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Abstract

Perceived discrimination has been found to pose a serious threat to the psychological adaptation of immigrant youth. At the same time, it may undermine intergroup relations by increasing hostility of immigrants against the nationals. Within the MIRIPS framework, perceived discrimination is closely related to the multiculturalism and integration hypotheses since it can be considered a proxy for cultural insecurity and a barrier in seeking interactions with the dominant outgroup. Various social psychological models attempt to explain the deleterious outcomes of perceived discrimination in terms of group identification. The present study draws on this theoretical background in order to examine whether and how ethnic and national identification of immigrant adolescents in Greece mediate the effect of perceived discrimination on their well-being and outgroup attitudes. The sample consisted of 510 immigrant children and adolescents (52% male, 63% second generation, mean age=12.7 years, age range 10-17 years) of various ethnic backgrounds (58% Pontian remigrants from the former Soviet Union, 32% from Albania) who were enrolled in Greek urban schools of primary and secondary education. Measures included perceived discrimination and national identification items drawn from the MIRIPS study, the revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, Nguyen & Von Eye’s Acculturation Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. SEM analyses showed that perceived discrimination, as expected, is negatively related to well-being as well as to national outgroup attitudes. Ethnic group identification promoted well-being; furthermore, it was found to buffer the negative effect of perceived group (but not personal) discrimination on well-being. On the other hand, decreased national identification partly explained the negative impact of perceived personal and group discrimination on national acculturation, in line with the Rejection-Disidentification model. The implications of the above findings are discussed in relation to psychological (developmental) and contextual (sociocultural) factors.
Perceived discrimination and the MIRIPS hypotheses

- **Multiculturalism hypothesis.** PD is expected to result from discriminatory behaviors of members of the majority society in the presence of realistic or symbolic threat (Stephan et al., 1999).

- **Contact hypothesis.** PD may be indicative of a group-based hierarchy and the domination of 'inferior' by 'superior' groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) which, in turn, undermines the conditions for positive contact outcomes.

- **Integration hypothesis.** Several social psychological theories deriving mainly from SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) suggest that PD may lead to increased ethnic group identification and hostile intergroup relations as strategies to maintain a positive self-esteem.
The Rejection-Identification Model (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999)

- Perceived discrimination
- Ethnic identification
- Psychological well-being

Diagram:
- Perceived discrimination → Ethnic identification → Psychological well-being
- Perceived discrimination → Psychological well-being
- Ethnic identification → Psychological well-being
The Rejection-Disidentification Model (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim, 2009)

- Perceived discrimination
- National identification
- Ethnic identification
- Outgroup attitudes
- Psychological Well-being

The arrows indicate the direction of the relationship between the variables. The positive (+) and negative (-) signs indicate the nature of the relationship.
Perceived personal and group discrimination

- Research has consistently revealed that minorities tend to perceive a higher level of discrimination directed at their group as a whole, rather than at themselves as individuals, which is referred to as the personal/group discrimination discrepancy (Taylor, Ruggiero, & Louis, 1996).

- Theoretical explanations include motivational and cognitive processes (e.g., minimization of personal discrimination and auto-stereotyping, respectively) and imply differential effects of PPD and PGD on various outcomes.

- Most studies converge on the finding that perceived personal discrimination has a stronger impact on the adaptation of immigrant youth than perceived group discrimination (Motti-Stefanidi & Asendorpf, 2012).
Research findings on perceived discrimination

- In a meta-analysis of 134 samples, Pascoe & Richman (2009) concluded that perceived discrimination has a significant negative effect on various aspects of both mental and physical health, with social support, coping behavior and group identification acting as mediators.

- Schmitt et al. (2014) performed two meta-analyses of research with correlational and experimental data. They confirmed that the pervasiveness of perceived discrimination is fundamental to its harmful effects on psychological well-being.

- Perceived discrimination reported by immigrant youth has been shown to be associated with stronger ethnic identity, weaker national identity, and lower commitment to the new culture (Berry et al., 2006).
Research based on the RIM and RDIM models

- Cronin et al.’s (2012) longitudinal study showed that ethnic identification in response to PD protects well-being and promotes activism, in line with the RIM.

- Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. (2009) reported evidence in support of the RDIM, i.e., PD resulted in national disidentification which, in turn, increased hostile attitudes towards the nationals.

- In the few studies of the RIM distinguishing between personal and group discrimination, Bourguignon et al. (2006) and Armenta & Hunt (2009) found that PGD was related to higher personal self-esteem via group identification, while PPD was associated with lower personal self-esteem.
Research on perceived discrimination with immigrants in Greece

- In a countrywide representative sample of adult immigrants \( N = 1,843 \), high levels of PPD were related to the ethnic and diffuse profiles, while low PPD was evident in the integration and national profiles (Pavlopoulos et al., 2011).

- Perceived personal (but not group) discrimination has been found to pose a risk factor in the relationship between stress and school adaptation of Albanian adolescents (Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2006).

- In a multilevel longitudinal study, Motti-Stefanidi & Asendorpf (2012) showed that individual attributes, such as personality traits and fewer life stressors, may protect immigrant youth from translating experiences of PGD into PPD.
Research purpose and hypotheses

- We draw on social psychological background to explore the consequences of the relation between PD and psychological well-being on intergroup relations, in the context of the integration hypothesis of the MIRIPS project.

- We test the basic assumptions of the RIM and RDIM models by distinguishing between PPD and PGD.
  
  - PGD is expected to increase ethnic identification of immigrant youth in an attempt to maintain positive psychological functioning. At the same time, PGD will have negative impact on national identification and on relations with Greeks.

  - PPD will be negatively related with both ethnic and national identification, thus posing a risk factor for psychological well-being and intergroup relations.
Demographic profile of participants (N = 510 students)

- **Country of origin/ethnicity**
  - 163 (32%) Albania;
  - 296 (58%) Former USSR (Pontian Greeks);
  - 51 (10%) other

- **Generation status**
  - 190 (37%) first generation;
  - 315 (63%) second generation

- **Sex**
  - 265 (52%) male;
  - 245 (48%) female

- **School class (Mean age)**
  - 212 (42%) Primary (11.2 yrs);
  - 298 (58%) Junior High (13.7 yrs)

- **Place of residence**
  - 216 (42%) Athens;
  - 223 (44%) Thessaloniki
  - 35 (7%) Volos;
  - 36 (7%) Rethymno
## Participating immigrant groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albanian immigrants</th>
<th>Pontian remigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Albanians</strong> (few of Greek origin)</td>
<td>Immigrants of Greek origin from Former Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former communist regime, moved in the ’90s</td>
<td>Former communist regime, moved in the ’90s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic immigrants, voluntary minority (Ogbu, 2003)</td>
<td>Officially treated as remigrants and given full citizen status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They speak Albanian; religion not important</td>
<td>Speak Pontian Greek (and Russian); Greek Orthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread around the country (over 60% of immigrant population)</td>
<td>They often settle together in enclaves (about 160,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

- **Perceived Discrimination** (based on MIRIPS and AStRA studies)
  - Against the ethnic group (3 items, $\alpha=.66$)
  - Against the self (3 items, $\alpha=.79$)

- **Ethnic Identification** (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007)
  - Sense of belonging to the culture of origin (3 items, $\alpha=.77$)

- **National Identification** (based on MIRIPS)
  - Sense of belonging to the Greek culture (2 items, $\alpha=.69$)

- **Acculturation** (Nguyen & Von Eye, 2002)
  - National orientation – intergroup relations (5 items, $\alpha=.86$)

- **Psychological Well-Being**
  - Global self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965; 10 items, $\alpha=.72$)
  - Emotional symptoms (Goodman, 1997; 5 items, $\alpha=.67$)
Perceived discrimination, cultural identification and psychological well-being by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albanian Mean</th>
<th>Pontian Mean</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Discrimination</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discrimination</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identification</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Identification</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Acculturation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = .008  p = .010  p < .001  p = .008  p = .004
Perceived discrimination, cultural identification and psychological well-being by generation status

- Personal Discrimination
- Group Discrimination
- Ethnic Identification
- National Identification
- National Acculturation
- Self-esteem
- Emotional Problems

