



Universiteit Utrecht

Migration and School wellbeing

Studying influences of parent and peer support, ethnic density and receiving country context.

Lytske van der Loon

Migration and School wellbeing

Studying influences of parent and peer support, ethnic density and receiving country context.

Lytske van der Loon, 4225015

Thesis supervisor: dr. G.W.J.M. Stevens

Universiteit Utrecht

Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen Master Jeugdstudies

Study year 2014 – 2015

June 17, 2015

Number of words: 5954

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my appreciation to my supervisor Gonneke Stevens for her valuable and constructive feedback. Her support and enthusiastic encouragement was inspiring. My special thanks are extended to Suzanne Rutz for her valuable comments and my colleagues at the Dutch youth inspectorates for their interest in this thesis. Finally, I wish to thank my family, friends and love for their expertise, necessary criticism, moral support, and their willingness to provide me with comfort food.

Abstract

This study explored the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing. Data was used from the 2009-2010 Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study. A total of 52,120 adolescents living in 10 different countries, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, USA and Wales, were included in the study. Results indicated that immigrant status did not significantly impact school wellbeing when controlling for age, gender and family affluence. Support from one's best friend did not change this relation. Parent support was found to be a moderator. Only when support from father was low, there was an impact of migration on school wellbeing. When support from father was high and when support from mother was low and high, no significant relation was found between immigration and school wellbeing. Ethnic density also moderated the association between immigrant status and school wellbeing and suggested that the impact of migration on school wellbeing may be stronger when ethnic density is low. Finally, the results indicated that the receiving country in which adolescents live significantly influenced whether there is a significant relation between migration and school wellbeing. Future research should elaborate on these findings by looking into the relationships for different immigrant groups.

Keywords: Immigrants · School wellbeing · Parent support · Peer support · Ethnic density · International differences

Introduction

In today's globalised world, the number of immigrants in Western countries is substantial. Although being an immigrant may bring strengths, such as strong family and community ties, many immigrants face challenges, such as experienced discrimination and poverty in the host country (Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes & Milburn, 2009). These challenges have been found to influence adolescent wellbeing. Studies in the past have revealed higher levels of both or either internalizing and/or externalizing problems among immigrant adolescents (Stevens & Vollebergh, 2008), although findings seem to vary highly with specific immigrant populations. Even though it is known that migration can potentially negatively influence health development and that migration is often related to a lower social economic status, it is not precisely understood why for some immigrant families there appears to be intergenerational mobility, whereas for other families migration is related to all kinds of problems (Crosnoe & Lopez Turley, 2011). One important factor, which has only limitedly been addressed in the literature yet, which could be very important, concerns the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing.

Roffrey (2008) defines school wellbeing as school connectedness, which encompasses *“how students feel at school, their participation and engagement with learning, and the quality of the relationships they experience”* (p. 29). The school experiences of adolescents, such as whether students feel engaged with school or whether they experience a positive school environment, is an important contributor to school success (Pong & Hao, 2008; Roffrey, 2008). In the literature high levels of school satisfaction and school engagement among adolescents are associated with positive health outcomes. More specifically, adolescents who do not feel engaged with learning at school or who do not feel connected to teachers and peers are more likely to have externalizing as well as internalizing problem behavior (Bond et al., 2007). Thus, feeling disconnected at school can constitute a risk factor for adolescents and can as such have far reaching consequences (Samdal, Wold & Bronis, 1999; Bond et al., 2007).

Immigration is associated with negative consequences such as discrimination, which could impact school wellbeing. A Dutch study by Verkuyten and Thijs (2010) showed that immigrant pupils are more likely to experience being called names and social exclusion, than non-immigrant pupils. Theoretically, according to Dion (2002), prejudice and perceived discrimination is a stressor, as it elicits victims to see themselves as targets of the antagonist and consequentially experience a sense of threat. Based on Dion's stress model, perceiving

discrimination leads to stress and, in result, to psychological symptoms. Several studies confirm that discrimination may have a deteriorating impact on how immigrants experience their school environment (Steele & Aronson, 1995, Orom, Semalulu & Underwood, 2013). For instance, in the United States it was found that being aware of negative stereotypes of the group one identifies with leads to less academic engagement (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Thus, because immigrants may experience higher levels of discrimination, which is likely to be associated with lower levels of school wellbeing, immigrant adolescents may show lower school wellbeing than non-immigrant adolescents.

