the first step and three predictors representing the different dimensions of the profile (language, values, and identity/identification) entered in the second, third and fourth steps. Here the demographic variable of age on arrival was not used, because the number of predictors to be entered in the regression was limited to four, and perceived discrimination was considered more important to include, on
the basis of previous research, than age on arrival. This was a compromise called for by the restricted N of the sample, but allowed the inclusion of perceived discrimination in all analyses, thus making comparisons over time uniform.

Hypothesis 3 on the impact of intergenerational value discrepancies on psychological well-being at Time 1 and Time 2 will be tested by conducting hierarchical regression analyses with age on arrival entered in the first step, acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination) entered in the second step and discrepancies between the participants’ own family obligation and independence values and those of their parents (actual at Time 1, perceived at Time 2) entered in the next steps.

In answering research question IV and testing hypothesis 4 regarding the impact of acculturation experiences, dimensions, and outcomes on sociocultural adaptation, the same analyses will be conducted at Time 1 as those described above for testing and exploring effects on psychological well-being. However, at Time 2, the effects on sociocultural adaptation will be tested and explored with logistic regressions, as the outcome variable is dichotomous.

Research question V on the cross-sectional impact of the two acculturation outcomes on each other will be answered and hypotheses 5 and 6 tested at Time 1 by including psychological well-being/sociocultural adaptation in the last step of hierarchical regression analyses on sociocultural adaptation/psychological well-being with acculturation experience, dimension and profile variables as predictors (see section 12.4). Hypothesis 5 will be tested in
the same way at Time 2. In addition, the best hierarchical regression models explaining the outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation at Time 1 and psychological well-being at Time 2 will be sought.

Research question VI on the similarities and differences in the explanatory power of acculturation experiences, dimensions and profiles for children/adolescents and young adults will be answered by comparing the predictors included in the best explanatory models (hierarchical or logistic regression analyses) for psychological well-being/sociocultural adaptation at Time 1 and Time 2 (see section 12.4). Hypothesis 7 will be tested by comparing the extent to which discrepancies between the participants’ own family obligation and independence values and those of their parents (actual at Time 1, perceived at Time 2) explain psychological well-being at Time 1 (childhood/adolescence) and at Time 2 (adulthood).

Research question VII on the long-term impact of acculturation experiences, dimensions and profiles on psychological well-being will be answered and hypothesis 8 tested by conducted hierarchical regression analyses with acculturation experiences (perceived discrimination) at Time 1 entered in the first step and acculturation dimensions and profiles at Time 1 entered in subsequent steps (see section 12.5). In addition, a discriminant analysis will be conducted in order to find the predictors at Time 1 and Time 2 differentiating those who were depressed both at Time 1 and Time 2 from the others. Research question VII regarding sociocultural adaptation will be answered and hypothesis 9
tested with logistic regressions, as the outcome variable is dichotomous. In addition, the best (hierarchical or logistic) regression models explaining the longitudinal outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation will be sought.
12 RESULTS

12.1 Descriptive statistics

12.1.1 Demographic background

The demographic statistics of the participants at Time 1 and Time 2 are shown in Table 1.

As Table 1 shows there were more boys/men than girls/women among the participants at both times. This gender distribution corresponds with the proportion of girls and boys in the total school-age Vietnamese population in Finland at Time 1, when the original sample was made. Vietnamese children and youth arriving in Finland as refugees were predominantly male, probably due to more male children being sent out by their families as refugees from Vietnam, in general, while more girls (and women) remained behind (see e.g., Freeman, 1995).
Table 1  Demographic characteristics of participants at Time 1 (1992) and Time 2 (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1992 (Time 1)</th>
<th>2004 (Time 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 97)</td>
<td>(N = 59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender, (%)**
- Female: 39 (40.2%) vs. 26 (44.1%)
- Male: 58 (59.8%) vs. 33 (55.9%)

**Age, years: mean (range)**

**Age on arrival, years: mean (range)**
- 1992: 9.4 (0.5 – 16) vs. 2004: 9.0 (0.5 – 15)

**Length of residence, years: mean (range)**

**Marital status, (%)**
- 1 single: 97 (100%) vs. 27 (45.8%)
- 2 married/partner: — vs. 27 (45.8%)
- 3 separated/divorced: — vs. 5 (8.5%)

**Occupation**
- 1 student or a student employed part time: 97 (100%) vs. 31 (52.5%)
- 2 employed or employed and a part-time student: — vs. 21 (35.6%)
- 3 maternity/childcare leave, military service, unemployed, or sick leave: — vs. 7 (11.9%)

**Living arrangements**
- 1 with parents/childhood family: 88 (90.7%) vs. 13 (22.0%)
- 2 alone: 3 (3.1%) vs. 7 (11.9%)
- 3 with siblings/relatives/friends: 6 (6.2%) vs. 12 (20.3%)
- 4 with partner/spouse: — vs. 12 (20.3%)
- 5 with partner/spouse and children or alone with children: — vs. 15 (25.4%)
12.1.2 Data loss from Time 1 to Time 2

In order to examine possible selection bias due to sample attrition, t-tests and chi-square tests on relevant demographic factors (gender, age, age on arrival, and length of residence in Finland) and the 1992 scales (a) perceived discrimination, (b) identity, (c) Finnish language proficiency, (d) Vietnamese language proficiency, (e) family values, (f) depression, and (g) school achievement) were performed.

The chi-square analyses showed that the follow-up sample participants did not differ from those in the original sample not participating at Time 2 according to gender, age, age on arrival, or length of residence in Finland. The independent-samples t-tests showed that none of the mean differences on the 1992 scales between those who participated in both waves or only in 1992 were statistically significant:

a) Perceived discrimination

There was no significant difference in levels for participants ($M = 2.36, SD = 1.04$), and for non-participants ($M = 2.35, SD = .91; t(95) = .07, p = .95$). The magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared = .000).
b) Identity (Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity)
There was no significant difference in levels for participants $(M = 1.58, SD = .50)$, and for non-participants $(M = 1.61, SD = .60)$; $t(95) = .26, p = .80$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared = .001).

c) Finnish language proficiency
There was no significant difference in levels for participants $(M = 3.03, SD = .98)$, and for non-participants $(M = 2.84, SD = .84$; $t(95) = -.95, p = .34)$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (eta squared = .02).

d) Vietnamese language proficiency
There was no significant difference in levels for participants $(M = 2.94, SD = 1.12)$, and for non-participants $(M = 3.29, SD = 1.09; t(95) = 1.47, p = .14)$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (eta squared = .05).

e) Family values
There was no significant difference in levels for participants $(M = 2.97, SD = .44)$, and for non-participants $(M = 2.93, SD = .35; t(95) = .42, p = .68)$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was very small (eta squared = .004).

f) Depression
There was no significant difference in levels for participants $(M = 11.61, SD = 6.30)$, and for non-participants $(M = 13.05, SD = 5.88; t(95) = 1.13, p = .26)$. The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (eta squared = .03).
g) School achievement
There was no significant difference in levels for participants ($M = 7.45$, $SD = .76$), and for non-participants ($M = 7.20$, $SD = .70$; $t(95) = -1.63$, $p = .11$). The magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate ($\eta^2$ = .06).

12.1.3 Baseline comparison: values, psychological well-being, and sociocultural adaptation of Vietnamese and Finnish participants at Time 1

At Time 1 the Vietnamese were compared to Finnish peers matched by gender and age, providing a baseline view of the relatively recently (average length of residence = 4.1 years) arrived immigrants’ situation concerning values, psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation in a Finnish context.

At Time 1, the Vietnamese students adhered significantly more ($M = 3.58$, $SD = .48$) to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values than their Finnish peers ($M = 2.73$, $SD = .56$) ($t = 11.27$, $df = 192$, $p < .000$). A significant difference ($t = -6.35$, $df = 192$, $p < .000$) was also found in adherence to (national) Finnish independence values, with the Vietnamese students adhering to them less ($M = 3.8$, $SD = 6.9$) than the Finnish students ($M = 4.3$, $SD = .50$).
An ANOVA was made to compare the Vietnamese and Finnish parents’ and their children’s value adherence (see Figure 6 below). There was a statistically significant difference in adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values for the four groups \(F(3, 476) = 34.4, p = .000, \eta_p^2 = .67\). Between-group comparisons (Scheffe’s post hoc tests with \(p < .05\)) indicated that the mean adherence to family obligation values was significantly higher among the Vietnamese children and adolescents \((M = 3.58, SD = .48)\) and their parents \((M = 3.69, SD = .54)\) than among the Finnish children and adolescents \((M = 2.73, SD = .56)\) and their parents \((M = 2.06, SD = .42)\). There was no significant difference between the Vietnamese children and adolescents and their parents. There was, however, a significant difference between the Finnish children and adolescents and their parents, with greater adherence to family obligation values among the younger generation.
Figure 6  Value adherence, by ethnicity and generation at Time 1(1992) (N = 97 Vietnamese children and adolescents, 97 Finnish children and adolescents, 83 Vietnamese parents, and 163 Finnish parents)

A second ANOVA was made for adherence to (national) Finnish independence values among the Vietnamese and Finnish parents and their children (see Figure 6 above). Both Vietnamese parents and their children showed less adherence than their Finnish counterparts. There was a statistically significant difference in adherence to (national) Finnish independence values for the four groups \((F(3, 476) = 32.4, p = .000, \eta_p^2 = .17)\). Between-group comparisons (Scheffe’s post hoc tests with \(p < .05\)) indicated that the mean adherence to (national) independence values
was significantly lower among the Vietnamese children and adolescents \((M = 3.80, SD = .69)\) and their parents \(M = 3.65, SD = .60\) than among the Finnish children and adolescents \((M = 4.35, SD = .50)\) and their parents \(M = 4.12, SD = .53\). There was no significant difference between the Vietnamese children and adolescents and their parents. There was, however, a significant difference between the Finnish children and adolescents and their parents, with greater adherence to independence values among the younger generation.

Regarding sociocultural adaptation, there was a significant difference in school achievement between the Vietnamese and Finnish students. The grade point average of the Finnish students was higher \((M = 7.80, SD = .80)\) than that of the Vietnamese students \((M = 7.35, SD = 72)\) \((t = -3.87, df = 174, p < .000)\).

A significant difference was also found in the psychological well-being of the Vietnamese and the Finnish participants. The Vietnamese participants were significantly more depressed than their Finnish peers at Time 1. The mean Children's Depression Inventory score among the Vietnamese was 12.18 \((SD = 6.15)\), while it was 6.84 \((SD = 4.9)\) among the Finnish children and adolescents. The difference was statistically significant \((t = 6.67, df = 192, p < .001)\).
12.2 Answering the first three research questions: comparing acculturation variables at Time 1 and Time 2

Paired-samples t-tests were conducted to compare changes in perceived discrimination, Finnish language proficiency, Vietnamese language proficiency, family obligation values, independence values, and depression over time (see Table 2 below). Because different measures of identity were used at Time 1 and Time 2, no direct comparisons of means over time were made for identity.

Changes were significant for all variables except (national) Finnish independence values. The acculturation experience of perceived discrimination had decreased, as had depression, one of the outcomes of acculturation (see Table 2). Comparing the acculturation profiles at Time 1 and Time 2, it can be noted that, generally, the Finnish profile was strengthened while the Vietnamese was weakened: Finnish language proficiency and adherence to Finnish independence values had increased, while adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values had decreased from Time 1 to Time 2. However, Vietnamese language proficiency deviated from this pattern as the mean proficiency was higher at Time 2 than at Time 1: Finnish and Vietnamese proficiency had both increased in twelve years.
Table 2  Changes in perceived discrimination, language proficiency, values and depression from Time 1 (1992) to Time 2 (2004) (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-7.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>8.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>7.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ethnic) family obligation values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-10.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(National) independence values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (dichotomized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-4.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***p ≤ .001

While the change in overall adherence to family obligation values over time was significant, there were two individual statements for which adherence had not changed
(see Table 2 above and Appendix 2, Table 2 for $t$-tests of changes over time in individual values).

As adults, the participants still agreed with the statement

- “Brothers and/or sisters should never be envious or jealous of one another”

and disagreed with the statement

- “Parents should be able to admit mistakes to their children”,

reflecting a continuing adherence to cohesiveness and parental authority in the family.

The change in overall adherence to independence values was not significant, but there were significant changes over time concerning support for five individual statements (see Table 2 above and Appendix 2, Table 2). As adults there was more adherence for the following statements:

- “It is all right for boy over the age of 18 to decide when to marry and whom to marry”
- “It is all right for girls to choose their own career”
- “Every member of the family has a right to keep certain thoughts and feeling private”, 
reflecting increased support for individual choice concerning major life choices and for the right to privacy.

Another way of looking at the changes in depression over time is to cross-tabulate the 2004 participants according to their present (2004) and previous (1992) state of depression, i.e. depression scores above or under the cut-off point of nine. It can be seen from Table 3 that the overall level of depression has declined in 12 years: only half of those who were depressed as children or adolescents at Time 1 were depressed also at Time 2 and only one of the non-depressed at Time 1 was depressed as an adult at Time 2.

Table 3  Number of depressed and non-depressed participants at Time 1 (1992) and Time 2 (2004) (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-depressed</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity, 43% (N = 42) of the Vietnamese participants said at Time 1 that they considered themselves Vietnamese, while 55% (N = 53) said they considered themselves both Vietnamese and Finnish, and 2% (N = 2) considered themselves Finnish. At Time 2, after 14 to 25 years in Finland, the participants’ self-
categorized identity was more Vietnamese than at Time 1, with 63% \( (N = 37) \) saying they considered themselves Vietnamese, 29% \( (N = 17) \) considering themselves both Vietnamese and Finnish, and 8% \( (N = 5) \) considering themselves Finnish.

At **Time 2** it was also possible to examine the relationship between (ethnic) Vietnamese and (national) Finnish identification, using separate scales, which was not possible at Time 1. The correlation between the identifications was \(-.10\) (Vietnamese identification \(_{\text{Time 2}}\), \(M = 4.31, SD = .73\); Finnish identification \(_{\text{Time 2}}\), \(M = 3.18, SD = .91\)). A paired-samples \(t\)-test showed that Vietnamese identification was significantly stronger than Finnish identification, \(t(58), p < .001\).

