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What is This?
Internalising and externalising problems in middle childhood: A study of Indian (ethnic minority) and English (ethnic majority) children living in Britain

Naama Atzaba-Poria, Alison Pike, Martyn Barrett

The psychological adjustment of ethnic minority children has received little research attention, particularly in Britain. The present study set out to investigate the adjustment of Indian children living in Britain as well as the adjustment of their English peers. The sample consisted of 125 children (66 Indian and 59 English) between the ages of 7 and 9 years (M = 8.51, SD = 0.62) and their parents and teachers. Mothers, fathers, and teachers reported about the children’s problem behaviour, and parents also reported on their acculturation strategy and use of their Indian language. Analyses revealed that overall Indian children seem to be well adjusted in Britain. Nevertheless, according to parental reports, they exhibited more internalising problems than did their English peers. No significant differences, however, were found for externalising or total problem behaviour. Furthermore, within the Indian group, it was found that children whose mothers and fathers were more traditional in their acculturation style displayed lower levels of externalising, internalising and total problem behaviour, according to their teachers. In addition, children whose mothers and fathers utilised their Indian language to a greater extent displayed lower levels of externalising and total problem behaviour (teachers’ reports). These findings highlight the importance of examining the adjustment of ethnic minority children in multiple contexts.

Introduction

Ethnic minority children grow up exposed to two different cultures, often resulting in conflicting demands. Research concerning the adjustment of ethnic minorities and immigrant adults has led to contradictory findings, indicating both increased and decreased rates of psychiatric disorders and hospitalisation for immigrants and ethnic minorities compared to the ethnic majority (e.g., Bengi-Arslan, Verhulst, & Crijnen, 2002; Jarvis, 1998). In spite of much interest in the mental health of ethnic minority groups, there has been little systematic investigation of the psychological and social adjustment of these children (Munroe-Blum, Boyle, Offord, & Kate, 1989; Rutter, Yule, Berger, Yule, & Bagley, 1974). Most of the studies investigating children’s adjustment have focused on immigrant children (first generation) or refugee children (Munroe-Blum et al., 1989). A review of the few studies that have examined whether children of ethnic minority groups are at risk of having more problem behaviour than majority children reveal inconsistent results: on the one hand, there is evidence showing that being part of a minority group does not increase the likelihood for problem behaviour (e.g., Fuligni, 1998; Munroe-Blum et al., 1989), whereas other studies indicate increased rates of problem behaviour (e.g., Bradley & Sloman, 1975; Ogbu, 1988; Pawliuk, Grizenko, Chan-Yip, Gantous, Mathew, & Nguyen, 1996; Rutter et al., 1974).

Evidence for ethnic minority children not being at risk for problem behaviour comes from several sources. Munroe-Blum and colleagues (1989) compared 2852 Canadian ethnic minority and majority children, aged 4 to 16 years, who were born between 1966 and 1979. They found that being an ethnic minority child was not a risk indicator for psychiatric disorder or for poor school performance. Similarly, Fuligni (1998) reported that based on analysis of data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, a representative study of more than 20,000 adolescents in the United States, first- and second-generation adolescents of Asian and Latin American origin were less likely to engage in delinquent and violent acts, to use drugs and alcohol, and to have had sex than their peers from ethnic majority families. In addition, they were less likely to have missed school because of health or emotional problems. These findings may reflect the social reality in which children are living today in the Western world, and highlight the possible gap existing between American white majority children and the new ethnic minority children in the United States.
States: It may be that, unlike majority children, ethnic minority children have a collection of values and traditions that provide them with a clear direction, a responsible role, and a strong cultural identity (Fuligni, 1998).

On the other hand, there is also opposing evidence. For example, Rutter and colleagues (1974) conducted a large population survey in 1970 of all 10-year-old children residing in an inner London borough. They found that Caribbean children showed more problem behaviour, especially conduct disorder, than did ethnic majority children. However, this difference was present only for teachers’ ratings and not for parents’ ratings (Rutter et al., 1974). The authors interpreted these results as suggesting that ethnic minority children behave differently in different cultural environments (i.e., at home and at school). In other words, it seems that Caribbean children showed more problems outside the family, at school, in an environment where minority status may be more salient. Therefore, it may be that at school, the discontinuity that these children feel between the home environment and the school environment has negative consequences for their behaviour (Rutter et al., 1974). Furthermore, children’s awareness of existing discrimination and prejudice (Ghuman, 1999, 2003; Modood, 1997) may be greater at school than at home, and consequently may influence behaviour in that setting (Rutter et al., 1974). On the other hand, it may be the case that due to different expectations, parents and teachers rated the children’s behaviour differently, and those differences in child behaviour represent their beliefs rather than the children’s actual behaviour.

As most of the studies investigating the lives of ethnic minority children have been conducted in the United States and Canada (e.g., Fuligni, 1998; Munroe-Blum et al., 1989), two countries known to have large populations of minorities throughout their history, a main aim of the current study was to investigate the situation of ethnic minorities in Britain.

One aspect that needs to be considered when studying immigrants and ethnic minority groups is the cultural distance between the country of origin and the country of settlement. Cultural distance is a term used to express the difference between cultures (Berry, 1997; Ghuman, 1999). The larger the distance, the more difficult the adjustment will be. In the current study, the cultural group investigated was Indians living in Britain. India’s historical association with Britain has resulted in a relatively large immigration of Indian people into Britain. Today, Indians are the biggest ethnic minority group in Britain (Berthoud, Modood, & Smith, 1997; Office of National Statistics, 1996; Owen, 1993), and the number of Indian people settling in Britain is greater than all other countries in the West (Sachdev, 1995). Therefore, the socialisation of children of Indian origin who are living in Britain is particularly salient. The next section describes the Indian culture of origin, the British culture of settlement, and stresses the main differences between these cultures.