However up until now, empirical findings on this theoretical notion about school wellbeing of immigrant and non-immigrant adolescents are scarce and inconsistent. For instance, a study among medical students revealed that minority students experienced a less positive school environment (Orom, Semalulu, & Underwood 2013). A study by Greenman (2013) showed an opposite result. Namely, that immigrant adolescents reported more positive behaviors and attitudes regarding education than native adolescents. With exception of the before mentioned studies, previous research on educational differences on the basis of immigrant status has mostly focused on attainment levels such as average grades or standardised performance tests. Numerous studies have indicated the existence of an 'achievement gap' between immigrant and native adolescents (Hillmert, 2013; Song, 2011; Steinberg, Dornbusch & Brown, 1992; Zinovyeva, Felgueroso & Vazquez, 2014). For example, based on European data from a Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), immigrant adolescents have been found to be less likely to have a high academic track than majority youth (Song, 2011; Zinovyeva, Felgueroso & Vazquez, 2014). Other studies revealed that immigrant adolescents might not be doing less well in school than their national peers (Crosnoe & López Turley, 2011; Kao & Tienda, 1995). Crosnoe and López Turley (2011) indicate that immigrant adolescents even do better in school than non-immigrants. This advantage, however, varied among immigrant populations and was more pronounced for Asian and African immigrants than for other groups of immigrants. Importantly though, the focus of these empirical studies is academic performance and does not consider the experienced school wellbeing of immigrant and non-immigrant adolescents.

Therefore, the main question of the present study is whether immigrant status and school wellbeing are related. Based on the theoretical notions of perceived discrimination, it is expected that immigrant adolescents are less positive about their school environment than their non-immigrant peers. Since there is little empirical evidence, a further focus of this study is whether factors moderate the impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing. Apparently,

being an immigrant constitutes a risk for some adolescents but not for all. Why do some minority groups have negative experiences in schools whereas others do not? As will be lined out beneath, factors that might influence the relation between immigration and school wellbeing include parent and peer support, the ethnic density of the school and the host country in which adolescents live.

Parent and peer support

In general, supportive social relationships are important for school wellbeing (Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti & Solheim, 2004; Stewart, 2008; Walsh, Harel-Fisch & Fogel-Grinvald, 2010; Wentzel, 1998). Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes and Milburn (2009) identify two theoretical ways in which parents and peers influence school wellbeing. First, supportive relationships with others could alleviate or mitigate possible negative effects of experienced stress. Protective functions can include a sense of belonging, emotional support, practical assistance and information, cognitive guidance and positive feedback. For example, Gibson, Gándara and Koyma (as cited in Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes & Milburn, 2009) found that peers moderate negative effects as a result of school related violence by providing emotional support. Supportive relationships that directly promote school engagement and motivation entail a second type of influence. Parents and peers may find academic outcomes or school engagement important and model specific academic behavior.

Empirical studies indicate that supportive relationships influence the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing. For instance, Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes and Milburn (2009) have shown that supportive relationships explain immigrant adolescents' academic engagement and educational outcomes. Furthermore, research by Pels and Nijsten (2003) has revealed that peer support is relatively more important for immigrant adolescents than for non immigrant adolescents. Hence, it is expected that the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing is moderated by parent and peer support. Especially, immigrant adolescents who do not experience high levels of parent support and/or peer support will show lower levels of school wellbeing than native adolescents.

Ethnic density and school wellbeing

In addition to parental and peer influences, school characteristics could influence the relation between immigration and school wellbeing. Most studied in this context is the influence of ethnic density in class on adolescent wellbeing. Based on the ethnic density hypothesis, first

postulated by Farris and Dunham (1939), it is assumed that living with other members of one's ethnic group can protect against negative influences associated with having an ethnic minority status or being immigrant.

Previous studies on the ethnic composition of school classes support the ethnic density hypothesis. Verkuyten and Thijs (2010) concluded that in situations where immigrant adolescents constitute a numerical minority in class, they are more likely to experience racism. This finding is in line with the conclusions of an earlier study by Verkuyten and Thijs (2002) concerning self esteem among adolescents, in which they found that a higher proportion of ethnic majority students in the class was related to lower self esteem among ethnic minority students. Furthermore, a study by Gieling, Vollebergh and Van Dorsselaer (2010) showed that students who belong to an ethnic minority report higher levels of externalizing problems but this was only the case when they took in an ethnic minority position in their class.

Based on the evidence supporting the ethnic density effect, it is expected that ethnic density influences the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing. When ethnic density is low, indicating that immigrants are in a minority position, the effect of immigrant status on school wellbeing is expected to be stronger.

International differences

Because of the variation in the literature concerning the impact of migration on school wellbeing and also on school performance, the question arises whether aspects of the broader societal context influence school wellbeing. Relevant is the institutional theory, which claims that research should not only consider individual characteristics, in this case whether an adolescent has a background of immigration, but should also look at collective and cultural processes (Buchmann & Parrado, 2006; Hillmert, 2013). According to Buchmann and Parrado (2006), all societies develop legal, discursive and organizational structures that define the position of immigrants and determine whether and how they are able to participate in institutions of the host country. Whereas in some countries policies are exclusionary and emphasize the boundaries between natives and immigrants, other countries have more inclusionary policies and practices which encourage integration of immigrants. Especially the extent in which immigrant policy of the host country is respectful and supportive of cultural diversity is thought to be important for the wellbeing of immigrants (Phinney et al., 2001).