12.3 **Answering the fourth research question: the cross-sectional prediction of acculturation outcomes at Time 1 and Time 2 (hypotheses 1-4)**

12.3.1 **Predicting psychological well-being with acculturation experiences, dimensions, and profiles**
12.3.1.1 Acculturation experiences

Hypothesis 1 on the negative impact of the acculturation experience of perceived discrimination on psychological well-being for Time 1 was tested by including it in the second step, after control for age on arrival, of the hierarchical regression analysis designed to test also hypothesis 2 (see Table 4 below). Hypothesis 1 was confirmed for Time 1; the less perceived discrimination (PD), the lower was the level of depression. PD explained 8% of the variance in depression. Another similar hierarchical regression analysis for Time 2 revealed that PD in itself was not significantly related to depression (see Table 5) and thus hypothesis 1 was not confirmed for Time 2. It was only when PD was included in a hierarchical regression analysis testing the impact of intergenerational value discrepancies on self-esteem that it had a significant negative impact (see Table 8, section 12.3.1.2 below).

12.3.1.2 Acculturation dimensions

Hypothesis 2a and 2b on the impact of the acculturation dimension of language - national (2a) and ethnic (2b) language proficiency on psychological well-being were tested with hierarchical regression analyses for Time 1 (see Table 4 below) and Time 2 (see Table 5 below) with age on arrival entered in the first step, PD entered in the second
step, Vietnamese language proficiency in the third step and Finnish language proficiency in the fourth step. At Time 1, neither hypothesis 2a nor 2b was confirmed (see Table 4 below). Neither Finnish language proficiency nor Vietnamese language proficiency was significantly related to depression at Time 1.

**Table 4**  
Hierarchical regression analysis predicting depression at Time 1 (1992) as a function of age on arrival, PD, and language proficiency (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination Time1</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency Time1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency Time1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td>8.27**</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>13.50***</td>
<td>11.40***</td>
<td>7.96***</td>
<td>5.93***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p ≤ .001*
Table 5  
Hierarchical regression analysis predicting depression at Time 2 (2004) as a function of age on arrival, PD, and language proficiency (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ), as ( R^2 ) changes</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>14.88***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5.46***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table shows standardized betas (\( \beta \)):\***p ≤ .001

As can be seen from Table 5 (above) and Table 6 (below), for **Time 2**, hypothesis 2a (the impact of Finnish proficiency) was confirmed, but hypothesis 2b (the impact of Vietnamese proficiency) was not, as Vietnamese language proficiency had no impact on depression (Table 5) or self-esteem (Table 6). With age on arrival, PD and Vietnamese language proficiency controlled but non-significant, Finnish language proficiency was significantly and negatively related to depression, explaining 29% of its variance (Table 5) and positively to self-esteem (Table 6), explaining 38% of its variance.
Table 6  Hierarchical regression analysis predicting self-esteem at Time 2 (2004) as a function of age on arrival, PD, and language proficiency (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination(t_{\text{Time 2}})</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency(t_{\text{Time 2}})</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency(t_{\text{Time 2}})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F, ) as (R^2) changes</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>38.65***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>11.86***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table shows standardized betas (\(\beta\)): *\(p < .05\); ***\(p \leq .001\)

In order to test hypothesis 2c regarding the specific impact of fluent bilingual versus monolingual or marginal bilingual language proficiency on depression at Time 1, and on (1) depression and (2) self-esteem at Time 2, a series of one-way between groups analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted. The participants were divided into four groups according to their proficiency in Vietnamese and Finnish: (1) marginally bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish, (2) monolingual in Vietnamese, (3) monolingual in Finnish, and (4) fluently bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish.

For Time 1, hypothesis 2c was not confirmed. Although the model showed that, overall, bilingual proficiency is related to the depression scores of the four language proficiency groups (\(F(3, 93) = 2.9, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .08\), and although between-group comparisons (Scheffé’s post hoc tests with \(p < .05\)) indicated that the mean
depression score for those monolingual in Vietnamese ($M = 14.88, SD = 6.69$) was almost significantly higher than that for those monolingual in Finnish ($M = 10.10, SD = 5.06$), the mean depression score of the fluently bilingual group ($M = 11.97, SD = 6.63$) did not differ significantly from that of either monolingual group or the marginally bilingual group ($M = 10.88, SD = 4.11$), nor were other significant or almost significant differences found between any of the groups. Thus, fluent bilingual proficiency had no significant impact on depression at Time 1.

Similar ANOVAs conducted at Time 2 to test the specific impact of fluent bilingual proficiency versus monolingual or marginal bilingual proficiency on (1) depression and on (2) self-esteem revealed no significant differences between language proficiency groups in relation to depression ($F(3, 55) = 2.5, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .12$). Thus hypothesis 2c was not confirmed for depression at Time 2. However, hypothesis 2c was partly confirmed for the impact of fluent bilingual proficiency on self-esteem (see also Figure 7 below). Statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level were found between the self-esteem scores for most of the four language proficiency groups ($F(3, 55) = 7.1, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .28$). The between-group comparisons (Scheffe’s post hoc tests with $p < .05$) indicated that the mean self-esteem score for those fluently bilingual ($M = 4.3, SD = .48$), as well as for those monolingual in Finnish ($M = 4.25, SD = .49$), were both significantly higher than for those marginally bilingual ($M = 3.5, SD = .65$) or monolingual in Vietnamese ($M = 3.62, SD = .67$). There were no statistical
differences in self-esteem between the fluent bilingual group and the Finnish monolingual group or between the marginally bilingual group and the Vietnamese monolingual group.

**Figure 7**  *The relationship between language proficiency levels and self-esteem at Time 2 (N = 59)*

Turning to the acculturation dimension of values, **hypothesis 3** concerning the detrimental impact of intergenerational *value discrepancies* on psychological well-being was tested with hierarchical regression analyses for Time 1 and Time 2 with age on arrival entered in the first step, PD in the second step, intergenerational discrepancies concerning family obligation values in the third step, and discrepancies concerning independence values in the fourth step (see Table 7 below). Hypothesis 3 was partially confirmed at **Time 1**, as
a tendency, in that the smaller the intergenerational discrepancies concerning family obligation values, the lower was the level of depression. However, intergenerational discrepancies concerning independence values did not have a significant impact on depression.

| Table 7 Hierarchical regression analysis predicting depression at Time 1 (1992) as a function of age on arrival, PD and intergenerational value discrepancies (N = 64) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Predictors | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 |
| Age on arrival | .35** | .29* | .26* | .26* |
| Perceived discrimination<sub>Time1</sub> | .27* | .24* | .20* | |
| Intergenerational discrepancies (Family obligation values)<sub>Time1</sub> | .23 | .20 | | |
| Intergenerational discrepancies (Independence values)<sub>Time1</sub> | | | | .16 |
| $R^2$ | .12 | .20 | .24 | .27 |
| $F$, as $R^2$ changes | 5.36 | 3.90* | 1.80* |
| $F$ | 8.81** | 7.40*** | 6.47*** | 5.37*** |

*Note. Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): $p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p \leq .001$*

At Time 2 hypothesis 3 was only partially confirmed: when controlling for age on arrival and perceived discrimination (PD), neither intergenerational discrepancies in family obligation values ($R^2 = .02, \beta = .14, p = .31$) nor discrepancies
in independence values ($R^2 = .01, \beta = -.09, p = .54$) had an impact on depression, but discrepancies concerning family obligation values did have a significant negative impact on self-esteem, explaining 8% of its variance (see Table 8 below). This impact decreased to a tendency when discrepancies concerning independence values were added to the model.

**Table 8**   *Hierarchical regression analysis predicting self-esteem at Time 2 (2004) as a function of age on arrival, PD and intergenerational value discrepancies (N = 58)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination$_{Time2}$</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational discrepancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.24†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Family obligation values)$_{Time2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrepancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Independence values)$_{Time2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.86*</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
<td>2.42†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): †$p < .10$; *$p < .05$
In addition to testing hypothesis 3, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to explore the impact of ethnic (family obligation) and national (independence) values on psychological well-being (depression) at Time 1 (see Table 9 below). With age on arrival and PD controlled, independence values had a significant impact on depression: stronger adherence to independence values increased depression, but adherence to family obligation values had no impact. Value adherence explained 7% of the variance in depression.

Table 9  Hierarchical regression analysis predicting depression at Time 1 (1992) as a function of age on arrival, PD and values (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R<sup>2</sup>                     | .12        | .20     | .21     | .27     |
| F, as R<sup>2</sup> changes      | 8.27**     | 1.41    | 7.39**  |         |
| F                                | 11.40***   |         |         |         |
|                                  | 13.50***   | 8.10*** | 8.34*** |         |

*Note.* Table shows standardized betas (β):+p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Similarly, for **Time 2**, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to explore the impact of ethnic (family obligation) and national (independence) values on psychological well-being (depression) (see Table 10 below). With age on arrival and PD controlled, family obligation values now had a significant impact on depression, in contrast to Time 1: stronger adherence to traditional values increased depression, but adherence to independence values had no impact. Value adherence explained 14% of the variance in depression at Time 2.

#### Table 10  Hierarchical regression analysis predicting depression at Time 2 (2004) as a function of age on arrival, PD and values ($N = 59$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>9.17**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.64**</td>
<td>3.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): +$p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$*

A second hierarchical regression for **Time 2** explored the impact of values on self-esteem (see Table 11 below). Here also, with age on arrival and PD controlled, (ethnic) family obligation values had a significant detrimental impact.
on self-esteem, while the impact of independence (national) values was non-significant. Value adherence explained 21% of the variance in self-esteem.

**Table 11 Hierarchical regression analysis predicting self-esteem at Time 2 (2004) as a function of age on arrival, PD and values (N = 59)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination_{Time2}</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.22+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values_{Time2}</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>15.22***</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>6.77***</td>
<td>5.18***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): $+p < .10$; $*p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p < .001$*

In order to explore the specific cross-sectional impact of bicultural versus monocultural or marginal values on depression at **Time 1**, and on depression and self-esteem at **Time 2**, one-way between-groups analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted. At both times, the participants were divided into four groups according to their adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values and (national) Finnish independence values: (1) marginal adherence to both Vietnamese values and Finnish values, (2) monocultural Vietnamese in adherence to both values (strong family obligation value adherence and weak independence value adherence), (3) monocultural Finnish in adherence to both
values (weak family obligation value adherence and strong independence value adherence), and (4) strong bicultural adherence to both Vietnamese family obligation values and Finnish independence values. There were no significant differences between these value groups in relation to depression at Time 1 ($F(3, 93) = 2.5, p > .05, \eta_p^2 = .07$).

At Time 2 there were no significant differences between these value groups in relation to depression ($F(3, 55) = 2.4, p > .05, \eta_p^2 = .12$). However, there were statistically significant differences in regard to self-esteem at Time 2 at the $p < .05$ level between the four value groups ($F(3, 55) = 5.2, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .22$) (see also Figure 8 below). Between-group comparisons (Scheffe’s post hoc tests with $p < .05$) indicated that the mean self-esteem score of those with monocultural Finnish values was significantly higher ($M = 4.33, SD = .36$) than that of those with monocultural Vietnamese values ($M = 3.61, SD = .65$) and of those with bicultural Vietnamese-Finnish values ($M = 3.63, SD = .36$). Those with marginal Vietnamese-Finnish values ($M = 3.77, SD = .66$) did not differ significantly in self-esteem from any of the other groups, nor was there a significant difference between those with monocultural Vietnamese values and those with bicultural Vietnamese-Finnish values.
Finally, in order to explore the impact of the acculturation dimension of identity on psychological well-being (depression) at Time 1, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted, with perceived discrimination controlled. The results showed that self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity had no impact on depression ($R^2 = .11, \beta = .12, p = .23$) at Time 1. For Time 2, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted using self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity and Vietnamese and Finnish identification as predictors of (1) depression, and (2) self-esteem, with PD controlled. As for Time 1, none of the identity/identification
predictors were significant, for either depression or self-esteem, at Time 2.

In order to explore the specific impact of monocultural versus bicultural identity on depression at Time 1, and monocultural versus bicultural identification on (1) depression and (2) self-esteem at Time 2, a series of one-way between-groups analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted. As the identity measure used at Time 1 was a single one-dimensional question, including only one response option for each alternative (ethnic, national, or bicultural), a four-way distribution of the participants similar to those used above for language and values was not possible. The participants were therefore divided into three groups only, according to their self-categorization as (1) Vietnamese (monocultural Vietnamese identity), (2) Finnish (monocultural Finnish identity), or (3) both Vietnamese and Finnish (bicultural identity). There were no significant differences between these identity groups in relation to depression at Time 1 ($F(2, 94) = 1.3, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .05$).

For Time 2, ANOVAs were conducted to explore the specific impact of monocultural versus bicultural (or marginal) Vietnamese or Finnish identification on (1) depression and (2) self-esteem. Because the distributions of identification were very skewed, a four-way distribution of the participants was not possible (see Measures, section 11.3). Therefore, both those marginally (weakly) identifying as Vietnamese and Finnish and those strongly identifying as Vietnamese and Finnish were joined in a common group
labeled mono- vs. bicultural identification. There were no significant differences between identification groups in relation to depression ($F(2, 56) = 1.6, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .05$) or self-esteem ($F(2, 56) = .08, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .00$) at Time 2.

12.3.1.3 Ethnic, national, and bicultural acculturation profiles

Turning now to the predictive power of ethnic, national and bicultural acculturation profiles that combine the corresponding language(s), values and identity/identities, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in order to explore their impact on psychological well-being (depression) at Time 1 (see Table 12 below). For reasons of comparison, Tables 12, 13, and 14 (below) show only the final steps of each regression analysis: Model 1 is for the ethnic profile, Model 2 for the national profile, and Model 3 for the bicultural profile. Missing values (empty cells) in the tables signify variables not used in that particular model.

As can be seen from Table 12, when including PD in each profile model, it was the model with the (ethnic) Vietnamese profile that had the greatest impact on depression at Time 1, increasing the level of depression and explaining 23% of the its variance. This impact was mainly due to the language dimension (Vietnamese language proficiency). PD and the national (Finnish) profile explained 19%, due mainly to the value dimension; stronger adherence to independence values was related to higher levels of depression. The bicultural profile, which included both the highly bicultural and the marginally bicultural, explained
14% of the variation in depression at Time 1, but this was due mainly to the impact of perceived discrimination.