**Culture of origin—the Indian culture**

The first generation of immigrants from India came mainly in the second half of the 20th century, after the Second World War. Economic expansion in Britain and the resulting shortage of labour attracted immigrants (Desai, 1963). As Indians were allowed to enter Britain without visas or work permits, many came during this period (Ghuman, 1994). In these years, migration from India was mainly economically motivated (Desai, 1963). This first generation (mainly men) came to urban Britain in order to work, with the intention of returning to India (Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1991). However, Britain afforded these immigrants a better standard of living for their children and wives, and therefore many decided to bring over their families (Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1991). Although Indian immigrants received basic civil rights in the UK including the vote, they were, in fact, socially and sometimes geographically separated from white majority British people (Ghuman, 1999, 2003). Despite some changes in Indian family organisation in the British environment, many Indian immigrants have made a choice *not* to adopt a British lifestyle, but have retained their Indian customs and values (Ghuman, 1999, 2003; Sachdev, 1995). This is also true for the second and third generation of Indians living in Britain today (Ghuman, 1999, 2003; Sachdev, 1995), and suggests that differences in areas such as child-rearing ideologies, expectations, norms, and beliefs adhered to by parents tend to preserve meaningful elements of the original culture (Frankel & Roer-Bornstein, 1982; Levine, 1988).

**Culture of settlement—the British culture**

The British have in the past had great faith in their social systems and way of life. The new immigrants from India were expected to be British without any recognition of their original culture and customs (Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1991). In other words, the British attitude has been primarily assimilationist, expecting immigrants and all ethnic groups to adopt a British way of life. However, Indians do not have white skin, which was, and still is, one of the criteria which is implicitly regarded as being essential for “being British” by many native British (Condor, 1996; Phoenix, 1995). This unchangeable characteristic therefore represents a problematic barrier between the British and Indians, and is the reason why many Indians prefer to identify themselves as Indian, Asian, or British-Asian rather than as English or British (Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1991).

**Cultural distance between India and Britain**

The Indian and the British cultures are diverse in many respects. The core values of both cultures are different, and tend to represent opposite extremes of several dimensions. One of the main differences is the relationship between the individual and the community. The British culture is individualistic, whereas the Indian culture is more collectivistic (Ghuman, 1999). In addition, Hinduism, one of the principal Indian religions, is very different from Christianity, being much more theologically varied, with many different schisms and strands, and far more internally diverse in relationship to both practice and belief (Ghuman, 2003; Jackson & Nesbitt, 1993). Furthermore, not only did Indians who immigrated into Britain have to adjust to British cultural values, they found differences in most of the minor as well as major aspects of life, for example language, clothes, food, weather, and attitude toward education (Ghuman, 1999, 2003).

**Indian children in Britain**

The vast majority of Indian children (94%) aged 0–15 years who live in Britain were born in Britain (Modood, 1997). In addition, 15% of Indian children aged 5 to 10 years old have a parent who was born in Britain. These data show that most of
the children at this age are second generation. These British-born children of Indian origin are often exposed to two differing types of socialisation processes: one at home and the other at school. Schools in Britain mainly reflect the values and norms of Western society, which includes the development of autonomy, encouragement of self-expression, and gender equality. On the other hand, traditional Indian values emphasise group solidarity, family loyalty and obedience, and sex role differentiation. These differences may lead to conflicts for Indian children (Ghuman, 1997). Furthermore, Indian primary school children face other problems of adjustment to British schools, due to conflicting demands, especially in the domains of religion and language (Ghuman, 1997). In addition, Troyna and Hatcher (1992) found that most Asian children are likely to experience racial prejudice from their white peers and some teachers at school.

It is therefore important to examine whether the fact of being an ethnic minority poses a higher risk for developing problem behaviour. On the other hand, it may be that since children of Indian origin have a strong cultural identity and feeling of responsibility towards their family, and a collection of values and traditions that provide them with a clear direction for their behaviour (Fuligni, 1998), they will exhibit less problem behaviour than their English peers. Moreover, the Indian families who took part in this study were living in an area of London where the majority of the residents were of Asian origin. This is also reflected in schools in this area, where minority children predominantly occupy most of the local schools. It may be that living in such a predominantly Asian environment reduces the cultural conflict and accordingly protects children from adjustment difficulties.

**Acculturation style and problem behaviour**

Another variable that may be related to the level of problem behaviour for ethnic minority children is parental acculturation style. Two dimensions of acculturation style are proposed: *traditionalism* or *cultural maintenance*, which refers to the extent that the original cultural identity and characteristics are considered to be important and maintained; and *Western attitudes* or *contact and participation*, which refers to the extent of involvement in the dominant cultural group (Berry, 1997). Phinney described the acculturation model as "a two-dimensional process, in which both the relationship with the traditional or ethnic culture and the relationship with the new or dominant culture must be considered, and these two relationships may be independent" (Phinney, 1990, p. 501). For example, there are individuals who may develop bicultural identities (sometimes termed as integration; Berry, 1997), that is, have interest in both maintaining the original culture and interacting with the host culture (i.e., higher in both traditional and Western attitudes), whereas others may have little interest in cultural maintenance, coupled with little interest or interaction with the host group (i.e., lower in both traditional and Western attitudes). Furthermore, the strategies may not be constant, and may vary, for example, according to context or life domain: in more private domains (e.g., in the home, with the extended family) more cultural maintenance may be shown than in more public domains (e.g., in the workplace) (Arends-Tooth & Van de Vijver, 2003).