Based on the institutional theory, one could expect that school wellbeing of immigrant adolescents is not only attributable to individual factors but also to macro-level conditions.

Even though there have been no comparative studies so far concerning associations between immigration and school wellbeing, there have been a few studies which compared the educational achievements of immigrant adolescents internationally. Hillmert (2013) analyzed the school performance of immigrant adolescents in five European countries and revealed considerable variation between these countries. Buchmann and Parrado (2006) also compared countries on the basis of student performance and found that Northern European countries, that according to the authors have more exclusionary policies concerning immigrants, have a larger educational achievement gap than countries which are said to have a more inclusionary society. The more inclusionary countries were mostly Southern European countries and countries that have a long history of immigration such as the United States. This study suggests that school performances of immigrant students are affected by the institutional and integration policies of the host countries in which they live. Although there is no empirical evidence that the impact of immigration on school wellbeing differs cross-nationally, the evidence that supports the institutional theory where it concerns school performance indicates that this theory might also be applicable to school wellbeing. Hence, the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing is expected to vary across countries.

Hypotheses:

Based on the proposed theoretical notions and the empirical evidence, the following hypotheses are formulated:

- H1: There is a relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing. Immigrant adolescents are more likely to report lower school wellbeing than native adolescents.
- H2: The relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing is moderated by parent and peer support. Immigrant adolescents, who do not experience high levels of parent support and/or peer support, will show lower levels of school wellbeing than native adolescents.
- H3: The relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing is moderated by the ethnic density of the school. Based on the ethnic density effect, it is expected that the impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing is more prominent when ethnic density is low.

H4: The relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing differs according to the host country in which adolescents are brought up.

Methods

Sample and data collection

This study is based on data from the 2009-2010 Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) survey. The HBSC study is an international school-based survey which includes self-completion questionnaires which are administered anonymously in classrooms every four years in about forty countries. Data is gathered on health, wellbeing and social relations of adolescent boys and girls in the ages of 11, 13, and 15. The current study used data of ten countries that have included questions regarding immigrant status (Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, USA and Wales). To ensure the representativeness of the data in every country, a standardised cluster sampling method was used, in accordance with the national education structure. The sampling unit was the school class, stratified by region or school type. In the cases where it was not possible to take school class as a sampling unit, the school was used as sampling unit. Sample sizes per country vary in the range from 4.173 to 10.893 respondents. The percentages of immigrant adolescents of the total sample range from 12.1% to 30.7%.

Measures

Migrant status was measured by asking participants to state their own country of birth, and the country of birth of both of their parents. If adolescents themselves or one of their parents were born abroad, they were considered migrants. If neither the adolescent, nor one of his or her parents was born abroad, they were considered non-migrants. Respondents with missing values on this item were excluded from analyses (2,905 adolescents). According to Nordahl and colleagues (2011), adolescent-parent agreement on this item is high, indicating robust results.

School wellbeing was assessed by a 6-item scale. A high total score represents a high level of school wellbeing and was understood as reflecting a more positive school experience. The first item concerns school engagement which was measured in terms of liking school. Respondents were asked '*how do you feel about school at present?*' with four possible

responses *'I don't like it at all'*, *'I don't like it very much'*, *I like it a bit'* and *'I like it a lot'*. The second item was about academic achievement, measured by asking respondents the following question *'In your opinion, what does your class teacher(s) think about your school performance compared to your classmates?'*. Possible responses were *'below average'*, *'average'*, *'good'*, and *'very good'*. The third item concerned perceived pressure. Students were asked *'How pressured do you feel by the schoolwork you have to do?'*. The answering options were *'a lot'*, *'some'*, *'a little'* and *'not at all'*. The last three items assessed the level of classmate support. The items were *'The students in my class(es) enjoy being together'*, *'Most of the students in my class(es) are kind and helpful'* and *'Other students accept me as I am'*. Items were rated on a 5-point likert scale ranging from *'strongly disagree'* to *'strongly agree'*. For those adolescents who had a missing value on one of the 6 items of the scale variable school wellbeing, the missing values were replaced with the mean for that item. Respondents with more than one missing value were excluded from further analyses (1,534 adolescents). The reliability of the scale of school wellbeing was .64, as indicated by Cronbach's alpha.

Ethnic school composition was measured as the proportion of pupils in the school who were considered migrants. This was done by aggregating the results from the migrant status measure to the school level.