**Table 12**  *Hierarchical regression analyses of acculturation profiles predicting depression at Time 1 (1992), showing final steps only (N = 97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1, Step 5 Ethnic profile</th>
<th>Model 2, Step 5 National profile</th>
<th>Model 3, Step 4 Bicultural profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \begin{align*}
R^2 & = .23 \quad .19 \quad .14 \\
F, \text{ as } R^2 \text{ changes} & = 1.18 \quad .86 \quad 3.80^* \\
F & = 5.46^{***} \quad 4.35^{***} \quad 6.52^{***}
\end{align*} \]

*Note: Table shows standardized betas (β): <sup>+</sup>p < .10; <sup>*</sup>p < .05; <sup>***</sup>p ≤ .001*
Similar hierarchical regression analyses, including PD, were conducted to explore the impact of ethnic, national and bicultural profiles on depression at Time 2 (see Table 13 below). At Time 2, in adulthood, contrary to Time 1, the national (Finnish) profile had the greatest impact on depression, explaining 40% of the variance. In this case, all acculturation dimensions were important, but in opposite directions; while a poor proficiency in Finnish and a low adherence to Finnish family obligation values (i.e., high adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values) were related to increased depression, also a stronger Finnish identification was related to higher levels of depression. The ethnic (Vietnamese) profile explained 22% of the variance in depression, mainly due to the value dimension; stronger adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values was related to higher levels of depression. The bicultural profile explained only 11% of the depression scores.

In Table 12 (above), the self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity variable and the mono- vs. bicultural identity variable were used in the model. In Tables 13 and 14 (below), the ethnic, national, and mono- vs. bicultural identification (one-item) variables were used in the models. All but Finnish identification (one item) were non-significant (see Table 13 below). Similar regression analyses were made using the more comprehensive ethnic, national, and mono-vs. bicultural identification variables (see Methods, section 11.3), with now all identification variables, including Finnish identification, non-significant.
Table 13  *Hierarchical regression analyses of acculturation profiles predicting depression at Time 2* (2004, showing final steps only *(N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 2, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 3, Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese identification (one item)&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification (one item)&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural identification (one item)&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $R^2$ |   .22 | .40  | .11  |
| $F$, as $R^2$ changes | 2.62 | 7.70** | 1.76 |
| $F$ | 3.03* | 6.91*** | 1.73 |

*Note:* Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): $^+$ $p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p \leq .001$
At **Time 2**, similar hierarchical regression analyses including PD were conducted to explore the impact of ethnic, national and bicultural profiles on self-esteem (see Table 14 below. As was the case for depression (see Table 13 above), the model including the (national) Finnish profile had the greatest impact on self-esteem, explaining 48% of its variance. This impact was mainly due to the language dimension, as higher self-esteem was related to greater proficiency in Finnish and the lower the adherence to Finnish family obligation values (higher adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values). The (ethnic) Vietnamese profile explained 27% of the variance in self-esteem, due mainly to the value dimension; weaker adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values was related to higher self-esteem. The bicultural profile explained only 7% of the variance in self-esteem.
Table 14  Hierarchical regression analyses of acculturation profiles predicting self-esteem at Time 2 (2004), showing final steps only (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 2, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 3, Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic profile</td>
<td>National profile</td>
<td>Bicultural profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination_{Time2}</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency_{Time2}</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values_{Time2}</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values_{Time2}</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural values_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese identification (one item)_{Time2}</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification (one item)_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural identification (one item)_{Time2}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ), as ( R^2 ) changes</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>3.91**</td>
<td>9.69***</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table shows standardized betas (\(\beta\)): *\(p < .10\); *\(p < .05\); **\(p < .01\); ***\(p \leq .001\)

This section (12.3.1) has concerned the impact of acculturation variables on psychological well-being at Time 1 and Time 2. The following section (12.3.2) will focus on
the impact of acculturation variables on sociocultural adaptation.

12.3.2 Predicting sociocultural adaptation with acculturation experiences, dimensions, and profiles

12.3.2.1 Acculturation experiences

The impact of the acculturation experience of *perceived discrimination* on sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) at **Time 1** was explored by including it in the second step, after controlling for age on arrival, of a hierarchical regression analysis (see Table 15 below), designed to test hypothesis 4 on the impact of the *acculturation dimension of language proficiency* on sociocultural adaptation (see section 12.3.2.2) at **Time 1**. As can be seen from Table 15, perceived discrimination had a significant negative impact on school achievement, explaining 9% of its variance.
Table 15  Hierarchical regression analysis of age on arrival, PD and language proficiency predicting school achievement at Time 1 (1992) (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]  | .00    | .09    | .12    | .39    |

\[ F, \text{ as } R^2 \text{ changes} \]  | 8.89** | 3.26*  |        | 41.66***|

\[ F \]  | .16    | 4.53*  | 4.18** |        |

14.92***

Note. Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): * $p < .10$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

The impact of the acculturation experience of perceived discrimination on sociocultural adaptation (educational attainment) at Time 2 was explored by including it in the first step of a logistic regression analysis (see Table 16 below), designed to test hypothesis 4 on the impact of the acculturation dimension of language (the positive impact of Finnish language proficiency on sociocultural adaptation) at Time 2. Contrary to what was the case at Time 1 (see Table 15 above), PD did not have a significant impact on sociocultural adaptation in adulthood (see Table 16 below).
12.3.2.2 Acculturation dimensions

As can be seen from Table 15 above, hypothesis 4 was confirmed for Time 1. The greater Finnish proficiency, the better was school achievement. The acculturation dimension of language explained 29% of the variance in school achievement at Time 1. However, proficiency in Finnish alone explained 27% of this variance; ethnic language (Vietnamese) showed a tendency to increase school achievement when its direct effect without Finnish proficiency was measured, but it still explained only 3% of the variance in school achievement at Time 1 (see Table 15 above).
Table 16  Logistic regression analysis for variables predicting educational attainment at Time 2 (2004) (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Model (4a) Step 2</th>
<th>Model (4b) Step 3</th>
<th>Model (4b) Step 2</th>
<th>Model (5a) Step 2</th>
<th>Model (5b) Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination@Time2</td>
<td>β (.50)</td>
<td>.99 (.65) 2.71</td>
<td>.45 (.59) 1.57</td>
<td>.49 (.56) 1.63</td>
<td>.46 (.57) 1.59</td>
<td>.90 (.71) 2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency@Time2</td>
<td>1.59 (.64) 4.88*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56 (.78) 4.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency@Time2</td>
<td>.08 (.50) 1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.51 (.57) .60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values@Time2</td>
<td>-1.49 (.68) .23*</td>
<td>-1.16 (.73) .31</td>
<td>-1.41 (.78) .25</td>
<td>-1.31 (.94) .27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values@Time2</td>
<td>1.56 (.88) 4.80*</td>
<td>1.77 (.94) 5.86*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 (.17) 13.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese identification (one item)@Time2</td>
<td>.68 (.48) 1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification (one item)@Time2</td>
<td>- .99 (.45) .37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.50 (.50)</td>
<td>-7.09 (4.16)*</td>
<td>4.70 (2.29)*</td>
<td>-2.25(4.49)</td>
<td>-2.96(5.52)*</td>
<td>-9.82(6.78)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hosmer-Lemeshow test
-2 LL  
Total model  
Omnibus test

Note. Table shows logit coefficients, standard errors and odds ratios. + p < .10; * p < .05; *** p ≤ .001
As can be seen from Table 16 (above) hypothesis 4 was confirmed also for **Time 2**. Those with greater Finnish proficiency at Time 2 had an odds of almost 5 to 1 ($OR = 4.88^*$) of having attained more than a basic education. As can also be seen from Table 16, Vietnamese proficiency had no significant impact on educational attainment at Time 2.

To explore the specific impact of bilingual proficiency on school achievement at **Time 1**, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Just as for exploring the impact of fluent bilingual proficiency versus monolingual Vietnamese, Finnish, and marginal language proficiency on psychological well-being (see section 12.3.1.2), the participants were divided into four groups according to their proficiency in Vietnamese and Finnish: (1) marginally bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish, (2) monolingual in Vietnamese, (3) monolingual in Finnish, and (4) fluently bilingual in Vietnamese and Finnish.

There was a statistically significant difference in school achievement (grade point averages) for the four language proficiency groups ($F(3, 93) = 9.5, p = .000, \eta^2_p = .23$)(see also Figure 9). Between-group comparisons (Scheffe’s post hoc tests with $p < .05$) indicated that the mean grade point average was significantly higher among the fluently bilingual ($M = 7.77, SD = .72$) than among those monolingual in Vietnamese ($M = 6.98, SD = .53$) or the marginally bilingual ($M = 6.99, SD = .50$). There were no significant differences in school achievement between those marginally bilingual, those monolingual in Vietnamese and those
monolingual in Finnish ($M = 7.45, SD = .73$), Thus, bilingual proficiency had a significant impact on school achievement.

**Figure 9**  *The relationship between language proficiency and school achievement at Time 1 (N = 97)*

Turning to the acculturation dimension of *values*, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to explore the impact of ethnic and national values on sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) at **Time 1** (see Table 17 below). With age on arrival and perceived discrimination controlled, adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values had a significant negative impact on school achievement, while adherence to (national) independence values was not significant.
Table 17  Hierarchical regression analysis of age on arrival, PD and values predicting school achievement at Time 1 (1992) (N=97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.66*</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
<td>5.06**</td>
<td>4.15**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, an ANOVA was conducted to explore the specific impact of marginal or mono- vs. bicultural values on school achievement at Time 1. Just as for exploring the impact of bicultural versus mono- or marginal cultural values on psychological well-being (see section 12.3.1.2), the participants were divided into four groups according to their adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese family obligation values and (national) Finnish independence values: (1) marginal adherence to both Vietnamese values and Finnish values, (2) monocultural Vietnamese in adherence to both kinds of values (strong family obligation value adherence and weak independence value adherence), (3) monocultural Finnish in adherence to both kinds of values (weak family obligation value adherence and strong...
independence value adherence), and (4) strong bicultural adherence to both Vietnamese family obligation values and Finnish independence values.

There was a statistically significant difference in school achievement (grade point averages) for the four value adherence groups \(F(3, 93) = 3.2, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .09\). Between-group comparisons (Scheffé’s post hoc tests with \(p < .05\)) indicated that the mean grade point average was significantly higher among the marginally bicultural in value adherence \((M = 7.60, SD = .63)\) than among those strongly bicultural in values \((M = 7.00, SD = .67)\). There were no significant differences in school achievement between those with monocultural Vietnamese values \((M = 7.35, SD = .72)\) or monocultural Finnish values \((M = 7.40, SD = .80)\) or between these two and the marginally or strongly bicultural.

The impact of marginal or mono- vs. bicultural values on sociocultural adaptation at **Time 2** was not explored, as the outcome variable (educational attainment) was dichotomous. Instead, for Time 2, a logistic regression analysis conducted to explore the impact of ethnic and national values on sociocultural adaptation (educational attainment) (see Table 16 above, model 4b, steps 2 and 3) showed that with perceived discrimination controlled, adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values had a significant negative impact on educational attainment, as it did at Time 1; adherence to these values decreased the odds of having attained more than a basic education by 77% (\(OR = .23^*\)). However, this impact disappeared when adherence to (national) independence values was entered in the model,
and in the final 4b model, it was adherence to (national) independence values which showed a tendency to increase the odds of having attained more than a basic school education with almost 5 to 1 (see Table 16 above).

Turning to exploring the impact of the acculturation dimension of *identity* (self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity) on sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) at **Time 1**, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with perceived discrimination controlled. It showed that self-categorized identity had no impact on school achievement ($R^2 = .10, \beta = -.10, p = .31$).

For **Time 2**, a logistic regression analysis including perceived discrimination was conducted to explore the impact of identification (Finnish or Vietnamese) on sociocultural adaptation (educational attainment), but this model was not significant; identification had no impact on the probability of having more than a basic school education at Time 2. However, when Finnish identification (one item) was included in a logistic regression analysis with perceived discrimination, Finnish proficiency, family obligation values, and independence values, a stronger Finnish identification increased the probability of having no more than a basic school education (see Table 16, Model 5b, above).

### 12.3.2.3 Acculturation profiles

Turning now to the predictive power of *ethnic, national and bicultural* acculturation profiles, hierarchical regression
analyses were conducted in order to explore their impact on sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) at Time 1 (see Table 18 below). As can be seen from Table 18, including perceived discrimination in each profile model, it was the model with the (national) Finnish profile that had the greatest impact on school achievement at Time 1, increasing school achievement and explaining as much as 40% of the its variance. This impact was mainly due to the language dimension (Finnish language proficiency); the greater was Finnish proficiency, the better was school achievement. Perceived discrimination and the (ethnic) Vietnamese profile explained 18%, due mainly to the value dimension; stronger adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values was related to lower school achievement. The bicultural profile explained 11% of the variation in depression at Time 1, but this was due mainly to the impact of perceived discrimination.
Table 18  *Hierarchical regression analyses of acculturation profiles predicting school achievement at Time 1 (1992), showing final steps only (N = 97)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 2, Step 5</th>
<th>Model 3, Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>Ethnic profile</td>
<td>National profile</td>
<td>Bicultural profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.18+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bilingual proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mono- vs. bicultural identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $R^2$                                           | .18             | .40             | .11             |
| $F$, as $R^2$ changes                          | .44             | .76             | .08             |
| $F$                                             | 4.11**          | 12.18***        | 2.84*           |

*Note:* Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): $+p < .10$; $p < .05$; $**p < .01$; $***p \leq .001$
For **Time 2**, a logistic regression analysis was conducted to explore the impact of ethnic and national profiles on sociocultural adaptation (educational attainment) (see Table 16 above, ethnic profile in model 5a and national profile in model 5b). As can be seen from Table 16, all model indices are better for model 5b (national profile) than for model 5a (ethnic profile), which means that the national profile had a stronger impact on educational attainment at Time 2 than did the ethnic profile.