The core of the link between parental acculturation style and children's adjustment may be understood when considering the acculturative stress parents may experience. People vary in their experience of acculturation. For some people acculturation changes may be experienced as stressors, while for others they may be perceived as positive and even be seen as opportunities (Berry, 1995). When serious conflicts exist, acculturative stress may be experienced. Acculturative stress is "a stress reaction in response to life events that are rooted in the experience of acculturation" (Berry, 1997, p.19). The stress of acculturation may result in identity confusion, anxiety and depression (Berry, 1995). One important factor that has been found to be related to acculturative stress is the mode of acculturation (Berry, 1995; Berry & Kim, 1988). For example, Berry and colleagues investigated stress related to acculturation style in adults from several immigration groups. They found that Native Canadians (i.e., aboriginals) who adopted an integration style of acculturation (i.e., high in both traditional and Western attitudes) experienced low stress, whereas those who felt assimilated (i.e., high in Western and low in traditional attitudes) tended to be somewhat more stressed. They also found that stress was strongly related to separation (i.e., high only in traditionalism) and marginalisation (i.e., low in both traditional and Western attitudes) styles of acculturation in a Korean immigrant group (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987).

The link between acculturation style and well-being has mainly been explored among adults. These investigations have revealed inconsistent results. On the one hand, there is evidence to suggest a positive relationship between internalising behaviours such as depression and traditionalism. For example, it was found that people who were more traditional and loyal to the culture of origin were more depressed (Salgado de Snyder, 1987). Furthermore, it was found that people who were less Westernised were also more depressed (Neff & Hoppe, 1993). On the other hand, there are findings indicating that rejection of the traditional culture is related to more mental health problems (Ramirez, 1968). Finally, no association between acculturation and adjustment has been reported (Griffin, 1983).

Parental acculturation style has also been related to children's adjustment (Baranikin, Konstantareas, & De Bosset, 1989; Pawliuk et al., 1996). Evidence suggests that children of more traditional parents are better adjusted (Fuligni, 1998), perhaps as a result of the greater sense of obligation children have in more traditional families, which provides them with a clearer set of expectations and direction that may assist in their adjustment (Fuligni, 1998). Inconsistent findings were reported, however, regarding the adjustment of children of more Westernised parents. On the one hand, it has been proposed that parental rejection of, or alienation from, the host culture increases acculturative stress and accordingly has a negative impact on children's adjustment (Minde & Minde, 1976). On the other hand, children of assimilated parents have been found to have more behavioural and disciplinary problems.
Use of language and problem behaviour

Another variable of potential importance for children’s adjustment is the use of language spoken at home. In addition to the findings regarding the association between parental ability to use the host language and the psychological functioning of their children (Barankin et al., 1989; Williams & Carmichael, 1985), there is evidence to suggest that usage of the native language has a positive effect on the well-being of ethnic minority children (Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001). For example, a positive link was found between ethnic language use and future educational and occupational aspirations (Bankston & Zhou, 1995; Portes & Schauffler, 1994). The usage of the native language is positively related to ethnic identity (e.g., Bankston & Zhou, 1995). It seems that retention of the native language acts as a cultural resource (Portes & Schauffler, 1994) and therefore may positively influence the child in the process of adaptation.

To summarise, most of the studies conducted in the area of children’s ethnicity and adjustment have focused on immigrants (e.g., first generation) or refugees. The limited research that has addressed ethnic minority children and problem behaviour has shown evidence for both increased and decreased risk associated with ethnic minority status. There are several dimensions shown to influence the adjustment of children from ethnic minority groups. Parental acculturation style and parental use of the native language are salient variables. Given the disparity in findings from previous studies, there is clearly a need for further investigation of the relationship between ethnic minority status and the development of problem behaviour in middle childhood.

Present study

This paper focuses on English and Indian group differences in children’s problem behaviour, as well as variation within the Indian group. Given the potential for group differences in children’s problem behaviour, the first research question examined ethnic group differences in problem behaviour. Specifically, are there differences between the English and Indian children in the level of externalising, internalising, and total problem behaviour they exhibit? Furthermore, as the Indian group should not be seen as a homogenous group, we explored within-group variation in children’s problem behaviour. Accordingly, we examined whether Indian children’s problem behaviour varies in accordance with their parents’ acculturation style, and with the extent of Indian language use by their parents.

Method

Eligibility criteria

Children were eligible to participate in this study if they were pupils in years three or four at primary school (7–9 years old), and were either English or Indian. For the purposes of this study “English” was operationalised as White, of British nationality, and being resident in England continuously since birth. Children belonging to the Indian group (i.e., the ethnic minority group) were born in Britain, but had parents or grandparents born in India (i.e., children were second or third generation in Britain), and were of Hindu religion. Parents were required to speak in English and to read either English or Gujarati (one of the Indian languages). In addition, inclusion criteria specified that children in both groups be resident with both biological parents, or with a stepfather who had been in the father-role for the target child prior to the child’s second birthday. Finally, in order to control for as many confounding variables as possible, all families were recruited from the same geographical areas.

In order to access eligible families 71 schools in West London (i.e., Hounslow, Wembley, and Southall) were contacted. From these, 29 schools agreed to take part in the study. Reasons for not participating included involvement in another study, shortage of teachers, or having a new headteacher at the school.

Schools in these areas are characterised by having a culturally and racially diverse population. For example, a report on Hounslow primary schools (Teach in Hounslow, 2004) indicates that 51.3% of the school population in this area is from ethnic categories other than White, with the largest groups being Indian, Pakistani, and black Caribbean. Furthermore, over 43.1% of pupils have English as an additional language.

Sample

The sample consisted of 125 families participating in the Family and Child Behaviour Study (Atzaba-Poria, 2002). Fifty-nine children came from the English group (28 boys and 31 girls) and 66 from the Indian group (36 boys and 30 girls). In three families only mothers participated in the study, as the fathers refused or were unable to take part. In another three families, only the fathers took part in the study, as the mothers did not speak English, nor could they read Gujarati, and therefore were unable to complete the questionnaires or be interviewed. For the remaining 119 families, data were collected from both parents as well as the target child. Children’s ages ranged from 7.0 to 9.6 years ($M = 8.51, SD = 0.62$).