Parent support was measured by asking participants to respond to the following question *"How easy is it for you to talk to the following persons about things that really bother you?"*. This was asked for mother and father separately on a 5 point scale with answers ranging from *'not at all'* to *'very easy'*. Peer support was measured with the same question and answering categories now focusing on one's best friend.

Individual characteristics, such as age gender and family affluence status were also taken into account to control for their possible influence on school experience indicators. Family affluence was measured by using the Family Affluence Scale. The scale consisted of four items, that asked adolescents about the number of cars at home, whether they had their own bedroom, the number of computers in their home and the number of times the family has gone on holiday. Even though the tested reliability of the scale was rather low (Cronbach's alpha was .37), this scale has been validated in previous studies (Boyce, Torsheim, Currie & Zambon, 2006).

Statistical procedure

In order to test the proposed hypotheses, analyses for descriptive statistics and linear regression analyses were conducted. Age, gender and family affluence were included as control variables. The analyses included interaction terms for associations between immigrant status and a) parent support, b) peer support, c) ethnic density and d) host country. Because the variable host country was categorical, dummy variables were made with the Netherlands as reference category. The continuous independent variables were centralized to prevent collinearity. Prior to interpreting the results of the analyses, several assumptions were checked. Even though the dependent variable school wellbeing deviates slightly from a normal distribution, no correction has been made to the data because of the magnitude of the sample size. The assumption of linearity was met as indicated by a plot of residuals versus predicted values which showed constant variance. Also, there were no significant outliers and in the analyses no indication of multicollinearity was found as VIF values were all below 10.

Results

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the Pearson correlations between the relevant variables. This Table indicates that being an immigrant adolescent is correlated with less school wellbeing, although it must be noted that the correlation was weak. The older adolescents were, the lower was their average school wellbeing. Adolescent girls reported a higher level of school wellbeing than boys. Family affluence was positively associated with school wellbeing, with more affluent adolescents reporting higher levels of school wellbeing. The moderator variables were also significantly correlated with both immigrant status and school wellbeing. Support of the father, mother and best friend were negatively correlated with immigrant status, indicating that immigrant adolescents reported lower levels of support. Additionally, parent and peer support were positively correlated with school wellbeing indicating that higher levels of support were correlated with higher levels of school wellbeing.

To provide an indication of the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing, the means of native and immigrant adolescents were compared by use of an independent sample t- test for each studied country. Table 2 provides an overview of the outcomes. In Germany, Iceland and the Netherlands significant differences of reported school wellbeing were found between native and immigrant adolescents. Among immigrant

adolescents living in Germany and Iceland the average school wellbeing was lower compared to that of native students. Immigrant adolescents in the Netherlands reported higher average school wellbeing than native adolescents. In total, native adolescents showed a significantly higher mean of school wellbeing than immigrant adolescents.

Table 1: Correlations between the studied variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Age	1								
2. Gender	-.013**	1							
3. Family Affluence	-.002	-.023**	1						
4. Immigrant status	-.014**	.008	-.122**	1					
5. School wellbeing	-.217**	.022**	.115**	-.013**	1				
6. Support father	-.191**	-.201**	.121**	-.036**	.269**	1			
7. Support mother	-.203**	.005	.087**	-.041**	.266**	.531**	1		
8. Support best friend	.103**	.158**	.045**	-.015**	.094**	.132**	.163**	1	
9. Ethnic density	-.025**	-.012**	-.068**	.218**	-.010*	-.005	-.008	-.014**	1

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$. Immigrant status: 0 = native, 1 = immigrant; Gender: 0 = boys, 1 = girls.

Table 2: Results of independent t-tests for the mean differences of school wellbeing between native and immigrant adolescents per country.

Country	School wellbeing						T	p
	N	Native Mean	SD	N	Immigrant Mean	SD		
Denmark	3342	20.97	3.05	762	21.05	3.35	-.63	.526
Germany	3627	21.06	2.73	1161	20.67	3.19	3.72	.000
Greece	4030	19.40	3.34	719	19.20	3.40	1.41	.160
Iceland	8996	20.99	3.16	1674	20.74	3.39	2.79	.005
Ireland	3077	20.41	3.21	1319	20.21	3.34	1.87	.062
Italy	3883	20.00	3.05	673	19.76	3.22	1.86	.063
Netherlands	3418	21.30	2.83	837	21.61	3.08	-2.67	.008
Spain	4146	20.31	3.24	800	20.32	3.28	-.12	.905
UK	4193	20.16	3.13	532	20.41	3.07	-1.71	.088
USA	3416	19.80	3.46	1515	19.75	3.57	.47	.637
Total	42128	20.49	3.19	9992	20.38	3.38	2.82	.005

The relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing

To test whether immigrant status can account for a significant proportion of the variance in school wellbeing, a linear regression analysis was conducted. As reported in Table 3 (model 1), the regression analysis revealed that the effect of immigrant status on school wellbeing was not significant when age, gender and family affluence were included as control variables.