Specifically, the odds of having more than a basic education at Time 2 were 13 to 1 for those with stronger adherence Finnish independence values and almost 5 to 1 for those with good Finnish language proficiency. However, having a more Finnish identity decreased the odds of having attained more than a basic education at Time 2 by 63% (*OR = .37*). As can be seen from the ethnic profile model (5a) in Table 16 (above), adherence to Vietnamese family obligation values had a tendency to decrease the odds of having attained more than a basic education at Time 2.

This section (12.3) has concerned the cross-sectional relationship between of acculturation variables and sociocultural adaptation and the previous section (12.2) the cross-sectional relationship between acculturation variables and psychological well-being. The following section (12.4) will examine the relationship between these two outcomes, as well as the significance of intergenerational discrepancies in childhood or adolescence compared to adulthood. In addition, the best cross-sectional models of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation will be presented.
12.4 Answering the fifth and sixth research questions: the relationships between the acculturation outcomes and between the outcomes and age-specific predictors (hypotheses 5-7)

Hypothesis 5 concerning the positive and independent impact of greater sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) on psychological well-being at Time 1 was tested (see Table 19 below) by inserting school achievement as the last step in the same hierarchical regression analysis designed to explore the impact of the ethnic acculturation profile on depression at Time 1 (Table 12 in section 12.3.1.3, above), as it is so far the best model explaining depression in childhood and adolescence. As can be seen in Table 19, however, hypothesis 5 was not confirmed for Time 1.
Table 19  Best model predicting depression at Time 1. Hierarchical regression analysis with ethnic profile variables and school achievement predicting depression at Time 1 (1992) (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School achievement&lt;sub&gt;Time 1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R<sup>2</sup>                                     | .11     | .17     | .22     | .23     | .23     |
| F, as R<sup>2</sup> changes                      | 5.96*   | 3.22*   | 1.18    | .40     |
| F                                               | 12.17***| 9.38*** | 6.52*** | 5.46*** | 459*** |

Note. Table shows standardized betas (β): *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p ≤ .001

For Time 2, Hypothesis 5 was first tested (see Table 20 below) by inserting educational attainment (dichotomous variable) as the last step in the hierarchical regression analysis designed to explore the impact of the national
acculturation profile on depression in adulthood (Table 13, section 12.3.1.3 above), except for the (national) independence values, which were non-significant in that model. This model presented in Table 13 was chosen as a starting point because it is so far the best model predicting depression in adulthood. As can be seen from Table 21 (below), in contrast to Time 1, hypothesis 5 was confirmed for **Time 2**: with PD, Finnish proficiency, values and identification controlled, higher educational attainment had a significant positive impact on well-being in adulthood, shown as less depression. The explanatory power of the model increased by 8% compared to the one including the national profile variables only (see Table 13, section 12.3.1.3 above and Table 20 below). However, hypothesis 5 was not confirmed regarding self-esteem, as educational attainment had no impact on it when PD, Finnish proficiency, values and identification were controlled ($R^2 = .02, \beta = .17, p = .13$).
Table 20  Hierarchical regression analysis of national profile variables and educational attainment predicting depression at Time 2 (2004) (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification (one item)&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, as ( R^2 ) changes</td>
<td>15.76**</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
<td>8.15**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>9.43***</td>
<td>7.98***</td>
<td>8.79***</td>
<td>9.05***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table shows standardized betas (\( \beta \)): \( ^* p < .10 \); \( ^* p < .05 \); \( ^** p < .01 \); \( ^*** p \leq .001 \)

Consequently, the best predictive model of psychological well-being at Time 1 (Table 19 above) shows that more perceived discrimination, greater Vietnamese proficiency and greater adherence to (national) independence values all increased depression. It is thus the ethnic profile which best predicts depression in childhood and adolescence, as shown already in Table 12. The total variance of depression
explained in the model in Table 19 was 23%, and including school achievement in the last step did not increase the model’s explanatory power compared to the model with ethnic profile predictors only (see Table 12, section 12.3.1.3 above, and Table 19 above).

As noted above, however, the inclusion of educational attainment in the last step of the model exploring the impact of the national profile on well-being at **Time 2** improved the model’s explanatory power (see Table 13, section 12.3.1.3 above, and Table 20 above), as educational attainment had a significant impact on depression in adulthood and increased the variance explained from 40% to 48%. However, exchanging the Finnish identification variable for a one-dimensional self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity measure improved the explanatory power of the model even further (see Table 21 below). Now the variance of depression explained totaled 53% at Time 2. Consequently, less Finnish proficiency, greater adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values, only a basic education and, perhaps surprisingly, greater self-categorization as Finnish, all increased depression in adulthood (see Table 21 below).
Table 21  Best hierarchical regression model predicting depression at Time 2 (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²   | .04    | .25    | .30    | .47    | .53    |
F, as R² changes | 15.76*** | 4.04*  | 17.23*** | 7.05*  |
F     | 9.43*** | 12.05*** | 12.12*** |

Note: Table shows standardized betas (β): †p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p ≤ .001

In predicting self-esteem at Time 2, a new combination of predictors was found to be the best explanatory model (see Table 22 below). At Time 2, controlling for perceived
discrimination, both Finnish proficiency and Vietnamese proficiency, in addition to weaker adherence to family obligation values, increased self-esteem, together explaining one half of the variance in the self-esteem of adults.

**Table 22**  *Best hierarchical regression model predicting self-esteem at Time 2 (2004) (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values&lt;sub&gt;Time 2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$, as $R^2$ changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.67***</td>
<td>4.30***</td>
<td>7.47*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>18.42***</td>
<td>14.43***</td>
<td>13.97***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): *$p < .05$*** $p \leq .001$

Turning now to the testing of **hypothesis 6** concerning the positive and independent impact of better psychological well-being (less depression) on sociocultural adaptation (higher school achievement) at **Time 1**, depression was inserted as the last step in the same hierarchical regression
analysis designed to explore the impact of the national acculturation profile on school achievement at Time 1 (see Table 18, section 12.3.2.3 above). However, hypothesis 6 was not confirmed, as depression had no significant impact on school achievement ($R^2 = .00, \beta = .00, p = .99$) and the explanatory power of the model did not improve; the variance of school achievement explained remained the same, 40% (see Table 18).

The best model for predicting school achievement at Time 1 turned out to be the national profile model presented in Table 18 (section 12.3.2.3 above) with the addition of Vietnamese language proficiency (see Table 23 below). In this model, 43% of the variance in school achievement was explained, and Vietnamese language proficiency significantly and positively predicted school achievement before identity was included in the model. However, this impact was reduced to a tendency when identity was introduced in the last step of the model, although the latter had no significant impact on school achievement. What can be seen from Table 24 (below) is that good Finnish language proficiency far outweighs the impact of the other variables, explaining alone 27% of the variance in school achievement.
Table 23  Best hierarchical regression model predicting school achievement at Time 1 (1992) (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Step 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination$_{Time1}$</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency$_{Time1}$</td>
<td>.17+</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency$_{Time1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values$_{Time1}$</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values$_{Time1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity$_{Time1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ | Step 1 | .09 | .11 | .38 | .39 | .42 | .43 |
$F$, as $R^2$ changes | 2.81 | 40.55* | .36 | 5.77* | .59 |

Note. Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): *$p < .10$; **$p < .05$; ***$p < .01$; $$p \leq .001$.

The best predictive model of educational attainment at Time 2 was already presented in Table 16 (see section 12.3.2.2 above). As noted in section 12.3.2.3 on the exploration of the impact of acculturation profiles on sociocultural adaptation at Time 2, the best model for predicting educational
attainment in adulthood was the one including the national profile (see Model 5b in Table 16, section 12.3.2.2 above).

Finally, hypothesis 7 on the greater significance for the psychological well-being of children and adolescents than for adults of the discrepancies between one’s family obligation values and independence values and one’s parents’ (actual/perceived) values was analyzed by comparing the results for Time 1 and Time 2 of the hierarchical regression analyses used to test hypothesis 3 on the general beneficial impact on psychological well-being of smaller (actual or perceived) value discrepancy (see Table 7 and Table 8 in section 12.3.1.2 above).

It can be concluded that hypothesis 7 was partially confirmed in that, when controlling for perceived discrimination, intergenerational value discrepancies concerning (ethnic) family obligation values significantly increased depression in childhood and adolescence (see Table 7), but not at in adulthood \( R^2 = .03, \beta = .11, p = .47 \). Discrepancies concerning family obligation values did, however, have a significant negative impact on self-esteem (see Table 8, section 12.3.1.2 above) in adulthood. In contrast, value discrepancies concerning (national) independence values had no impact on depression in childhood and adolescence (see Table 7, section 12.3.1.2 above), nor on depression \( R^2 = .01, \beta = -.13, p = .38 \) or self-esteem in adulthood (see Table 8, section 12.3.1.2) above. Thus, discrepancies concerning (ethnic) family obligation values had a stronger impact on depression in childhood and
adolescence than in adulthood, but these discrepancies, nevertheless, had a significant impact on adult psychological well-being when measured as self-esteem.

This section (12.4) has concerned cross-sectional prediction of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation. The following section (12.5) will look at the long-term prediction of these outcomes.

12.5 Answering the seventh research question:
long-term predictors of acculturation outcomes (hypotheses 8-9)

Hypothesis 8 concerning the impact of Time 1 factors on psychological well-being (depression) at Time 2 was tested with a hierarchical regression analysis with perceived discrimination at Time 1 entered in the first step, and Time 1 Finnish proficiency, Time 1 school achievement, and Time 1 depression entered in the next steps (see Table 24). Hypothesis 8 was only partly confirmed. Perceived discrimination was significant through the third step, but no longer in the final step when depression at Time 1 was entered in the model, and demonstrated a significant increasing impact on depression in adulthood. Neither of the other two Time 1 predictors hypothesized to influence well-being in adulthood (Finnish proficiency and school achievement) had a significant impact on depression at Time
2. Together the hypothesized Time 1 predictors explained 22% of depression in adulthood (see Table 24 below).

Table 24  *A hierarchical regression model for over-time prediction of depression (Time 1 to Time 2) (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination~T1</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency~T1</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School achievement~T1</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression~T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ), as ( R^2 ) changes</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>5.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>8.50**</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
<td>3.14*</td>
<td>3.82**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Table shows standardized betas (\( \beta \)): * \( p < .05 \) ** \( p < .01 \)*

A second hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test hypothesis 8 for predicting self-esteem at Time 2, in adulthood, using the same steps as for depression (see Table 25 below). Also for self-esteem, hypothesis 8 was only partly confirmed. The results were the same for self-esteem as for depression: Perceived discrimination at Time 1 was again significant through the third step, but no longer in the last step, when less depression at Time 1 was the only significant predictor of greater self-esteem in adulthood.
Table 25  *A hierarchical regression model for over-time prediction of self-esteem (Time 1 to Time 2) (N = 59)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School achievement&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.29+</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, as R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; changes</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
<td>5.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.39**</td>
<td>4.79*</td>
<td>4.32**</td>
<td>4.96**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table shows standardized betas ($\beta$): $^+p < .10 \quad *p < .05 \quad ***p \leq .001$

The question then arises as to what factors at *Time 1* and *Time 2* best predict depression in adulthood, i.e. what can have contributed to continuing or renewed depression at *Time 2*. In order to explore this, a discriminant function analysis was carried out to identify the best possible predictors differentiating those who were not depressed from those who were depressed in adulthood. One significant function was isolated, $\chi^2 (4, N = 59) = 23.01$, $p < .001$. The function maximally distinguished the depressed from the not depressed in 2004, and the loading matrix of correlations between predictors and the discriminant function, shown in Table 26 (below), suggests that greater Finnish proficiency as an adult, not having been depressed in childhood or adolescence, perceiving less discrimination as a child or adolescent, and less self-categorization as Finnish as an adult
distinguished those with better psychological well-being (not depressed) in adulthood from those who were depressed (see Table 28 below).

Table 26  Discriminant function analysis of Time 1 and Time 2 predictors of depression in adulthood (2004) (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Correlation of predictor variables with discriminant function</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>df = 1, 57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency&lt;sub&gt;Time2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>11.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>9.84**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination&lt;sub&gt;Time1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>6.56*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-categorized Vietnamese-Finnish identity&lt;sub&gt;Time2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The correlations are given with regard to being depressed. *p < .05 **p < .01

Finally, hypothesis 9 concerning the impact of Time 1 factors on educational attainment (a dichotomous variable) at Time 2 was tested with a logistic regression analysis including perceived discrimination (PD) at Time 1 in the first step, and Finnish proficiency at Time 1, depression at Time 1, and school achievement at Time 1 entered in the next steps. However, all independent variables except PD were non-significant, with the lowest p-value of the other three predictors in the final step being p = .555. When the impact of other acculturation variables at Time 1 on
educational attainment at time 2 was explored with a series of logistic regression models (see Table 27), the same result was found; only discrimination perceived in childhood or adolescence decreased the odds with 60% \((OR = .40**)\) of having attained more than a basic education in adulthood.
Table 27  Logistic regression of Time 1 variables on educational attainment at Time 2 (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model (1)</th>
<th>Model (2)</th>
<th>Model (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived</strong></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination Time1</td>
<td>-0.92 (.35)**</td>
<td>-0.73 (.40)*</td>
<td>-0.83 (.37)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time1</td>
<td>.75 (.52)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values Time1</td>
<td>1.33(1.04)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time1</td>
<td>-0.35 (.61)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression Time1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiency Time1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.14 (.33) .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.78 (1.06)***</td>
<td>-1.67 (5.08)</td>
<td>4.05 (1.66)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Hosmer-Lemeshow**  | **X² =** | **X² =** | **X² =** |
| test                 | df=7     | df=8     | df=8     |
| p                    | .019     | .560     | .095     |
| -2 LL                | 51.53    | 47.66    | 50.96    |
| Total model          | X² = 8.06 | X² = 11.94 df=5, | X² = 8.46 |
| df=1, p = .005       | p = .036 | df=4, p = .071 |
| Omnibus test         | X² = 3.87 | X² = .58 |
| df=4, p = .423       | p = .901 |

Note: Table shows logit coefficients, standard errors and odds ratios *p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, ****p ≤ .001
However, when the participants were divided into three groups according to (1) having never been depressed, (2) having been depressed only at Time 1, and (3) having been depressed at Time 1 and/or at Time 2, those who were depressed both as children or adolescents and as adults had 80% lower odds ($OR = .20^*$) of having attained more than a basic education in adulthood (see Table 28 below). This impact disappeared when Time 2 predictors representing the national profile (Finnish language proficiency, adherence to national independence values and Finnish identification) were included in the next step of the model. Apparently, Time 2 acculturation variables (better Finnish proficiency, greater adherence to independence values, and less identification as Finnish) are more important than childhood depression for predicting greater educational attainment in adulthood. Nevertheless, the results for the depression variables shown in Table 26 (above) indicate that childhood depression may be related not only to psychological well-being but also to sociocultural adaptation in adulthood (see Table 28 below).
Table 28 Logistic regression analysis of Time 1 and Time 2 variables on educational attainment at Time 2 (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No depression</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed in 1992 but not in 2004</td>
<td>-0.06 (.83)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed in 1992 and/or in 2004</td>
<td>-1.61 (.81)</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency*time2</td>
<td>1.39 (.76)</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values*time2</td>
<td>2.23 (.90)</td>
<td>9.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification (one item)*time2</td>
<td>-0.72 (.39)</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.80 (.54)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hosmer-Lemeshow test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total model</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus test</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table shows logit coefficients, standard errors and odds ratios.