Demographic information, including both mothers’ and fathers’ age, place of birth, educational qualifications, and professional occupations are presented for the whole sample as well as for each ethnic group separately (see Table 1). As can be seen, the vast majority of the English parents were born in Britain, whereas most of the Indian parents were born in either India or East Africa. Furthermore, meeting the eligibility criteria, all Indian parents were of Hindu religion (with the exception of two mothers who were of Sikh religion, whose children were being brought up as Hindus), and the vast majority of parents were married or cohabiting with the biological parent of the child. Two English fathers were not
the biological parents; however they had been in the father-role since the child’s birth. The sample was also diverse in terms of parental education: 10% of the mothers and 14% of the fathers did not have any educational qualification; most of the mothers (71%) and fathers (57%) finished school with either the equivalent of a high school diploma or higher national diploma, and 18% of the mothers and 29% of the fathers were university graduates. Although this pattern was broadly similar for both ethnic groups, a significant difference, $t(118) = 2.41, p < .05$, was found for fathers’ education, with English fathers holding lower educational qualifications than their Indian counterparts.

Mothers’ and fathers’ current or most recent occupations were categorised using the Standard Occupational Classification (Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, 1991). Most of the mothers had skilled occupations and fewer but still many mothers had managerial and technical occupations or partly skilled occupations (see Table 1). However, the picture was different for fathers; many fathers had managerial and technical occupations or partly skilled and unskilled occupations. A single SES composite was created using mothers’ or fathers’ highest educational level, mothers’ or fathers’ highest occupational status, and an index of crowding (i.e., the ratio of number of people in the household to number of rooms in the house). Although the two samples did differ significantly on the index of crowding, $t(118) = -2.49, p < .05$, with Indian families living in more crowded houses than English families ($M = 0.98, SD = 0.31; M = 0.86, SD = 0.20$, respectively), no significant differences were found for SES between English and Indian families. Furthermore, family size varied between 3 and 16 people ($M = 4.94, SD = 1.52$). Most families had two (57%) or three (28%) children living at home, and the target children were primarily eldest (42%), or the second born (41%). Finally, children’s teachers reported on children’s problem behaviour. Each teacher reported on between one and six children. Most teachers reported on one or two children (75%), whereas only a minority of teachers reported on six children (5%).

### Procedure

In order to protect families’ confidentiality, letters were sent via schools to the children’s homes. Schools were asked to target those children from two-parent families of either English or Indian origin. However, we are unsure of the accuracy of this procedure, and not all schools agreed to target specific children. In addition, letters were sent home via the children, but there was no guarantee that parents received our letters. Because of this opt-in procedure, it was not possible to estimate refusal rates. Certainly, this volunteer sample represents a minority of eligible families. However, the sample included a wide range of SES families, and indeed wide variability on most measures, including child IQ. Furthermore, as the majority of the Indian population in Britain is of Hindu religion, and the most popular language spoken by this population is Gujarati, this sample may be regarded as being broadly representative of the Indian community living in Britain.

Interested families were visited at home, where parents were

### Table 1

Demographics for the entire sample, and by ethnic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entire sample (n = 120–121)</th>
<th>English group (n = 58–59)</th>
<th>Indian group (n = 62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>37.67 (5.56)</td>
<td>40.97 (5.71)</td>
<td>37.83 (6.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/East Africa</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educationa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (Grade 2–5)/GCSE (D–G)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE (Grade 1)/O-level (A–C)/GCSE (A–C)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level, S-level</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher National Certificate (HNC)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher National Diploma (HND)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate qualification</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and technical</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled: manual and nonmanual</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly skilled</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying at home with children with no previous work</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a No qualifications = school leavers who did not sit/pass any exams; CSE or O-level = exams taken at age 16; A-level = specialised exams taken at age 18; HND = nonacademic qualification.
interviewed and completed questionnaires. In addition, teachers were visited at school and were asked to complete questionnaires that were then mailed back to the researchers.

**Measures**

In order to obtain a more representative sample within the Indian group, all parental questionnaires were translated into Gujarati. Gujarati is one of the languages spoken in India, in the area of Gujarat (i.e., West India). This language was chosen as it is the principal language used among most of the Hindu families in Britain (Modood, 1997). The translation was done by two people fluent in both languages. A native speaker of Gujarati translated the English version of the questionnaires into Gujarati and then it was back-translated into English by another translator fluent in English and Gujarati. All disagreements were discussed until a consensus was reached.

**Child problem behaviour.** The Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991a) is a parental report of problem behaviour for children 4–18 years of age. Parents were asked to indicate how true different statements of behaviours were about their child within the past 6 months, using a 3-point scale ranging from not true (0) through somewhat true or sometimes true (1), to very true or often true (2). The 113 items forming this questionnaire cover eight scales including delinquency behaviour (e.g., “lying or cheating”), aggressive behaviour (e.g., “cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others”), withdrawn (e.g., “would rather be alone than with others”), anxious/depressed (e.g., “unhappy, sad, or depressed”), attention problems (“can’t concentrate, can’t pay attention for long”), social problems (“doesn’t get along with other kids”), thought problems (e.g., “can’t get his/her mind from certain thoughts; obsessions”), and somatic problems (e.g., “overtired”). These eight scales form two second-order scales: externalising behaviour problems (items from the delinquency and aggression scales) and internalising behaviour problems (items from the withdrawn, somatic problems, and anxious/depressed scales). Finally, summing all the problem items (the eight scales) yields a total problem score.