Moderation of parent and peer support

To test for moderation, three interaction terms of support mother, support father and support from a best friend with the variable immigrant status were included in the analysis. These results indicated that support from a best friend did not significantly impact the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing. Therefore, the insignificant interaction between best friend support and immigrant status was removed from the analysis. In Table 3 the results of the analysis are presented including the interactions between immigrant status and support from father and mother. Both support from father and from mother showed significant moderation effects for the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing.

To be able to interpret the moderation of parent support, new variables were made representing conditions in which the support from either father or mother is low (one standard deviation above the mean) or high (one standard deviation below the mean). Regression analyses were employed to test the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing in the four conditions. When support from father was low, the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing was significant ($\beta = .014$, $t = 2.377$, $p = .017$), indicating that native adolescents reported a higher school wellbeing than immigrant adolescents. In all the other conditions no significant differences between immigrant and native adolescents were found (high support father: $\beta = -.002$, $t = -.349$, $p = .727$; low support mother: $\beta = .000$, $t = -.080$, $p = .937$; high support mother: $\beta = .010$, $t = 1.684$, $p = .092$), although it must be noted that differences between immigrant and native adolescents were more pronounced (but still insignificant) when the level of support from mother was high compared to when it was low.

Table 3: Results of the linear regression analysis on the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing moderated by parent support.

		School wellbeing			
		B	SE	β	R ²
Model 1					.062
	Age	-.435	.009	-.223 ^{***}	
	Gender	.146	.030	.023 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.193	.008	.107 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status	.001	.039	.000	
Model 2					.131
	Age	-.332	.009	-.171 ^{***}	
	Gender	.287	.030	.045 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.134	.008	.074 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status	.069	.037	.008	
	Support from best friend	.240	.019	.058 ^{***}	
	Parent support:				
	Support from father	.551	.019	.163 ^{***}	
	Support from mother	.500	.021	.129 ^{***}	
Model 3					.131
	Age	-.332	.009	-.171 ^{***}	
	Gender	.287	.030	.045 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.134	.008	.074 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status	.065	.038	.008	
	Support from best friend	.240	.019	.058 ^{***}	
	Parent support:				
	Support from father	.578	.021	.171 ^{***}	
	Support from mother	.472	.023	.122 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status *	-.133	.045	-.018 ^{**}	
	Support father				
	Immigrant status *	.137	.051	.016 ^{**}	
	Support mother				

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$. Immigrant status: 0 = native, 1 = immigrant. Gender: 0 = boys, 1 = girls.

The moderation of ethnic density

Table 4 shows the results from the moderation of ethnic density on the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing. Ethnic density had a slightly significant negative impact on school wellbeing indicating that a higher proportion of immigrant adolescents in school was related to a lower average of school wellbeing. The interaction between immigrant status and ethnic density, included in model 3, was significant. From these results it can be inferred that the impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing varies according to the school's ethnic composition.

Table 4: Results of the linear regression analysis on the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing moderated by ethnic density.

		School wellbeing			
		B	SE	β	R ²
Model 1					.062
	Age	-.433	.009	-.220 ^{***}	
	Gender	.129	.028	.020 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.206	.008	.113 ^{***}	
Model 2					.062
	Age	-.434	.009	-.220 ^{***}	
	Gender	.128	.028	.020 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.204	.008	.113 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status	-.004	.037	-.001	
	Ethnic density	-.341	.166	-.009 [*]	
Model 3					.062
	Age	-.434	.009	-.220 ^{***}	
	Gender	.128	.028	.020 ^{***}	
	Family affluence	.205	.008	.113 ^{***}	
	Immigrant status	-.023	.038	-.003	
	Ethnic density	-.637	.203	-.017 ^{**}	
	Immigrant status *	.875	.350	.014 [*]	
	Ethnic density				

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$. Immigrant status: 0 = native, 1 = immigrant. Gender: 0 = boys, 1 = girls.

In order to interpret the moderation effect, similarly as with parent support, new variables were made which represented a condition in which the ethnic density was low (one standard deviation above the mean) and a condition in which the ethnic density was high (one standard deviation below the mean). Regression analyses were conducted to test the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing in both these conditions. The results indicated that when ethnic density is either low or high, the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing is not significant (low ethnic density: $\beta = -.012$, $t = -1.879$, $p = .060$; high ethnic density: $\beta = .006$, $t = 1.216$, $p = .224$). Even though no significant effects for the conditions high and low ethnic density were found, the direction of the effects was in accordance with the hypothesis. When ethnic density was low, immigrant adolescents tended to report lower levels of school wellbeing than native adolescents, compared to when ethnic density was high.