*p < .10  *p < .05  **p < .001
In summing up the results of the above analyses of the impact of acculturation experiences and the changes in and impact of acculturation dimensions and acculturation profiles on psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, both general tendencies as well as variations and deviations arise. Looking cross-sectionally at the age-specific predictors, the significance of perceived discrimination was found primarily among the young. Acculturation dimensions were more significant for psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation than ethnic, national or bicultural profiles. Finnish language proficiency and school achievement were not very significant for the well-being of the young compared to having the acceptance of their peers, that is of not perceiving discrimination. However, taking on the (national) independence values of Finnish youth did not appear to be the path to well-being, as this predicted greater depression.

In adulthood, however, Finnish language proficiency was a strong predictor of both less depression and greater self-esteem, and adhering to independence values was constructive for educational attainment, while perceived discrimination played a significantly smaller role. Both better Finnish and fluent bilingual proficiency were related to better self-esteem as an adult, with Finnish skills essential for educational attainment. Finnish skills are the key to
education and employment, sociocultural adaptation, and to communication with the majority population.

12.6.1 Best cross-sectional models

It can be noted that the best models for predicting the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of children and adolescents on the one hand, and of adults on the other, differed in some crucial respects. The best cross-sectional predictive models were the following:

**Depression in childhood and adolescence** (Time 1)
Greater depression at Time 1 was best predicted by more perceived discrimination, greater Vietnamese proficiency, and greater adherence to (national) independence values (see Table 19, section 12.4).

**School achievement in childhood and adolescence** (Time 1)
Better school achievement at Time 1 was best predicted by greater Finnish proficiency and less adherence to (national) independence values (see Table 23, section 12.4).

**Depression in adulthood** (Time 2)
Greater depression at Time 2 was best predicted by less Finnish proficiency, greater adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values, and greater self-categorization as Finnish (see Table 21, section 12.4).
Self-esteem in adulthood (Time 2)
Greater self-esteem at Time 2 was best predicted by greater Finnish proficiency, greater Vietnamese proficiency, and less adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values (see Table 22, section 12.4).

Educational attainment in adulthood (Time 2)
Greater educational attainment at Time 2 was best predicted by greater Finnish proficiency, greater adherence to (national) independence values and a weaker Finnish identification (see Table 16, section 12.3.2.1).

12.6.2 Long-term changes

Looking first at the long-term changes (Table 2, section 12.2) which occurred in acculturation experiences, one notes that, as adults, the participants perceived significantly less discrimination than as children or adolescents. Then, looking at the acculturation dimensions of language, values and identity, one notes first that both (ethnic) Vietnamese language proficiency and (national) Finnish language proficiency increased over time. Value change occurred in a (national) Finnish direction, shown as a decrease in adherence to (ethnic) Vietnamese values, especially concerning authority roles and obligations in the family. Changes in identity, in contrast, were in a more (ethnic) Vietnamese direction. Thus changes in acculturation
dimensions varied in direction, some in the ethnic and some in the national direction.

Psychologically these young adults are doing much better than when they were children and adolescents in school, with the proportion of depressed having declined by half. The majority were currently pursuing or had already completed post-secondary schooling, were finding jobs and living in a relationship and/or starting a family.

12.6.3 Age on arrival

Next, the demographic background factor of *age on arrival*, which was used as a control variable, proved to be non-significant for most psychological well-being outcomes and for school achievement, with the exception of depression in childhood and adolescence when examining the impact of value adherence. Being older on arrival was related to greater depression in childhood or adolescence, when there was more perceived discrimination and greater adherence to (national) independence values. This summons up the picture of an unfriendly school context, where the individual is taking on majority independence values, but is being rebuffed, not fitting in – not an easy situation.
12.6.4 The cross-sectional impact of perceived discrimination

Looking cross-sectionally at the impact of perceived discrimination on the acculturation outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation separately for children or adolescents and for adults, perceived discrimination was found to have had a much larger role in predicting both depression and school achievement among children and adolescents than for predicting psychological well-being and educational attainment among adults.

12.6.5 The cross-sectional impact of the dimensions (language, values, and identity) – age specificity

Just as the long-term changes in the dimensions were age-specific, so also was the impact of the dimensions on acculturation. In the following the impact of each dimension will be summarized separately.
12.6.5.1 Language

Language proficiency, in particular (national) Finnish language proficiency, was a key factor in predicting acculturation outcomes. Although Finnish proficiency did not have a significant impact on psychological well-being in childhood and adolescence, it did predict less depression and greater self-esteem in adulthood. Finnish proficiency did, however, greatly increase school achievement in childhood and adolescence, as it did educational attainment in adulthood.

Considering the role of (ethnic) Vietnamese proficiency, one sees that in childhood and adolescence greater Vietnamese proficiency was related to greater depression, while in adulthood its impact was positive: greater Vietnamese proficiency was related to better self-esteem. Vietnamese proficiency also showed a tendency to increase school achievement in childhood and adolescence.

Bilingual proficiency was not found to be significantly related to depression in either childhood or adolescence or in adulthood. However, those who were fluently bilingual had significantly higher self-esteem as adults than those who were monolingual in Vietnamese or marginally bilingual. There were no significant differences in self-esteem as adults between those who were fluently bilingual or monolingual in Finnish.
Bilingual proficiency was also significantly related to sociocultural adaptation in childhood and adolescence. Those who were fluently bilingual had greater school achievement. There were no significant differences in school achievement between those who were marginally bilingual, monolingual in Vietnamese or monolingual in Finnish.

12.6.5.2 Values

Looking next at the dimension of values, age-specific differences arose in the impact of value adherence. The roles of (ethnic) family obligation values and (national) independence values were interchanged in going from childhood and adolescence to adulthood. For the young, adherence to (national) independence values increased depression and decreased school achievement, while for adults, adherence to independence values had no impact on either depression or self-esteem, but, instead, increased educational attainment. Adherence to (ethnic) family obligation values, on the other hand, had primarily no impact on psychological well-being in childhood or adolescence, but in adulthood, it increased depression and decreased self-esteem.

The role of adherence to family obligation values for sociocultural adaptation was an exception to this pattern of value impact reversal: adherence to family obligation values decreased sociocultural adaptation for children and adolescents, as well as for adults, when looked at alone with perceived discrimination controlled, but when other factors
such as Finnish proficiency were considered, family obligation adherence was no longer significant for either children and adolescents or adults.

*Intergenerational value discrepancies* concerning family obligation values showed a tendency to be related to greater depression among children and adolescents, as well as a tendency to be related to greater depression and lower self-esteem among adults. Discrepancies concerning independence values were not significant for the psychological well-being of either children and adolescents or adults.

Bicultural value adherence was not found to be significantly related to depression in childhood or adolescence or in adulthood. Monocultural adherence to Finnish values was, however, found to be related to greater self-esteem as an adult when compared to bicultural value adherence or monocultural adherence to Vietnamese values. Those with marginal Vietnamese-Finnish value adherence did not differ in self-esteem from the other groups.

In regard to school achievement as a child or adolescent, those who were marginally bicultural in value adherence had a significantly higher grade point average than those who were strongly bicultural in value adherence. There were no significant differences in school achievement between those with monocultural Vietnamese or Finnish values or between these two and the marginally or strongly bicultural.
12.6.5.3 Identity

Identity, the third acculturation dimension, had little impact on either psychological well-being or sociocultural adaptation in childhood or adolescence. In adulthood, however, self-categorization as Finnish was related to greater depression, and a stronger Finnish identification was related to lower educational attainment.

12.6.6 Two measures of psychological well-being in adulthood

In summing up the factors impacting on psychological well-being as an adult, it was beneficial for the study to use two different outcome variables, depression and self-esteem, as they had partially different relationships with the predictors. Finnish proficiency had an impact on both, but Vietnamese proficiency and bilingual proficiency only on self-esteem. There was no difference in the direct impact of values, but when considering mono- vs. bicultural or marginalized values, monocultural Finnish values increased self-esteem, while there were no differences concerning depression. Intergenerational value discrepancies concerning (ethnic) family obligation values decreased self-esteem, but had no impact on depression. In overtime predictions, impacts were the same for both measures of psychological well-being.
12.6.7 The cross-sectional impact of national, ethnic, and bicultural acculturation profiles

Turning now to acculturation profiles - national, ethnic and bicultural, the results show that the (national) Finnish profile had the greatest impact over all - on psychological well-being in adulthood and on sociocultural adaptation in both youth and in adulthood. This was primarily due to the role of Finnish language proficiency, but also to the negative relationship of Finnish identification with educational attainment as an adult. The one exception to the role of the national profile was psychological well-being in childhood and adolescence, when the (ethnic) Vietnamese profile had the greatest impact and increased depression. The bicultural profile had no significant impact on psychological well-being or sociocultural adaptation in either childhood and adolescence or in adulthood.

12.6.8 The cross-sectional relationships between psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation

When looking at the relationship between the acculturation outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, the impact they have on each other, one sees that while school achievement did not predict psychological well-being for children and adolescents, less educational attainment predicted greater depression for adults. As for the impact of psychological well-being, it did not have a
significant impact on school achievement for children and adolescents. In adulthood the impact of psychological well-being on educational attainment was more difficult to ascertain, as achieved educational attainment may have occurred much earlier and the current level of depression cannot necessarily be said to be a cause of the education level reached earlier.

12.6.9 Long-term predictors

Turning then to the results for the long-term predictors of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, these can be summarized as follows: initial depression as a child or adolescent was the strongest predictor of the acculturation outcomes of depression and self-esteem as an adult. More perceived discrimination in childhood or adolescence also contributed significantly to being depressed as an adult.

Weaker Finnish proficiency as an adult and greater self-categorization as Finnish as an adult, combined with the long-term impact of more perceived discrimination and being depressed in childhood or adolescence, differentiated those who were depressed as adults from those who were not.

Perceived discrimination was also a significant over-time predictor of sociocultural adaptation, with less perceived discrimination as a child or adolescent increasing the probability of having more than a basic education as an adult. More significant for educational attainment as an
adult, however, were current acculturation factors, such as greater Finnish language proficiency, greater adherence to independence values and having a weaker Finnish identification, rather than factors reflecting the situation in childhood.

12.6.10 The nine hypotheses and the explorations

**Hypothesis 1** concerned the detrimental impact of perceived discrimination on psychological well-being and it was confirmed for Time 1, but not for Time 2.

The impact of perceived discrimination on sociocultural adaptation was explored, as the research results concerning its impact were contradictory. Perceived discrimination was significantly and negatively related to school achievement in childhood or adolescence, as well as to educational attainment as an adult.

**Hypothesis 2a** and **2b** on the favorable impact of (national) Finnish language proficiency and of (ethnic) Vietnamese proficiency on psychological well-being were not confirmed for childhood and adolescence.

For adults, the hypothesis concerning the favorable impact of Finnish proficiency on psychological well-being was confirmed, and the hypothesis concerning Vietnamese proficiency was confirmed partially, as they both enhanced self-esteem. Vietnamese proficiency had no impact on depression, while greater Finnish proficiency was significantly related to less depression.
**Hypothesis 2c** concerning the favorable impact of bilingual proficiency was not confirmed in either childhood or adolescence or in adulthood for depression. The hypothesis was partly confirmed, however, when those with fluent bilingual proficiency as adults were found to have significantly higher self-esteem than those who were monolingual in Vietnamese or marginally bilingual (weak in both languages).

**Hypothesis 3** concerning the negative impact of intergenerational value discrepancies on psychological well-being was not confirmed. In childhood and adolescence greater intergenerational discrepancies concerning family obligation values showed a tendency to be related to greater depression, while discrepancies concerning independence values were not related at all. In adulthood, also, greater intergenerational discrepancies concerning family obligation values showed a tendency to be related to greater depression, and also to lower self-esteem. Discrepancies concerning independence values were not related to depression or self-esteem in adulthood.

**Hypothesis 4** concerning the favorable relationship of (national) Finnish language skills and school achievement was confirmed in childhood and adolescence. The favorable relationship between Finnish proficiency and educational attainment in adulthood was also confirmed. The impact of (ethnic) Vietnamese language proficiency on sociocultural adaptation was explored: Vietnamese proficiency showed a tendency to increase school achievement in childhood or adolescence, but not for educational attainment in adulthood.
The impact of bilingual proficiency was also explored: fluent bilingual proficiency was significantly and positively related to greater school achievement in childhood and adolescence.

**Hypothesis 5** concerning the positive and independent impact of greater sociocultural adaptation (school achievement) on psychological well-being in childhood or adolescence was not confirmed for childhood and adolescence, but it was confirmed partially for adulthood: higher educational attainment was significantly and positively related to well-being in adulthood, shown as less depression, although it was not related to self-esteem.

**Hypothesis 6** concerned the opposite relationship to hypothesis 5: the positive and independent impact of better psychological well-being (less depression) on sociocultural adaptation (greater school achievement) in childhood or adolescence. This hypothesis was not confirmed. It was not possible to test this hypothesis similarly in adulthood, as educational attainment was a dichotomous variable. However, best models for educational attainment were found using other analyses and variables.