The CBCL has been used to document behavioural and emotional problems among children from diverse culture backgrounds. Similar age and gender patterns have been shown across 12 different cultures for total, externalising, and internalising problems (Crijnen, Achenbach, & Verhulst, 1997). Furthermore, extensive research supports the reliability, stability, and validity of the CBCL (Achenbach, 1991a). Internal reliability for the two clusters as well as for total problem behaviour was excellent for both parents’ reports in the two ethnic groups. Internal reliability coefficients were high for externalising behaviours (α = .90, α = .89), for internalising behaviours (α = .88, α = .87) and for total problem behaviour (α = .95, α = .92) for maternal reports in both the English and the Indian groups, respectively. As for paternal reports, internal reliability coefficients were also high for externalising behaviours (α = .92, α = .90), for internalising behaviours (α = .84, α = .85) and for total problem behaviour (α = .95, α = .93) in the English and the Indian groups, respectively.

Correlations between mothers’ and fathers’ reports were calculated for each of the clusters as well as the total problems index. Mother–father agreement was substantial for the externalising (r = .64), internalising (r = .55), and total problems (r = .58) scales. On the basis of these inter-reporter correlations, reports from both parents were averaged to form externalising, internalising, and total problems composites. This strategy was used in order to increase the reliability and validity of these indices (Epstein, 1984; Rushton, Brainerd, & Pressley, 1983).

Similar to the CBCL, the Teacher’s Report Form (TRF; Achenbach, 1991b) is a teacher’s report of children’s problem behaviour. Teachers were asked to report about the target child’s behaviour in the previous 2 months. Similar to the CBCL, the 113 items form eight different scales, which in turn create two clusters: externalising and internalising problems, and a total problem behaviour index. Internal consistency was excellent for externalising problems (α = .95), internalising problems (α = .86), and total problem behaviour (α = .97).

Teachers’ reports were treated separately from parental reports, as the correlations between parental reports and teachers’ reports were relatively low (rs = .42, .16, .32, for externalising, internalising, and total problems, respectively), and it was of interest to examine the different behaviour shown by children at home and at school.

**Acculturation style.** Ghuman’s Acculturation Scale (Ghuman, 1975) was used to measure acculturation style (i.e., traditional and Western beliefs and attitudes). This 29-item questionnaire assesses the acculturation of Asian people into British culture. The questionnaire includes items across the following domains: food and clothes, the role of women, religion, and entertainment and community life. Two factors are indexed via this questionnaire: traditional attitudes (i.e., retaining Asian attitudes), and Western attitudes (i.e., adapting to British cultural norms). Parents indicated on a 5-point scale their degree of agreement, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Fifteen items measured the “traditionalism factor” (e.g., “marriages should be arranged by the family”); (α = .78, α = .72, for mothers’ and fathers’ reports, respectively), and 14 the “Western attitudes factor” (e.g., “our women should wear English [European] clothes”; α = .64, α = .54, for mothers’ and fathers’ reports, respectively). For both scales, higher scores indicated higher traditional or higher Western attitudes, accordingly. The traditionalism factor ranged between 1.73 and 3.93 (M = 2.68, SD = 0.55) for mothers and between 1.80 and 3.80 (M = 2.74, SD = 0.46) for fathers, whereas the Western attitudes factor ranged between 2.36 and 4.21 (M = 3.48, SD = 0.39) for mothers and between 3.00 and 4.43 (M = 3.59, SD = 0.33) for fathers. This acculturation scale has good face validity (Ghuman, 2000), and findings using it support its content validity as reported by the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE, 1978) on a sample of 1117 Asian attitudes (Ghuman, 1991). Furthermore, validity (by extreme group method) was established on a large sample of South Asian people (N = 465; Ghuman, 1991).

**Use of language.** Parents were interviewed about their mother tongue. Two questions were asked (adapted from Martin, Sabogal, VanOss, & Perez-Stable, 1987): (1) “How often do you speak (their Indian language) at home with your children?”; (2) “How often do you speak (their Indian language) with your friends?” Interviewers rated these answers on a 4-point scale ranging from never (1) to a lot (4). These two items were highly correlated (r = .74, r = .64, for mothers and fathers respectively), and were therefore averaged to create maternal and paternal use of language scales, in which higher scores...
indicated more use of the Indian language. Both mothers’ and fathers’ use of the Indian language ranged between 1 and 4 (M = 3.05, SD = 0.96; M = 2.99, SD = 0.91, respectively).

Results

Preliminary analyses

Frequency distributions of the variables were examined. This examination revealed that all variables, except for teachers’ reports of children’s problem behaviour, were normally distributed. As teachers’ reports were positively skewed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), log10 transformations to normality were conducted. This procedure yielded a normal distribution of the data. Accordingly, analyses were conducted using the transformed scores.

Ethnic differences in problem behaviour between the English and Indian children

Preliminary analyses. Gender and ethnic group differences were first examined for the problem behaviour scales. Two (gender) × 2 (ethnicity) ANOVAs were used for teachers and parental reports. These analyses revealed significant gender differences for externalising behaviours, F(1, 118) = 10.81, p < .01; F(1, 118) = 11.03, p < .01, for parental and teachers’ reports, respectively, as well as for parental and teachers’ reports of total problem behaviour, F(1, 121) = 3.72, p = .06; F(1, 118) = 7.38, p < .01, respectively. Replicating previous research, boys exhibited more externalising and total problem behaviour than did girls (see Table 2). Finally, consistent with previous literature, teachers’ reports of children’s externalising, internalising, and total problem behaviour were significantly lower than parents’ reports t(118) = 13.25; t(120) = 13.30; t(121) = 17.78, all p < .001, respectively.