The moderation of country

Investigating the effects for immigrant status on school wellbeing for the Netherlands compared to the other receiving countries, provided significant effects for all countries except Denmark and the UK (Table 5, model 3). These results indicate that the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing does not vary significantly between Denmark and the Netherlands and between the UK and the Netherlands. However, the effects of immigrant status on school wellbeing significantly differed between the Netherlands and Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Spain and the USA.

In order to gain more insight into the impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing in the studied countries, regression analyses were conducted for each country separately. The analyses showed that no significant relations were present in the majority of these countries (Greece: $\beta = -.020$, $t = -1.417$, $p = .157$; Iceland: $\beta = -.016$, $t = -1.612$, $p = .107$; Italy: $\beta = -.023$, $t = -1.597$, $p = .110$; Spain $\beta = .011$, $t = .762$, $p = .446$; and the USA $\beta = .002$, $t = .168$, $p = .866$). For Germany, Ireland and the Netherlands the analyses did show significant effects (Germany: $\beta = -.043$, $t = -2.930$, $p = .003$; Ireland: $\beta = -.037$, $t = -2.393$, $p = .017$; The Netherlands: $\beta = .048$, $t = 3.140$, $p = .002$). Immigrant adolescents in Germany and Ireland reported less school wellbeing than native adolescents, whereas in the Netherlands, immigrant adolescents reported significantly higher school wellbeing than their native peers.

Table 5: Results of the linear regression analysis on the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing moderated by country.

				School wellbeing		
	B	SE	B	R ²		
Model 1						.062
	Age			-.433	.009	-.220***
	Gender			.129	.028	.020***
	Family affluence			.206	.008	.113***
Model 2						.086
	Age			-.422	.009	-.214***
	Gender			.117	.028	.018***
	Family affluence			.142	.008	.078***
	Immigrant status			-.049	.036	-.006
	Country:					
		Denmark		-.271	.069	-.022***
		Germany		-.353	.066	-.032***
		Greece		-1.735	.067	-.156***
		Iceland		-.449	.057	-.057***
		Ireland		-.711	.069	-.060***
		Italy		-1.266	.067	-.112***
		Spain		-.842	.066	-.077***
		UK		-.946	.069	-.080***
		USA		-1.439	.065	-.133***
Model 3						.086
	Age			-.422	.009	-.214***
	Gender			.117	.028	.018***
	Family affluence			.144	.008	.079***
	Immigrant status			.427	.121	.052***
	Country:					
		Denmark		-.217	.077	-.018***
		Germany		-.218	.075	-.020***
		Greece		-1.623	.073	-.146***
		Iceland		-.332	.063	-.042***
		Ireland		-.556	.090	-.047***
		Italy		-1.152	.074	-.102***
		Spain		-.769	.072	-.071***
		UK		-.884	.075	-.075***
		USA		-1.354	.075	-.125***
	Immigrant status *	Denmark		-.257	.178	-.009
	Immigrant status *	Germany		-.647	.161	-.030***
	Immigrant status *	Greece		-.591	.175	-.021***
	Immigrant status *	Iceland		-.635	.147	-.035***
	Immigrant status *	Ireland		-.678	.162	-.032***
	Immigrant status *	Italy		-.607	.178	-.021***
	Immigrant status *	Spain		-.341	.171	-.013*
	Immigrant status *	UK		-.189	.196	-.006
	Immigrant status *	USA		-.445	.154	-.024**

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$. Immigrant status: 0 = native, 1 = immigrant. Gender: 0 = boys, 1 = girls. Reference category of country: the Netherlands.

Discussion

Research has shown that there are educational disparities between immigrant and non-immigrant adolescents. However, up until now research mostly focused on researching educational attainment and often discarded the importance of school wellbeing. The present study aimed to explore the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing, and also investigated whether this relation varied with different levels of parent and peer support, ethnic density and the host country in which adolescents are brought up.

Results indicated that immigrant status does not significantly impact school wellbeing. Support from one's best friend did not change this relation but parent support did. Immigrant status was found to negatively impact school wellbeing when immigrant adolescents experienced little support from their father, while no impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing was found when levels of father support were high. For mothers, an opposite (yet insignificant) effect was found, showing more pronounced differences between immigrant and native adolescents when the level of support from mother was high than when it was low. The ethnic density of the school also moderated the effect of migration on school wellbeing. Even though effects were small, the direction of the effect revealed that when ethnic density is low, immigrant adolescents tended to report lower levels of school wellbeing than native adolescents than when ethnic density was high. Finally, the results showed that the host country in which adolescents live significantly influenced the effect of immigration on school wellbeing. Even though in the majority of the studied countries no significant relations were present, in some countries the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing was of significance. In Germany and Ireland immigrant adolescents reported lower school wellbeing than non-immigrant adolescents, whereas in the Netherlands, immigrant adolescents reported significantly higher school wellbeing than their native Dutch peers. It should be noted that the found moderating effects were small.