**Hypothesis 7** concerning the age-specific impact of intergenerational value discrepancies, that they be more significant for children and adolescents than for adults, was not confirmed. Greater (ethnic) family obligation value discrepancies showed a tendency to be related to increased depression in childhood and adolescence, but not to depression in adulthood. These value discrepancies did, however, show a tendency to be negatively related to self-esteem in adulthood. In contrast, value discrepancies
concerning (national) independence values were not significantly related to depression in childhood and adolescence, nor to depression or self-esteem in adulthood.

**Hypothesis 8** concerning the impact of Time 1 factors on psychological well-being (depression) at Time 2 was only partly confirmed. Perceived discrimination in childhood or adolescence was at first significant in the analysis, but when it was controlled, depression in childhood or adolescence proved to be a significant and negative predictor of both depression and self-esteem in adulthood. Neither of the other two hypothesized Time 1 predictors (Finnish proficiency and school achievement) had a significant impact on depression or self-esteem at Time 2.

**Hypothesis 9** concerning the impact of Time 1 factors on educational attainment at Time 2 was only partially confirmed. Only discrimination perceived in childhood or adolescence was a significant predictor of adult educational attainment, decreasing the probability of having attained more than a basic education.
13 DISCUSSION

This study had three main aims: (1) to predict the long-term effects of acculturation experiences, acculturation dimensions and acculturation profiles on the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of immigrants, using data from a 12-year follow-up study on Vietnamese in Finland; (2) to identify specific age-related factors in predicting acculturation outcomes and the extent to which predictors vary for children or adolescents and adults; and (3) to specify the impact of the acculturation context on the predictors of acculturation outcomes. An additional focus was the relationship between the outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation.

Acculturation outcomes in this study had different courses and predictors, in concordance with theory (e.g., Berry 2003, 2006b; see section 2). Majority language proficiency was a straight-path factor in the process, while values and identity fluctuated more, as did the outcome of psychological well-being, reflecting the complexity of the lives of immigrants (Verkuyten, 2005). In confirmation of earlier findings (e.g.,
Fuligni, 2003) this study shows that it is likely that different factors predict acculturation outcomes at different stages of the life span. It is not just time and exposure to a new society that explain acculturative change, as Fuligni (2003) states, but what is functional, what “fits” in adoption of values and in adaptation, in general.

13.1 Overall adaptation of the Vietnamese studied

The acculturation process of the young Vietnamese adult participants can be seen as having a good outcome at this point, concerning both psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation. After living in Finland for 14 - 25 years, the majority were doing well psychologically, with little depression and good self-esteem. Their psychological well-being was much greater than it had been as children or adolescents, confirming previous research findings that psychological well-being increases with length of residence (e.g., Beiser & Hou, 2001). The majority had also attained more than a basic education. Because the participants were still in their twenties or had just reached their thirties at the time of the follow-up, many were still studying and furthering their education, so that sociocultural adaptation measured as educational attainment will still increase in the future. The
majority were either employed or students and most were living in a relationship.

The participants appeared to come from the resilient families Detzner (1996) speaks of and have shown the resilience Garmezy (1986) found among the young: the majority had faced separation, conflict and loss during and after their flight to a country of refuge, but had proved ultimately to be hardy and tenacious, surviving both those past upheavals, but also obstacles in the new country, such as perceived discrimination in school, and most were now both doing well and faring well psychologically.

The self-assessed Finnish language skills of the participants had improved over 12 years, as had their Vietnamese language skills - both to fluent levels, on average. Their level of Finnish skills supported general research findings showing that majority language proficiency increases with length of residence (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2008). Vietnamese family obligation values were now less strictly adhered to than earlier, although key family cohesiveness features were retained, while more emotional openness in the family and independent decision-making were favored. This finding in Finland coincides with Kibria’s (1993) finding in the United States that especially the cooperation and collectivism of the traditional Vietnamese family system provide an essential source of cultural pride.

The comments below made by two of the study participants epitomize some of these essential features of Vietnamese family life and culture:
What I want to keep about being Vietnamese is belonging together, that’s really important, getting along with each other and helping each other, and not first thinking that…that’s none of my business…

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)

You have to know how to treat people right and be polite to other people…who is old, who is young and know what to do when you see older people…so you know how to behave…and show respect to older people…Showing respect is what’s most important…no matter what you’re doing, no matter how stupid you act or go around with friends, but you still come home, and always show respect to your parents…you can’t just say anything to their face…you ask their opinion because they have experience…

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)

13.2 Long-term effects

To sum up the longitudinal impact of childhood and adolescent psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, initial
psychological well-being had a significant impact on well-being, both depression and self-esteem, as an adult, in contrast, for example, to recent findings of long-term psychological impact in Finland among Russian adult immigrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008), but consistent with, for example, Beiser and Hou’s (2001) findings concerning Vietnamese adults in Canada.

Sociocultural adaptation as a child or adolescent, measured as school achievement, did not, however, predict sociocultural adaptation as an adult, measured as educational attainment. Contemporary adult factors such as a better level of Finnish language proficiency, greater adherence to Finnish independence values and identifying less as Finnish were related to better educational attainment as an adult. This is a reasonable, and comforting, result, actually, in that school achievement in the early stages of acculturation is necessarily hindered by having to learn the language of instruction while also learning new norms and expectations of behavior. There is time enough, for most, to learn the language and gradually do better in school. Early school achievement is not crucial for later educational attainment.

13.3 Age-specificity and the importance of individual dimensions of acculturation

Contrary to expectations (e.g., Suárez et al., 2008), majority language proficiency was not related to psychological well-
being as a child or adolescent, although it was for adults, which, again, was in accordance with expectations (e.g., Nicassio et al., 1986). Language is an example of an age-specific predictor, one that is more significant in adulthood than childhood. As a consequence, one can conclude that for children and adolescents, it was acceptance among peers that mattered in their young lives in school, and not how well they were speaking the majority language or how well they were doing academically.

One can also draw another conclusion and see the absence of a relationship between national language proficiency and depression in childhood or adolescence as being age-specific in the sense of being stage-specific, related to an early stage in the process of acculturation, in accordance with Beiser and Hou’s (2001) longitudinal findings with adults. They found that (national language) English proficiency had no effect on depression initially, but almost a decade later it was a significant predictor of depression. In the beginning years allowances may be made for not yet knowing the national language. After ten or twelve years sufficient time has passed for a lack of proficiency to be a definite disadvantage.

The impact of value adherence was distinctly age-specific. Explorations of how values enhanced psychological well-being in childhood or adolescence and in adulthood demonstrated that there may be several ways to reason about the relationship. Most previous research results, (e.g. Beiser et al., 2002; Fuligni, 1998; Zhou & Bankston, 1994), also in Finland (Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000), give cause to predict that adherence to ethnic values will enhance
psychological well-being, while some others, e.g., L. Nguyen and Peterson (1993), as well as the particular context of this study (a small and dispersed ethnic community in a traditionally monocultural country), suggest that adherence to national values would be more beneficial for psychological well-being. In the present study both results found support, but the impact of value adherence was both age-specific and related to the specific values in question.

In childhood or adolescence, stronger adherence to national Finnish independence values was related to increased depression, while adherence to ethnic Vietnamese family obligation values had no impact. In adulthood, the opposite was true: now stronger adherence to ethnic family obligation values was related to increased depression, while adherence to national independence values had no impact. The same was true for self-esteem as an adult, but, logically, in reverse: stronger adherence to ethnic family obligation values was related to lower self-esteem, while national independence values had no impact.

The age-specificity of these results confirms Liebkind and Jasinskaja-Lahti’s (2000) finding for childhood and adolescence of no significant impact of adherence to (ethnic) family-based values on self-esteem among 10-20 year-old adolescents from different cultural backgrounds, including Vietnamese, in Finland. The results in the current study also confirm those found by L. Nguyen and Peterson (1993) for the older group. The Vietnamese participants in L. Nguyen and Peterson’s study (1993) were first-generation Vietnamese American college students, equivalent to the young adult
Vietnamese participants in this study, at least regarding age and developmental level. With older age, adherence to traditional family obligation values no longer appeared to “fit” the context of the young adults’ lives.

In the study at hand, when the participants were children or adolescents in comprehensive school, they had relatively recently arrived in Finland. It was perhaps a too-rapid value acculturation in the national Finnish direction that led to depression at this time. This is contrary to H. Nguyen et al.’s (1999) assumption that the values of the school and majority-member peers are more significant for adolescents, and that involvement with the ethnic culture may not act as a positive buffer for psychological adjustment, because the majority context (school and peers) is more salient and minority involvement provides no advantage in that context.

The age-specificity of value adherence in regard to well-being can also be seen as related to “age” in another sense - to an era in time, to a specific context, and to an earlier stage in acculturation and not necessarily to a person’s physical age.

In the Finnish context of the early 1990s, when majority attitudes towards immigrants were harsher than now, and the participants in this study perceived significantly more discrimination than now, it seems understandable that adhering to familiar family obligation values, based on traditional roles reflecting a traditional and perhaps safe way of living in a relatively new and not so friendly country, where newcomers felt like outsiders, traditions formed a buffer zone to come home to, with values forming the social capital that Zhou and
Bankston (1994) speak of that promotes constructive forms of behavior.

As adults, the majority of the Vietnamese participants in the study at hand had become less strictly traditionally Vietnamese in their (ethnic) family obligation values and were doing better psychologically. They were also more proficient in the national (Finnish) language and were at a stage in their lives where they were gaining an occupation, forming a family, and becoming more independent than they were as children or adolescents in close-knit Vietnamese families. They perceived less discrimination than in their youth. Nevertheless, less self-categorization as Finnish was related to better psychological well-being and a weaker Finnish identity was related to better educational attainment. Integration in regard to language and values was positive, but in regard to identity it was not. The Vietnamese studied were thus displaying a flexibility in living in two cultures, with simultaneous adoption of national cultural elements and retention of ethnic ones (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005).

Something of traditional Vietnamese culture is perhaps being lost with value change, but these young adults are not just shells being emptied of their contents. The members of this generation are adapting, adding new Finnish elements to their lives and living hybrid lives, and adopting Finnish values, especially those relating to gender equality and independent decision-making. Values are changing, but as Freeman (1995) has said in his analysis of Vietnamese families in the United States, the Vietnamese family is changing – not disintegrating, but rather going through a transformation, and the same can
probably be said of the Vietnamese, their families, and their values in Finland.

As one of the participants stated in his interview, one can look at the good and the bad in both, what fits, and combine what feels right for oneself:

I put on a filter and filter out the bad parts…from both…I’m actually creating or what I really have is something like a culture of my own, I filter out, like…already since I was little…from both, like from being Finnish, it’s just that…they start smoking early…and drinking alcohol and…lazinesss, that they don’t clean up, share housework…I think is really one of the bad things. I think, well, maybe it’s just because of me but I like to clean up and take part, that we all do everything…and then about being Vietnamese, the bad part is that everything’s forbidden. That you can’t do that and that parents are always right about everything …

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)
13.4 Slow and uneven changes in identity, increases in language proficiency

Identity, as self-categorization, however, was even more strongly Vietnamese in adulthood than in childhood or adolescence, and significantly stronger than Finnish identity. The intensity, the strength of Vietnamese identification as an adult was also significantly stronger than that of Finnish identification as an adult, thus confirming Hutnik’s (1991) and Snauwaert and his colleagues’ (2003) finding that, overall, identity acculturates at a slower pace than other acculturation dimensions, such as language and values.

In the United States, Zhou (2000) also found that ethnic identity among Vietnamese adolescents had an uneven course, and could be multidirectional, displaying an ethnic resilience and return to a stronger Vietnamese identity. This finding was confirmed by the study at hand: Vietnamese identity was strengthened and reasserted over time. Being strongly Vietnamese was also related to higher self-esteem in this study, confirming Zhou’s (2000) findings. In adulthood, greater Vietnamese proficiency was related to higher self-esteem, reflecting the positive features of being actively Vietnamese.

One of the women participating in the study spoke vehemently about her identity and her refusal to accept the categorization majority members want to see her as:

I don’t like it that people say to me that I’m Finnish, or that I’m completely Finnish … lots
of people say that, but I don’t accept it … it’s not a question of whether I want to be Finnish or not, when I know I am not.

(young Vietnamese woman, interviewed in 2004)

Changes have thus occurred in both the national Finnish direction and the ethnic Vietnamese direction, but on different dimensions, confirming the basic premises of Berry’s (1990, 2006b) bidimensional acculturation model: adoption of a new language or values does not mean rejection of one’s own minority language, culture or identity.

Sociocultural adaptation (school achievement in childhood and adolescence and educational attainment in adulthood) was consistently enhanced by greater Finnish language proficiency, fully in accord with previous findings on the key meaning of national language proficiency (e.g., Rumbaut, 1994; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008). The greater Finnish proficiency, the better was school achievement. In adulthood, those with greater Finnish proficiency had a greater probability of having attained more than a basic education. Finnish proficiency was a better predictor of academic performance than Vietnamese proficiency, in accordance with previous findings (e.g., Driessen, 2000; Vedder, 2005).

Although (ethnic) Vietnamese language proficiency appeared to have no impact on educational attainment in adulthood, it did have a tendency to be related to increased school achievement in childhood or adolescence, in
acquaintance with Bankston and Zhou’s (1995) findings on the favorable effect of literacy in one’s own ethnic language. Fluent bilingual proficiency was, however, significantly related to greater school achievement in childhood and adolescence, confirming Vedder and Virta’s (2005) findings that students proficient in both their ethnic and national language are more socioculturally adapted than students less balanced in their bilingualism or lacking proficiency in either language. Good cognitive abilities in both the national and the ethnic language strengthen each other: being fluently bilingual has been found to have the advantages of divergent thinking, creativity, metalinguistic awareness, and sensitivity in communication (Baker, 2001). The Finnish education system supports bilingualism by providing ethnic language instruction, which the majority of the participants in this study had taken part in.