The same ANOVAs also revealed significant ethnic group differences in internalising problems. Specifically, as can be seen in Table 2, according to parental reports, Indian children displayed significantly more internalising problems than did the English children, F(1, 121) = 5.44, p < .05. Of these, 16 (10 boys and 6 girls) Indian children were above the clinical cut-off of t = 64 (Achenbach, 1991a) compared to only 4 (3 boys and 1 girl) English children. Similar results were not found for either externalising problems, F(1, 118) = 0.32, n.s., or total problem behaviour, F(1, 121) = 2.57, n.s. Ethnic group differences were also examined using teachers’ reports of children’s problem behaviour. These analyses revealed no significant differences in externalising F(1, 118) = 0.13, n.s., internalising, F(1, 117) = 1.08, n.s., or total problem behaviour, F(1, 118) = 1.70, n.s. (see Table 2). Furthermore, none of the ANOVAs yielded significant interaction effects. In addition, we examined whether these results changed when education and SES were statistically controlled, by entering them as covariates in the ANOVAs. None of the results changed when controlling for education or SES.

Problem behaviour within the Indian group

Preliminary analyses. Following the analysis of ethnic differences in problem behaviour, it was of interest to examine the variation in problem behaviour within the Indian group. Correlations between mothers’ and fathers’ traditional and Western attitudes were first examined. Positive moderate correlations were found between maternal and paternal traditionalism (r = .34, p < .01). No significant correlation was revealed, however, for the link between maternal and paternal Western attitudes (r = .04, n.s.), indicating that it is possible for husbands and wives to vary in their extent of traditional, and especially Western, attitudes. Furthermore, these two factors were correlated (r = −.60, p < .001) for mothers, but not for fathers (r = .04, n.s.), indicating the independence of traditional and Western attitudes among fathers. Finally, examination of the language spoken at home with children and friends revealed that most mothers (65%) and fathers (62%) reported speaking mostly an Indian language with their children and friends. Furthermore, paternal and maternal use of the Indian language were highly correlated (r = .74, p < .001).

Next, links between acculturation styles parents adopted and their use of the Indian language with their children and friends were examined using Pearson correlations. It was found that traditionalism was substantially positively correlated with parental use of language, both for mothers (r = .67, p < .001)
and for fathers ($r = .45$, $p < .001$). That is, the more traditional parents also reported more Indian language usage. Furthermore, the Western attitudes factor was negatively correlated with parental use of language for mothers ($r = -.41$, $p < .001$) but not for fathers ($r = .10$, n.s.). This means that, for mothers, having greater Western attitudes was related to using their mother tongue less frequently. For fathers, however, the extent of the use of their Indian language was not related to the extent of their Western attitudes.

**Acculturation style and problem behaviour**

In order to examine whether children’s problem behaviour varied according to parental Western and traditional attitudes, Pearson correlations were calculated. As can be seen in Table 3, negative moderate correlations were found between both maternal and paternal traditionalism and children’s externalising, internalising, and total problem behaviour as reported by teachers. Specifically, the more traditional mothers and fathers were, the fewer externalising, internalising, and total problem behaviours their children exhibited. Identical results were obtained when controlling for SES. Finally, no significant correlations were found between Western attitudes and children’s problem behaviour.

**Language usage and problem behaviour**

The examination of the association between Indian children’s problem behaviour and parental Indian language used has uncovered evidence for such a link when using teachers’ reports of children’s problem behaviours. As can be seen in Table 3, Indian children whose mothers and fathers used more Indian language in their interactions exhibited significantly lower levels of externalising as well as total problem behaviour according to teachers’ reports. These results remained the same when controlling for SES. Finally, none of these analyses was significant for parental reports of the children’s problem behaviour.

**Discussion**

The present study had two main aims: first, to examine the differences in adjustment of ethnic minority and majority children, and second, to investigate variation in children’s adjustment within the Indian ethnic minority group, according to their parents’ acculturation style and use of the Indian language. The findings are discussed with respect to each of these two aims, and conclusions are drawn concerning Indians living in Britain, as well as concerning ethnic minorities more broadly construed.

**Differences in problem behaviour between ethnic groups**

The growing proportion of minority group families in Britain (Modood, 1997; Office for National Statistics, 1996) stresses the need to investigate the daily lives of ethnic minority children, and the impact of their minority status on their adjustment. Of the six comparisons made (i.e., parent and teacher reports × three indices of problem behaviour), only one significant difference between the minority and majority children was found. This indicates that there were few differences between the groups overall. No differences emerged when using teachers’ reports. According to parental reports, the results indicate that Indian children are not at higher risk for exhibiting externalising problems or total problem behaviour but are at risk for displaying internalising problems. These mixed results reflect previous contradictory reports, which indicate both increased and decreased levels of behavioural problems for ethnic minority children (e.g., Fuligni, 1998; Munroe-Blum et al., 1989; Rutter et al., 1974). These findings suggest that, on balance, these Indian children are relatively well adjusted in Britain. However, the Indian children did exhibit significantly higher levels of internalising behaviours (according to parental reports) than their English peers. This may be due to the Indian children, as part of an ethnic minority group, experiencing conflict between the two cultures, with this in turn being expressed in their behaviour. In addition, it may be that the higher levels of internalising problems exhibited are a reflection of the prejudice and discrimination that they experience (Ghuman, 1999, 2003; Modood, 1997). Finally, although the CBCL is a descriptive measure that does not request interpretation of behaviours, it still may be affected by differences in perception of behaviour. That is, it is possible that the differences in children’s behaviours between the ethnic groups may represent parental beliefs rather than the children’s actual behaviour.