In contrast to what was expected, the current study did not support the hypothesis that immigrant status influences school wellbeing among adolescents. Even though slightly higher levels of school wellbeing were found for native adolescents than immigrant adolescents, these differences were explained by family affluence. When it concerns educational outcomes, such a finding is often explained by referring to the immigrant paradox (Crosnoe, & Lopez Turley, 2011; Greenman, 2013). The immigrant paradox refers to situations in which immigrant youth have similar or better educational outcomes than non-immigrant youth. In line with the current study, Crosnoe and Lopez Turley (2011) concluded

that evidence of the immigrant paradox is more likely to occur when family affluence and language skills are included in research analyses as control variables.

The results did not support the stress model as postulated by Dion (2002). Either, the adolescents in the sample experienced similar stress (such as perceptions of discrimination) as native adolescents or increased stress did not result into lower school wellbeing. An interesting explanation is offered by Kao and Tienda (1995). The authors state that although immigrant adolescents may be at a disadvantage compared to their native peers, they may still perform as well as native adolescents because of the immigrant optimism hypothesis. This theoretical notion assumes that parent's optimism about improved socioeconomic prospects, as a result of migration, leads them to behave in such a way that educational success in their family is promoted. Even though this explanation refers to educational performance and not to school wellbeing, it could be that parent's optimism influences school wellbeing in a similar manner.

Moderating effects were found for parent support, but not for peer support. Support for the impact of the relation between fathers and adolescents relation is offered by Pels and colleagues (2009). Their research among immigrant boys showed that problem behavior is related to authoritarian control exercised by the father or the absence of his support. This is especially relevant because previous research by Distelbrink, Geense and Pels (as cited in Pels, Distelbrink & Postma, 2009) has indicated that immigrant fathers are more absent in the upbringing of their children than non immigrant fathers. Interestingly, the impact of the mother on the studied relationship was more pronounced when mother's were supportive, rather than when they were unsupportive. An explanation for the results could either be that mothers of immigrant adolescents become more supporting when their children have a higher school wellbeing, or that immigrant adolescents are better able to benefit from a supportive relation with their mother than native adolescents.

In line with the empirical literature, ethnic density was found to moderate the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing. It should be noted however that further analyses showed that having a low or a high ethnic density in school did not significantly change the impact of immigration on school wellbeing. The reason that ethnic density did not appear to be a convincing moderator, could be due to the fact that this study only assessed the total proportion of immigrants and did not include information about the proportion of one's own ethnic group. Also, ethnic density was measured at school level. At school, immigrant adolescents may not be distributed evenly and as such may not represent

the direct environment of the student. According to Gieling, Vollebergh and Van Dorsselaer (2010), the ethnic density in the direct environment of adolescents is of most relevance.

As expected, the relationship between immigrant status and school wellbeing varied across countries, which supports the explanation of Buchmann and Parrado (2006) that a country's legal, discursive and organizational structures determine the way immigrants are able to participate in the host country. It is important that future studies on the topic of immigration and school wellbeing include the receiving country context.

Even though this study has provided several interesting insights, there are also limitations that must be taken into consideration while interpreting the results. First, this study did not take into account the differences between ethnic minority groups. As Bécáres, Nazroo, and Stafford (2009) indicate, minority groups may be very different in their reasons for migration, their acculturation strategies, and also the sizes of minority groups and the circumstances in the country of origin differ greatly. Future studies that encompass the specific circumstances of different ethnic minority groups could develop a deeper understanding of the school experiences of immigrant adolescents. A second limitation is that no differentiation is made between adolescents who are born in the country of origin and adolescent who are born in the host country. Previous studies have suggested that first and second generation immigrants differ with regard to school achievement (Hillmert, 2013; Song, 2011). Thirdly, it should be noted that the measures of school wellbeing, parent support and peer support were based on information reported by adolescents themselves. Including other sources of information such as the perspectives of parents, teachers and peers could be relevant to gain a more comprehensive understanding of school wellbeing. Additionally, school wellbeing in this study was measured by use of a scale consisting of 6 different items which deal with rather different aspects of school wellbeing. By using this scale it was possible to draw main conclusions about school wellbeing in relation to migration. Future research could elaborate on how immigration influences the different aspects of school wellbeing separately. A final limitation is that despite the large research sample of school aged children, the sample of immigrant adolescents may not be representative for all immigrant adolescents.

To my knowledge, this research is the first to explore the relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing in different countries and contributes to the existing knowledge of factors that impact this relation. The study is relevant to better understand under which circumstances adolescents are able to have a high level of school wellbeing. It can be concluded that immigrant status does not impact school wellbeing in most of the studied

countries. In some countries, however, a rather modest impact of immigrant status on school wellbeing was found. The relation between immigrant status and school wellbeing is moderated by parent support and ethnic density. Future research should elaborate on whether the found relationships hold for different types of immigrant groups.