The following interview comment is typical of the attitudes of the participants toward maintaining their ethnic language, and of the practical merits of better communication bilingualism provides, both at home and abroad:

We’ll try to teach our child his (her) own native language, at least we’ll speak it at home…as much as we can…you can’t forget your own language, even though I, though we came here when we were really small…our own language is important to us, really important, of course you have to know your mother tongue…you have to, you don’t just have to, it’s nice to know, if we
visit Vietnam later, if we go see a great-great-greatgrandfather or other relatives…

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)

In this study sociocultural adaptation had a significant impact on variations in psychological well-being (depression) in young adulthood. That the outcomes did not have a significant impact on each other in childhood or adolescence, again, was congruent with Zhou and Bankston’s (2000) finding that the outcomes were not related for Vietnamese children or adolescents, who did better scholastically than their peers, but worse psychologically. The strengthening of the relationship between sociocultural adaptation and psychological well-being over time, in adulthood, confirms Ward et al.’s (1998) finding that the relationship between the outcomes increases with increased contact with the receiving society.

One main result of this study is that the factors influencing these acculturation outcomes are myriad and definitely age-specific: what is significant and functional for the psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation of children and youth differs from the factors significant for adults (cf. Fuligni, 2003). Individual dimensions of values, language, and identity, and not composite ethnic, national or bicultural profiles, were the best predictors of outcomes. The best predictors of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation include dimension variables from both the ethnic and the national profiles. Phinney and Flores’ (2002) finding
that acculturation can be better understood when distinct aspects, not necessarily linked, are examined, found support in this study.

13.5 **Bicultural – integrational orientations**

Although the integration orientation has been promoted as the most beneficial path to psychological and sociocultural adaptation (Berry, 2003, 2006b), in this study integrational modes of language, values, and identity were not all related to positive outcomes. Bilingual proficiency was clearly an asset and related to better school achievement as a child, in accordance with Vedder et al (2006a), and to greater self-esteem as an adult. Bicultural value adherence, again, was not found to be related to well-being; on the contrary, monocultural adherence to Finnish values was related to greater self-esteem as an adult. Marginal bicultural value adherence, low in both ethnic and national value adherence, again, was found in childhood or adolescence among those with a significantly higher grade point average compared to those who were strongly bicultural in value adherence. It apparently was more beneficial for those in school and still living at home, to adopt a compromise between ethnic and national values, rather than adhere strongly to potentially clashing values.

In their study of bicultural identity formation among first-generation Chinese Americans, Benet-Martinez and Haritatos
(2005) noted how complex and multifaceted the process of negotiating multiple cultural identities is, with both positive and negative feelings involved. As Verkuyten (2005) has stated, individuals can see their cultural identities as additive and compatible or as oppositional and contradictory. The complexity of identity formation can result from the opposition and negative feelings that can arise when the two cultures are seen as clashing and not compatible (Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005). The same may be true for bicultural value formation. In this study adhering to a “mild” mix of both ethnic family obligation values and national independence values in childhood and adolescence was related to better adaptation.

13.6 The role of context and the impact of perceived discrimination

Perceived discrimination was more significant for the well-being of children and adolescents than for young adults, but discrimination experienced in youth also had long-ranging negative effects. As Suárez-Orozco et al (2008) noted in their longitudinal study of immigrant students, acceptance or discrimination can be defining aspects in a newcomer’s life. In childhood and adolescence, in the study at hand, perceiving discrimination, being left out, not being accepted as a member of the group, was related to being depressed, and both factors, perceived discrimination and depression, increased depression
in adulthood. The far-reaching harmful effects of seeing oneself as the target of discrimination can also lead to leaving school earlier than most, and not getting institutional training for an occupation.

The orientations which turn out to be most beneficial for acculturation outcomes may depend on the fit between the acculturation orientations of the immigrants and the preferences and policies of the host society. The context in which the study participants lived in 1992, at the time of the initial research phase, was quite monocultural, and a generally non-accepting one toward immigrants - also toward Vietnamese newcomers (see section 13.2). The change toward more acceptance of newcomers since then has been slow, although the number of newcomers has increased manyfold. This may be the explanation for the identity change among the young adults toward a more Vietnamese identity than that which prevailed in childhood and adolescence, instead of a more bicultural identity that would have been expected on the basis of theory with an extended length of residence.

If the context, the surrounding majority society is unaccepting, individuals may not want to integrate, and if assimilation is not an option, turning to one’s own ethnic group and “separating” at the identity level, at least, if not in values, may be an option (e.g., Berry et al., 2006; Bourhis et al., 1997; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., in press; Phinney et al, 2001; Phinney et al., 2006; Trimble, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005). As Berry et al (2006) found in their 13-country study of young immigrants, adolescents who felt they were being discriminated against tended to reject a national identity by disidentifying, while
those who did not perceive discrimination tended to show a national identity profile. It appears that ethnic self-definitions are chosen so that they protect the individual’s self-regard in the relevant social context.

Following is the comment of a young Vietnamese woman participant in this study, made during her interview (she herself identified strongly as Vietnamese and weakly as Finnish):

I think that it’s lucky…that that Vietnamese side of me is still so much there…for example, some people that have…lived in Finland for a shorter time than me, but still they, they behave and their way of thinking is so different from my way…they already imagine that in just a little while they’ll already be Finnish.

(Vietnamese woman, interviewed in 2004)

Others reported feeling uncomfortable with Finns, and not being able to communicate their thoughts and feelings as well in Finnish as in their native language, as did the following young Vietnamese man, identifying as very Vietnamese and slightly Finnish, who found it difficult to relate to Finns and was more comfortable with fellow Vietnamese:

…I don’t know…being soul mates is somehow different, with Finns.

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)
Others, however, have learned to live in both ethnic and national circles and have a hybrid Vietnamese-Finnish identity. Below is an excerpt from the interview of one of the male participants in the study. He identified as both highly Vietnamese and highly Finnish:

> When I go around with Vietnamese people, I feel very Finnish, because I have such a different way of thinking, but then again when I’m with Finns I’m not one-hundred-percent Finnish.

(young Vietnamese man, interviewed in 2004)

Although Finland is now more multicultural than it was in 1992, when the initial phase of the study took place, it still has one of the smallest immigrant populations in Europe. Although majority attitudes toward the Vietnamese have become more favorable (see Figure 1), still about one-half of the majority population in 2003 held attitudes unfavorable to the arrival of Vietnamese to Finland. Lepola (2000) has raised the question of who is “allowed” to be Finnish, take on a Finnish identity. The majority still sees a Finnish identity is something ethnic, not pertaining to citizenship or length of residence or even birthplace (Lepola, 2000), making it difficult for a minority member to identify as Finnish, especially if not assimilating and becoming “more Finnish than the Finnish”.

As noted above, recent research has found that the perception of ethnic discrimination stemming from the national
society can be experienced as unfair treatment, and that these experiences may discourage immigrants from identifying with the majority national in-group and prevent them from developing a sense of belonging to this group, expressed as a national identity (Berry et al., 2006; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2008; Phinney et al., 2006; Verkuyten, 2005). In these studies, perceived discrimination has been shown to be clearly associated with the immigrants' tendency to distance themselves from the larger society.

In the present study, the monocultural context in which the Vietnamese refugees arrived and the concomitant negative attitudes towards them may have discouraged the development of both an integrational, strongly bicultural or an assimilative identity. Perhaps as a consequence, the participants have turned more closely to their own ethnic group regarding their identity, re-ethnicizing their identity, which at this point in their acculturation process and in the process the majority environment is in, has the best “fit”.

13.7 What promotes integration in society

In considering the context and its impact on the well-being and sociocultural adaptation of the Vietnamese in this study, I will return on a more general level to some of the main tenets of integration in society proposed by Berry (2003, see section 1.1) concerning the adaption of institutions to the needs of all
groups, an explicit multicultural ideology, low levels of prejudice, and a collectivistic strategy for cultural maintenance in the nondominant group.

*Adaptation of institutions to the needs of all groups*

The Finnish comprehensive school system has adapted to the needs of newly arrived immigrants, and even their children, the second generation, by organizing introductory classes for immigrants and Finnish (or Swedish) as a second language instruction. Two hours of minority language instruction per week provided in both comprehensive school and senior secondary school answers at least partially to the language (and culture) maintenance needs of minority youth, also the children and grandchildren of immigrants, the second and third generation (Ikonen, 2008). Two hours a week is not enough to maintain a language, however, and needs constant support from the home also.

Schools should also mainstream multiculturalism throughout their curricula and daily life in school, as all students, both immigrants and native-born, need to learn to live with and enjoy diversity.

*An explicit multicultural ideology*

This is still missing in Finland. Multiculturalism is mentioned at the municipal level as a part of cities’ mission statements, i.e. Espoo, but what this means in practice, as policy and as actual services or ethos as a mainstreamed part of how to serve
the citizens of the country and the municipalities, and how to involve all our citizens in this process, is only just beginning. Political parties do now include multicultural statements in their programs and actively recruit immigrants as candidates for municipal and parliamentary elections (see e.g., Multicultural Finland, 2008)

*Low levels of prejudice*

As Jaakkola’s (e.g., 2005) surveys have shown (see section 1.2), Finnish attitudes towards ethnic groups are improving, along with the increase in ethnic groups in Finnish society, so that people have a greater chance to interact and forgo previously possibly held misconceptions and prejudices. Negative attitudes are still relatively high, even if there has been an improvement from the 1980s when the majority of this study’s participants had arrived in Finland. The participants reported perceiving more discrimination when they were younger than now as adults, so this does reflect positively on the current situation in Finnish society. Nevertheless, according to a Finnish study from the beginning of this decade (Häyrinen, 2000), immigrant adolescents continued to face racism and discrimination in school, with Russian, Arab and Somalian children and youth feeling the brunt of these negative attitudes.

*A collectivistic strategy for cultural maintenance in the nondominant group*
Is the Vietnamese community now large enough and is it cohesive enough to create and maintain such a strategy? The former refugees are forming new ties, reforming families, constructing transnational networks and affirming identities. The internal integration of the Vietnamese community is an ongoing process. With around 5,000 Vietnamese-speaking members and now with intermarriage with Finns and other ethnic groups, Vietnamese networks are growing and merging with Finnish family networks that can provide support, also for dual cultural maintenance. In her study of Vietnamese communities in Finland and in Canada, Valtonen (1999b) noted that large ethnic communities are necessary for creating social support and networks, as they provide sufficient room for both diversity and collectivism.

Cultural maintenance, which has thus far been carried on the shoulders of those who came to Finland as adults in the 1970s and 1980s, is being handed over to their children. The younger generation which has grown to adulthood in Finland is taking on the responsibility, with the support of the older generation, for keeping up Vietnamese cultural traditions and identity, as seen, for example, by the recently founded organization The Vietnamese Community in Finland (see Huynh, 2008).
13.8 A changing Finnish context and the transnational dimension

The Finnish context, a rather closed environment, is slowly becoming more multicultural, not only because of the increasing influx of immigrants, but also because of the influence of transnationalism, which is widening the context of reference people residing in Finland have in building their lives and identities. Transnationalism has taken on new forms in recent years along with innovative technological communication, opening doors from Finland to the wider world.

*Transnationalism* refers to the multiple ties and interactions that link people and institutions across nation-state borders and to the process by which immigrants form and maintain multistranded social relations that join their countries of origin together with their new home country (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006). Earlier, immigration meant breaking physical ties with one’s former country for decades or even forever. Even throughout the first half of the last century, before the advent of relatively affordable air travel, crossing an ocean to a new home meant perhaps not seeing one’s loved ones ever again. Strong emotional binds remained to one’s original homeland and communities, however, as Vertovec (2007) has noted. What has changed now is that modern transportation and communication technologies allow an unprecedented scope and intensity of transnational activities and movement not possible in earlier times (Snel,
Engbersen, & Leerkes, 2006). These globalization processes mark the way people see and place themselves and others, as Verkuyten (2005) has noted, and influence local definitions and self-understandings.

The Internet is widely used among the young Vietnamese adults interviewed in this study in conjunction with the questionnaire. They mentioned Vietnamese websites, some especially for young people, and at least two based in Finland, one maintained by The Young Vietnamese Students Association and one by another group of young Vietnamese who put on cultural performances. The websites provided chat rooms and places of contact, where one could even post love poems incognito. Emailing and phoning via the Internet with a videocam has increased the use of written and spoken Vietnamese, increased contacts within the global Vietnamese community and even led to love and transnational marriages. Vietnamese religious communities are also active transnationally, both via Internet instruction and annual international meetings for Vietnamese Buddhists and Catholics, attracting whole families and young people, especially.

Vietnamese music videos were also a form of transnational cultural involvement. International music videos were on in numerous households where the study’s interviews took place and almost every home had a karaoke system, both effective ways to maintain and develop Vietnamese language proficiency, as well as to steep oneself in Vietnamese activities world-wide.
13.9 Methodological limitations

There were a number of methodological limitations to the study. One is that the study had insufficient means to distinguish between development and acculturative change. The time span of the study was twelve years. This is a long time span compared to much of longitudinal research. Many factors intervening during this period, and not measured at Time 2, can have influenced the outcomes of psychological well-being, such as normal developmental changes, significant family events or illness, for example. These young adults have, along with acculturation change, developed from children and adolescents into adults, with the concomitant developmental changes this entails. As Fuligni (2001) has pointed out, studying acculturation longitudinally is difficult because there are so many confounding factors and normal change due to development is hard to disentangle from what is due to time spent in a new society.

The follow-up at Time 2 consisted of only 59 participants. Although the follow-up percentage was good, the actual number of participants was still low enough to restrict the number of predictors that could be used in linear and logistic regression analyses to a maximum of preferably four, perhaps five (one predictor per 15 participants)(Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). This restriction was why demographic background variables were not included in the profile regression analyses, the discriminant analysis, or the logistical regression analyses. Initial examination of the demographic
background variables showed that no single factor had a uniform correlation with the predictors used (see Appendix 3, Tables 1 and 2), but as “age on arrival” correlated most frequently with the predictors at Time 1 and Time 2, it was included in the regression analyses for the dimensions (language, values, identity), where the number of predictors was not as high.

In longitudinal studies, especially in one with a follow-up period of 12 years, data loss due to attrition can be expected. It can also be expected that those who participate are among the most adapted. There were no differences in baseline measurements between participants and non-participants (see section 12.1.2), but later paths can have diverged. Some of those who were did not participate were possibly less adapted, less proficient in the majority language, and therefore reluctant to participate, but others had moved abroad and were pursuing further education or a career, according to informants, and can thus be assumed to have fared well.