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parental reports</th>
<th>Teachers’ reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional ($n = 60$)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western ($n = 61$)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional ($n = 59$)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western ($n = 58$)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indian language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal ($n = 65$)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal ($n = 60$)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ext = externalising problems; Int = internalising problems; Total = total problem behaviour.
$\dagger$ $p < .10$; $^*$ $p < .05$; $^{**} p < .01$. 
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This may happen if the Indian parents in this study, although resident in Britain for several years, have different expectations and therefore perceive certain behaviours in a different way from English parents.

Why did the Indian children exhibit more internalising but not externalising nor total problem behaviour? Two different explanations are suggested. First, it may be that internalising problems, which consist of three different clusters of behaviours reflecting depression and anxiety (i.e., cries a lot, feels worthless or inferior), withdrawal (i.e., would rather be alone than with others, sulks a lot) and somatic complaints (i.e., overtired, feels dissy), are a natural expression of identity confusion, the contradicting demands and perhaps the prejudice that ethnic minority children experience. For example, Pawliuk et al. (1996) suggested that children’s feelings of not “fitting in”, as may happen when experiencing conflict between the home and school environments, are shown through internalising behaviours, such as depression and withdrawal. Second, the cultural context should be taken into consideration. Accordingly, it is proposed that internalising behaviours are expressed by the Indian children not only because of conflict they may experience, but also due to the specific characteristics of the Indian culture. That is, a similar conflict experienced by another ethnic minority group that has different cultural characteristics may result in different kinds of behaviours. Specifically, Indian children are part of a culture in which obedience and respect are two major principles (Ghumman, 1999; Laungani, 1999). Children learn from an early age that they should obey and respect adults. Therefore, inappropriate behaviour that has a negative impact on others, and may embarrass the family, such as aggression and delinquent behaviours (i.e., externalising behaviours), is unacceptable. Consequently, it may be that Indian children experiencing difficulties are implicitly urged to express these difficulties through internalising behaviours. Because of their nature, internalising problems are not as readily apparent, and are less prone to have a negative impact on others. This idea is supported by previous evidence indicating that Gujarati-Indian parents have stricter expectations of their children’s behaviour than English parents: They show less tolerance toward physical aggression, and higher expectations of obedience (Hackett & Hackett, 1993).

Another point that requires consideration is the fact that this difference was seen via parental reports, but not for teachers’ reports. This may suggest that the Indian children exhibited these problems in the home environment and not in the school environment. One possible reason for this may be that Indian children, like other ethnic minority children, do not want to be different, and therefore conform to majority group attitudes and expectations at school (Connolly, 1998). Furthermore, as school is perceived to be an important setting at this age, especially among Indian parents (Ghumman, 1999), Indian children may readily adopt majority cultural values and attitudes at school (Pawliuk et al., 1996). Consequently, they may not experience conflict, and thus may not exhibit more behavioural problems, in this setting. However, in the home environment, these adopted majority cultural attitudes and values may conflict with parental attitudes and values. In other words, these contradicting expectations at home may lead children to experience conflict, and hence to exhibit problems, specifically in the home context.

On the other hand, as most of the teachers (86%) in the study were not Indian, it may be that the difference in results is due to different cultural expectations of the Indian parents and the teachers. Furthermore, it may also be that the children exhibit similar levels of internalising problems at home and at school. However, as internalising problems are not very salient, teachers may fail to notice these behaviours. This explanation is supported by previous findings indicating that teachers often do not recognise children’s internalising problems (Abikoff, Courtney, Pelham, & Koplewicz, 1993). This idea is also reflected by the frequent comment, given by some teachers in this study, indicating that “the Indian children are the best behaved in our classes/school”. This finding is important, as internalising problems are often neglected (Klein, 1994). That is, as internalising problems do not disrupt the family or class activities, as do externalising problems, internalising behaviours are often overlooked. Therefore, these children may not get special consideration and the required assistance. The fact that, according to parents, the Indian children do exhibit more internalising problems highlights the importance of paying more attention to internalising behaviours that may also be present in the school environment.

Finally, although this study, as well as that of Rutter et al. (1974), revealed that ethnic minority children living in Britain exhibited more problem behaviours, these studies provide different and to some extent even contradictory findings. These differences stress several points. First, although children in both studies were from minority groups living in Britain, their origins were in different cultures (i.e., Indian and Caribbean). As described earlier, it may be that the differences in the type of behaviours Indian and Caribbean children exhibited (i.e., internalising versus externalising, respectively) may be culture-dependent. Second, Rutter’s study was conducted in the 1960s, and the current study in 2002. This historical time-period has seen increasing numbers of immigrants moving to Britain, and greater acceptance of ethnic minorities. That is, in Rutter’s study children exhibited more problems in the school environment, perhaps reflecting cultural conflict as well as discrimination and prejudice there. In our study, however, ethnic minority children were well adjusted in school, hopefully reflecting greater societal acceptance. These differences highlight the importance of considering historical time, cultural context, and aspects of specific minority groups in multicul tural research.

Differences in problem behaviour within the Indian group

The investigation of ethnic minority differences would not be complete without examining the variation within the Indian group. This is especially important as previous research has revealed that other variables, such as acculturation style (e.g., Pawliuk et al., 1996) and usage of the language (Phinney et al., 2001), may have an important role in the adjustment of ethnic minorities. That is, in Rutter’s study children exhibited more problems in the school environment, perhaps reflecting cultural conflict as well as discrimination and prejudice there. In our study, however, ethnic minority children were well adjusted in school, hopefully reflecting greater societal acceptance. These differences highlight the importance of considering historical time, cultural context, and aspects of specific minority groups in multicultural research.
assist in the process of adaptation. Furthermore, they reveal that it is not only whether parents are able to speak the host language (i.e., English) that is related to their children’s adjustment as reported in other studies (e.g., Williams & Carmichael, 1985), but also whether parents maintain their language of origin. Finally, the study reveals that parental endorsement of more Western attitudes was not significantly associated with problem behaviour.