References

- Bécares, L., Nazroo, J., & Stafford, M. (2009). The buffering effects of ethnic density on experienced racism and health. *Health & Place*, 15, 700-708.
- Bond et al. (2007). Social and school connectedness in early secondary school as predictors of late teenage substance use, mental health, and academic outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40, 357 -357.
- Boyce, W., Torsheim, T., Currie, C., & Zambon, A. (2006). The Family Affluence Scale as a measure of national wealth: validation of an adolescent self-reported measure. *Social Indicators Research*, 78, 473–87.
- Buchmann, C., & Parrado, E. A. (2006). Educational achievement of immigrant-origin and native students: A comparative analysis informed by institutional theory. In Baker, D. P., & Wiseman, A. (Eds.). *The impact of comparative education research on institutional theory*. St. Louis, MO: JAI Press, 345–377.
- Crosnoe, R., & Lopez Turley, R. N. (2011). K–12 Educational outcomes of immigrant youth. *Future of Children*, 21 (1), 129-152.
- Dion, K. L. (2002). The Social Psychology of Perceived Prejudice and Discrimination. *Canadian Psychology*, 43 (1), 1 -10.
- Gieling, M., Vollebergh, W. A. M., & van Dorsselaer, S. (2010). Ethnic density in school classes and adolescent mental health. *Social Psychology and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 45, 639–646.
- Greenman, E. (2013). Educational attitudes, school peer context, and the “immigrant paradox” in education. *Social Science Research*, 42, 698–714.

- Hillmert, S. (2013). Links between immigration and social inequality in education: A comparison among five European countries. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 32, 7–23.
- Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76 (1), 1-19.
- Liebkind, K., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Solheim, E. (2004). Cultural identity, perceived discrimination, and parental support as determinants of immigrants' school adjustments: Vietnamese Youth in Finland. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19 (6), 635–656
- Nordahl, H., Krolner, R., Pall, G., & Currie, C. (2011). Measurement of Ethnic Background in Cross-national School Surveys: Agreement Between Students' and Parents' Responses. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 49, 272–277.
- Orom, H., Semalulu, T., & Underwood, W. (2013). The social and learning environments experienced by underrepresented minority medical students: A narrative review. *Academic Medicine*, 88 (11), 1765- 1777.
- Pels, T., Distelbrink, M., & Postma, L. (2009). Opvoeding in de migratiecontext: Review van onderzoek naar de opvoeding in gezinnen van nieuwe Nederlanders. Verwey- Jonker Instituut.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, Immigration, and wellbeing: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57 (3), 493–510.
- Pong, S., & Hao, L. (2008). The role of school in the upward mobility of disadvantaged immigrants' children. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 620 (1), 62-89.

- Roffrey, S. (2008). Emotional literacy and the ecology of school wellbeing. *Educational & Child Psychology, 25* (2), 29-39.
- Samdal, O., Wold, B., & Bronis, M. (1999). Relationship between students' perceptions of school environment, their satisfaction with school and perceived academic achievement: an international study. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10* (3), 296–320.
- Song, S. (2011). Second-generation Turkish youth in Europe: Explaining the academic disadvantage in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. *Economics of Education Review, 30*, 938– 949.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797–811.
- Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. B. (1992). Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement: an ecological perspective. *American Psychologists, 47* (6), 723-729.
- Stevens, G. W. J. M., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2008). Mental health in migrant children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49* (3), 276- 294.
- Stewart, E. B. (2008). School structural characteristics, student effort, peer associations, and parental involvement the influence of school- and individual-level factors on academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 40* (2), 179-204.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Rhodes, J., & Milburn, M. (2009). Unraveling the Immigrant Paradox: Academic engagement and disengagement among recently arrived immigrant youth. *Youth & Society, 41* (2), 151-185.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Global and ethnic self-esteem in school context: minority and majority groups in the Netherlands. *Social Indicators Research, 67*, 253–281.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2010). Racist victimization among children in The Netherlands: the effect of ethnic group and school. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25* (2), 310-331.

- Wentzel, K. R. (1998). Social Relationships and Motivation in Middle School: The Role of Parents, Teachers, and Peers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90 (2), 202-209.
- Walsh, S. D., Harel-Fisch, Y., & Fogel-Grinvald, H. (2010). Parents, teachers and peer relations as predictors of risk behaviors and mental well-being among immigrant and Israeli born adolescents. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70, 976–984.
- Zinovyeva, N., Felgueroso, F., & Vazquez, P. (2014). Immigration and student achievement in Spain: Evidence from PISA. *SERIEs*, 5, 25–60.