Because of the small number of participants, the statistical models used in this study had to be limited in the number of variables that could be used as predictors. However, not only the small number of participants, but also theoretical models (for example, concerning dimensions and profiles) guided the selection of independent variables in each respective model. These smaller models (including as predictors, for example, perceived discrimination, Vietnamese proficiency, and Finnish proficiency) were made for theoretical reasons despite the risk of presenting results that may be biased or spurious. In contrast, the “best” predictive models listed in
section 12.6 primarily contained the maximum number of predictors.

The nature of the Time 2 sociocultural adaptation outcome variable, educational attainment, also restricted the use of statistical analysis methods (Tabachnik and Fidell, 1996). As it was a dichotomous, and not continuous variable, linear regression models could not be used with sociocultural adaptation as an adult as an outcome. The dichotomous outcome variable also prevented the use of structural equation models, which otherwise could have illustrated the impact of predictive variables over time on the two acculturation outcomes of psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation, simultaneously.

An issue in itself is how well educational attainment, the sociocultural adaptation outcome at Time 2, can be predicted cross-sectionally by Time 2 variables, as educational attainment had occurred over time, and ended much earlier for many, and not just at Time 2.

The relatively low reliability (.65) of the Time 1 Finnish proficiency scale and of the Time 2 Perceived discrimination scale (.62) must also be taken into consideration in the generalizability of the results, as should the low reliability (.56) of the Independence values—scale at Time 2.

The language, value, and identity measures were used to create bicultural/bilingual measures for the ANOVAs. For identity and for the profile regressions the bicultural option consisted of both those low and high on the language, value, and identity dimensions. This was done first for identity in the ANOVAs, because the marginalized and bicultural identity
subgroups were too small alone (N = 7) and needed to be combined. Second, because the profiles were composites of language, value and identity dimensions, and to have the variables be symmetric, all were combined in the same way. This option does confound integrationists with marginalizationists (Berry et al., 2006). This is one possible reason why the bicultural or bilingual option was not significantly related to the outcome measures (see section 14) used in the profile analyses.

Furthermore, causality cannot be inferred from cross-sectional analyses as they are correlational. As a consequence, other causal explanations for the cross-sectional findings than those presented here cannot be disconfirmed empirically. The strongest argument for causal relationships is longitudinal measurement, with a given factor preceding an outcome in time, thus making it a probable causal factor. Of course, many other factors not measured can have intervened and been the “real” cause. The longitudinal research design of the present study, does, however, also allow for longitudinal cause-and-effect argumentation.

Finally, the analyses presented showed only direct effects. The interactions between perceived discrimination and Finnish proficiency in predicting depression at Time 1 and depression and self-esteem at Time 2 were tested, but no significant results were found. This was probably at least partly due to the low number of participants.

Using the original Finnish peer participants from the initial phase of the study would, of course, have been the ideal, allowing comparisons between the two ethnic groups that
would have made it easier to differentiate between developmental change and acculturative change. It was not possible, however, to trace the original Finnish group randomly picked from the same classes or schools as the Vietnamese participants as only first name and birthdate information was available on them. Finding a comparable nation-wide Finnish group in 2004 would also have been a methodological challenge.

Despite the methodological limitations reported above, however, this study is well representative of the Vietnamese young adult population arriving in the 1970s and 1980s, with a good follow-up percentage (61%). The reliability of the majority of the measures is good, and the analyses used (ANOVAs, linear and logistic regression analysis, and discriminant analysis) fit the data available, providing information about real-time cause-and-effect relationships in longitudinal analyses.

13.10 Further research

Longitudinal research with both minority and majority ethnic groups is needed in order to separate developmental change from acculturative change. In this study, although the same individuals were followed for 12 years, it was not possible to separate change due to development and maturation from acculturation change. This would necessitate the inclusion of a
Finnish group, matched by age and gender with the Vietnamese participants, as was the case in the initial study at Time 1.

In addition to a longitudinal approach, research with immigrant populations also calls for both quantitative and qualitative data to better approximate the many factors contributing to different outcomes (Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005), providing both subjective description and generalizability. This study’s follow-up in 2004 also included qualitative data that was not gathered in the initial stage in 1992, but was not analyzed in-depth for this study. Excerpts from the interviews were included here to provide some illustration. In accordance with the view that the immigrants themselves should be included as actors living and interpreting their own reality (e.g., Pick, 1997), interview data should be used in tandem with qualitative data in order to widen understanding of acculturation as it is experienced. Additional themes essential in these immigrants’ lives were brought up by the interviewees themselves (for example, minorities within the Vietnamese community, crime, religion, romance and the transnational community).

Further research should also include contextual factors not used in this study. Social support and degree of ethnic and national social contact were not studied here, although they can have a significant impact on psychological well-being and language proficiency (e.g., Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008), for example, and thus lead to better sociocultural adaptation.
13.11 The contributions of this study and implications for policy

The longitudinal design of this study allowed for analysis of temporal cause-and-effect. Age-specific impact factors arose, showing that there is no over-all favorable pattern of acculturation leading to desirable psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation outcomes. Language, value, and identity dimensions each have their own weight in predicting outcomes, differing according to age, and sometimes taking opposite trajectories. The use of multiple measures of psychological well-being, i.e., both negative (depression) and positive (self-esteem) measures for adults, was an asset, as their predictive factors were not always the same: depression and self-esteem are not just mirrors of each other, but different aspects of a person’s subjective well-being. In order to increase the generalizability of results in acculturation research, psychological well-being should be clearly operationalized, and its various facets examined separately.

The significance of perceived discrimination, not only for psychological well-being in childhood and adolescence, but also for its long-term effects on psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation in adulthood demonstrates the need for interventions and policies focusing on improving inter-ethnic group relations and respect for diversity, especially among the young. School, the prime site of acculturation for children and adolescents, should be a warm and welcoming haven that
encourages people to get along with each other, as well as to learn.

Finnish proficiency was significant for both psychological well-being as an adult and sociocultural adaptation as a child or adolescent and as an adult, demonstrating the necessity of adequate Finnish language training, so that immigrant youth can participate in further education along with other Finns. The acquisition of cognitive academic language proficiency in the majority language takes time, 7 – 10 years, much longer than currently supported in the Finnish schools. This is especially so for those who have had interrupted schooling because of upheavals in their country of departure or because of time spent in a refugee camp.

When they were children or adolescents, depression was more prevalent among the Vietnamese participants than it was among their Finnish classmates. Depression should be recognized early, so that psychological interventions can be made and its possible long-reaching effects prevented or minimalized. Special efforts, sensitivity for weak signals, and awareness of the psychological and social ramifications of the acculturation process are needed by teachers and the school psychological and social support staff. Recently arrived immigrant children are not perhaps able to express their needs in a way that the Finnish staff understands. Schools should also employ more staff with an immigrant background, as well as work closely with ethnic communities.

School achievement was enhanced by fluent bilingual proficiency. This finding should encourage the government and the schools to continue developing ethnic language teaching,
possibly increasing the number of hours available (currently two hours a week) and also the use of ethnic languages as the medium of instruction in other subjects. Parents should be made more aware of the benefits of ethnic language instruction and bilingual proficiency, both for learning and in building communication skills, beneficial both psychologically and for the future in an interdependent global society.

Although the ethnic group studied here was the Vietnamese living in Finland, much of the results showing what leads to favorable acculturation can be probably generalized to other ethnic groups. The results of this study are important for the public discourse on what integration means in Finland for society and for individuals, and how the social context affects acculturation. Learning the majority language, while maintaining and developing one’s ethnic language leads at best to fluent bilingual proficiency. Adoption of majority values is necessary for sociocultural adaptation, but it is also important to retain the values of one’s own minority culture that nurture psychological well-being. These are paths that will help people coming here originally as immigrants in adapting and in being accepted as full members of society, while also belonging to an ethnic community. The majority society must also change, as it is changing, toward an appreciation and recognition of diversity.
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APPENDIX 1

*Perceived Discrimination scales*

**Time 1**

The Time 1 (1992) Perceived Discrimination Scale consisted of the following items:

1. I’m called names at school because I’m Vietnamese.
2. People stare at me during breaks.
3. I’m bullied at school.
4. I get kicked and pushed at school.
5. I get laughed at when I speak Finnish.
6. I feel like an outsider at school.
7. I’m included as part of the group. (reversed item)

**Time 2**

The Time 2 (2004) Perceived Discrimination Scale consisted of the following items:

1. I feel that Finns accept me. (reversed item)
2. I’m treated as well as the others at work or where I’m studying. (reversed item)
3. I feel like an outsider in Finland because I’m Vietnamese.
## APPENDIX 2

**Table 1. N. Nguyen and Williams (1989) Family Values Questionnaire factor loadings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grandparents should have more influence than parents in family matters</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parents always know what is best</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The oldest boy in the family should follow his parents’ wishes regarding dating, marriage, and/or career choice whether he wants to or not</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The oldest girl in the family should help her parents take care of the house and the younger children whether she wants to or not</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family members should prefer to be with each other rather than outsiders</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brothers and/or sisters should never be envious or jealous of each other</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Their should be a clear line of authority in the family and no question about who is in charge</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>On weekends, children over 7-8 years of age should be able to watch whatever they choose on TV</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Older children should have more privileges than younger ones</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>It is all right for a member of the family to cry openly when sad or upset</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parents should be able to admit their mistakes to their children</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family togetherness values (NOT USED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1  N. Nguyen and Williams (1989) Family Values Questionnaire factor loadings (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is all right for girls over the age of 18 to decide when to marry and whom to marry</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is all right for boys over the age of 18 to decide when to marry and whom to marry</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When a girl reaches the age of 16, it is all right for her to decide whom to date and when to date</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When a boy reaches the age of 16, it is all right for him to decide whom to date and when to date</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It is all right for girls to choose their own career</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Girls over the age of 18 should be allowed to move away from home to go to college and/or take a job</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is all right for boys to choose their own career</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Every member of the family has a right to keep certain thoughts and feelings private</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Boys over the age of 18 should be allowed to move away from home to go to college and/or take a job</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Togetherness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Family members should openly show their affection for one another</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When family members are angry with each other, they should let the others know</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Family members should share their deepest feelings with one another</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Important family decisions should involve discussion among its members</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A family should do something together regularly</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A family should eat together at least once a day</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>All family members should share equally in doing the household chores*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item removed because of low loading.

Factor 1 “Family obligation” accounted for 19% of the variance. Cronbach’s alpha = .85

Factor 2 “Independence” accounted for 10.8% of the variance. Cronbach’s alpha = .74

Factor 3 “Family Togetherness” accounted for 8.5% of the variance. Cronbach’s alpha = .54
### APPENDIX 3 Table 1 Correlations of Time 1 variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Time 1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age on arrival</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence Time 1</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression Time 1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School achievement Time 1</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination Time 1</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese proficiency Time 1</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values Time 1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values Time 1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational discrepancies (Family obligation values) Time 1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational discrepancies (Independence values) Time 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Time 1 (Vietnamese-Finnish)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < .01, *p < .05
**APPENDIX 3**

**Table 2** Correlations of Time 2 variables

| Variable                              | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    | 17    | 18    | 19    | 20    |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Gender                                | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Age Time 2                            | .09   | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Age on arrival                        | .20   | .74** | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Length of residence Time 2            | .21   | .03   | .61** | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Depression Time 2                     | .20   | .06   | .19   | -.17  | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Depression dichotomized Time 2        | .16   | .21   | .30** | -.14  | .80** | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Self-esteem Time 2                    | .10   | -.01  | -.17  | .22   | .63** | .46** | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Educational attainment Time 2         | .02   | -.11  | -.26* | .24   | .48** | -.30* | .38** | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Perceived discrimination Time 2       | .12   | .23   | .13   | .17   | .20   | .25   | -.21  | .12   | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Vietnamese proficiency Time 2         | .05   | .28*  | .41** | .29*  | -.07  | -.04  | .07   | .07   | .03   | -     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

**Note:**
- * indicates significance at the 0.05 level.
- ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level.
Table 2 Correlations of Time 2 variable (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish proficiency Time 2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family obligation values Time 2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence values Time 2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational discrepancies (Family obligation values) Time 2</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergenerational discrepancies (Independence values) Time 2</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Time 2 (Vietnamese-Finnish)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese identity Time 2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identity Time 2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese identification Time 2</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish identification Time 2</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Change in value adherence from Time 1 (1992) to Time 2 (2004), *t*-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Mean Time1</th>
<th>SD Time1</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Time2</th>
<th>SD Time2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grandparents should have more influence than parents in family matters</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The oldest boy in the family should follow his parents’ wishes regarding dating, marriage, and/or career choice whether he wants to or not</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parents always know what is best</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Boys should have more privileges than girls</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The oldest girl in the family should help her parents take care of the house and the younger children whether she wants to or not</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family members should prefer to be with each other rather than outsiders</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brothers and/or sisters should never be envious or jealous of each other</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Their should be a clear line of authority in the family and no question about who is in charge</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>58  .009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>On weekends, children over 7-8 years of age should be able to watch whatever they choose on TV</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>58  .001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Older children should have more privileges than younger ones</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>It is all right for a member of the family to cry openly when sad or upset</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>58  .000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parents should be able to admit their mistakes to their children</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.086*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Change in value adherence from Time 1 (1992) to Time 2 (2004), t-test, (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Mean Time 1</th>
<th>Mean Time 2</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD Time 1</th>
<th>SD Time 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is all right for girls over the age of 18 to decide when to marry and whom to marry</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.070*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is all right for boys over the age of 18 to decide when to marry and whom to marry</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When a girl reaches the age of 16, it is all right for her to decide whom to date and when to date</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>When a boy reaches the age of 16, it is all right for him to decide whom to date and when to date</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It is all right for girls to choose their own career</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Girls over the age of 18 should be allowed to move away from home to go to college and/or take a job</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is all right for boys to choose their own career</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Every member of the family has a right to keep certain thoughts and feelings private</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Boys over the age of 18 should be allowed to move away from home to go to college and/or take a job</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Children over the age of 7 should be allowed to know about unpleasant events in the family</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>