$p = .034$  $p = .036$  $p = .006$
Correlations among perceived discrimination, cultural identification, well-being, and national acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PerDis</th>
<th>EthId</th>
<th>NatId</th>
<th>SelfEst</th>
<th>Emot</th>
<th>NatAcc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Discrimination</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic identification</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National identification</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional symptoms</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National acculturation</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
SEM analysis of the Rejection-Identification Model including group and personal perceived discrimination

\[ \chi^2(2) = 1.82, \ p = .401; \ CFI = 1.00; \ NFI = .99; \ RMSEA = .00; \ SRMR = .01 \]
Mediation analyses (PROCESS; Hayes, 2012)

Perceived personal discrimination predicting self-esteem through ethnic identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLCI</th>
<th>BootUCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived group discrimination predicting self-esteem through ethnic identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLCI</th>
<th>BootUCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mediation analyses (PROCESS; Hayes, 2012)

Perceived personal discrimination predicting emotional symptoms through ethnic identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLCI</th>
<th>BootUCl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceived group discrimination predicting emotional symptoms through ethnic identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLCI</th>
<th>BootUCl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEM analysis of the Rejection-Disidentification Model including group and personal perceived discrimination

\[ \chi^2(0) = 0.00; \ CFI = 1.00; \ NFI = 1.00; \ SRMR = .00 \]
## Mediation analyses (PROCESS; Hayes, 2012)

### Perceived personal discrimination predicting national acculturation through national identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceived group discrimination predicting national acculturation through national identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect of IV</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEM analysis of the combined RIM and RDIM models including group and personal perceived discrimination

\[ \chi^2(8) = 23.24, p < .001; \ CFI = .98; \ NFI = .97; \ RMSEA = .06; \ SRMR = .05 \]
Multigroup SEM comparisons by ethnicity and generation status

### Ethnicity (Albanian vs. Pontian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement weights</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural weights</td>
<td>12.865</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural covariances</td>
<td>13.949</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Generation status (first vs. second generation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model comparison</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement weights</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural weights</td>
<td>5.473</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural covariances</td>
<td>7.579</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and conclusions

- Both PPD and PGD showed to have a consistent, negative impact on indices of psychological (self-esteem, emotional symptoms) and socio-cultural (intergroup relations) adaptation.

- The protective role of ethnic identification on well-being, as suggested by the RIM, was evident only for PGD. By contrast, PPD had negative direct and indirect effects on well-being, through low ethnic identification.

- National disidentification explained the path between PPD and less willingness to engage into relations with the national out-group, in line with the RDIM. On the other hand, the direct effect of PGD on national acculturation was not mediated by national disidentification.
Summary and conclusions

- The differential role of PPD and PGD may be viewed in the light of the personal/group discrimination discrepancy, which was replicated in the present study.

- PGD can be protective for psychological well-being through the minimization of personal experiences of discrimination (Taylor et al., 1996), which is enhanced by making social comparisons within one’s ethnic group.

- On the other hand, PGD may not necessarily result in national disidentification, as cultural identity shift is considered an individual mobility strategy in order to defend one’s threatened social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).
Summary and conclusions

- PPD is a major risk factor in the acculturation and adaptation of immigrant youth in manifold ways:
  - by directly threatening psychological well-being,
  - by undermining relations with the national peers,
  - by decreasing identification with any cultural group, which can bring serious detrimental effects in the acculturation (e.g., marginalization) and developmental processes (e.g., diffused identity).

- Multigroup comparisons showed that no ethnic group or immigrant generation is immune to the toxic effects of perceived discrimination, independent of group differences at the mean level.
Limitations and future directions

• The causality of effects is not easy to establish in a cross-sectional design. Mutual accommodation implies reciprocal relationships. According to the Interactive Acculturation Model (Bourhis et al., 1997) immigrant acculturation orientation may directly influence the attitudes of the host majority.

• It is of interest to understand what is the impact of the economic crisis in Greece on all components of the models under study (i.e., PPD, PGD, cultural identification, psychological well-being, and intergroup relations).

• Just as PGD does not always translate to PPD (Motti-Stefanidi & Asendorpf, 2012), macroeconomics do not directly explain levels of perceived threat, which makes psychological research more socially relevant than ever...
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