These findings on the links between parental traditional attitudes and children’s adjustment may be interpreted thus: Growing up in a family where the mother and father have retained much of their culture of origin yields the best outcome for children. It is noteworthy that the Indian families who took part in this study were living in certain areas of London where the majority of the residents were of Asian origin. Accordingly, these areas can appear more similar to neighbourhoods in India than to other parts of Britain. Perhaps, in such a predominantly Asian environment, the more traditional way of life is adaptive, reducing the conflict between the Indian and English cultures. That is, as the Indian culture is so salient in this environment, it may be regarded by children living in these areas as the dominant culture, although it is not considered as such in the broader British society. Furthermore, the idea of a reversal within certain contexts between the minority and majority groups is also seen in schools. Minority children predominantly occupy most of the schools in these areas. The English majority-group children in many schools are a minority group, whereas the Asian minority-group children are the majority in school. Thus, these Indian school-age children in such environments may not experience cultural conflict. This may be especially true as in many homes the Indian channel on TV is the most used (Ghuman, 1997). Consequently, in such an “Indian” environment, being more traditional and less Westernised may be an adaptive acculturation strategy that manages to avoid cultural conflicts.

In support of this interpretation, Buriel (1975) suggested that Hispanics (in the United States) living in areas with a high proportion of fellow Hispanics may not be acculturating to the majority culture, but instead may adopt the norms of their neighbourhood where characteristics of their Hispanic community are maintained. This idea expands the acculturation divisions of Berry (1997), and suggests that sometimes there is not a single monolithic majority to which immigrants must adapt, but a social complexity of many micro-societies (Horenczyk, 1997).

It is worth noting that these considerations relate to the childhood period. That is, children in middle childhood may be protected from identity conflict and prejudice under such conditions. However, as mentioned earlier, when children reach adolescence, their involvement with others in the environment and their exposure to British culture may increase. For example, in adolescence, children obtain more freedom, and may travel out of their neighbourhoods. In so doing, they may encounter higher levels of hostility and prejudice from the host culture. Furthermore, changes related to maturity, such as dating, may engender conflicts between the British culture, which is accepting of early relationships between youngsters, and the Indian culture, which is more conservative (Ghuman, 1999, 2003).

Finally, the examination of the connectedness of mothers’ and fathers’ acculturation styles revealed that both parents were positively related in their traditionalism. However, mothers and fathers were not linked in their levels of Western attitudes. Furthermore, a negative association was found between maternal traditional and Western attitudes, meaning that the more traditional mothers were, the less Westernised they were. However, these scales were independent for fathers, indicating that some fathers could have been highly traditional and Westernised at the same time. Taken together these results suggest that Indian mothers and fathers develop different acculturation patterns. One interpretation for these differences is that as fathers are spending more hours outside the home, while working and engaging with the dominant culture, they may be more likely to develop biculturalism, whereas mothers, who spend more time with the children at home, may be less inclined to adopt two different cultural systems.

An examination of the links between the use of the Indian language and acculturation style aids in the interpretation of this finding. Both mothers and fathers who were more traditional in their acculturation style and those mothers who had lower Western attitudes spoke using their Indian language to a greater extent than other parents. These results are consistent and suggest the following explanation. The Indian culture, being hierarchical, values obedience and respect to others in the family and the community (Ghuman, 1999; Laungani, 1999), and provides strong sanctions against externalising behaviours (Hackett & Hackett, 1993). Therefore, in those families where the Indian cultural beliefs and attitudes are maintained, the expression of externalising behaviours will be lower than in those families that have abandoned the Indian culture.

Different results were revealed when using parental reports. This highlights the importance of having a comprehensive examination of the child, including their behaviours in different settings and contexts, when examining children’s adjustment. Specifically, no significant association was found between children’s problem behaviour as reported by parents and acculturation style or usage of the Indian language. This suggests that children’s adjustment in the home environment is not related to particular attitudes, behaviours, beliefs, or language used. The difference in children’s adjustment is seen at school, where they encounter other cultural expectations and attitudes. We suggest that more traditional families provide children with clearer direction and perhaps a stronger sense of belonging and identity, enabling better adaptation.

Moreover, the fact that the differences in problem behaviour were found when using teachers’ reports might reflect the importance of school in the Indian culture. School is considered extremely important by Indian parents, with significant implications for the future (Ghuman, 1994). Therefore, in this setting there is an expectation that problematic behaviours will be avoided. The significantly lower levels of total problem behaviour displayed by children of mothers who maintained their native culture is consistent with this argument.

Limitation and future directions

Several limitations should be noted. First, in the current study, we examined one specific ethnic minority group—children of Indian origin and Hindu religion. As children from different minority groups may experience different acculturation processes and adjustment (e.g., Berry, 1997), it would be worthwhile to replicate this study with other ethnic minority groups. Such a replication may indicate whether the results seen in this study are unique to the Indian group living in...
Britain, or whether they can be generalised to other ethnic groups that have settled in Britain. In addition, future research exploring mediating processes (e.g., measures of prejudice experienced, cultural values, and family obligation) would enable the understanding of the mechanisms by which ethnic minority status influences adjustment.

Furthermore, due to a lack of suitable child measures, we were unable to examine the links between children’s adjustment and their own acculturation style. Children’s perceptions of their families’ cultural beliefs and attitudes may be more important than parental reports for children’s adaptation. However, as all acculturation style measures are designed for use with adolescents and adults, this was not possible in the current study. Future research aiming to produce a reliable and valid tool to measure children’s perceptions of familial acculturation could be an important step toward understanding those aspects influencing and shaping the adjustment of ethnic minority children.

In addition, as this study was not longitudinal, conclusions cannot be drawn as to the developmental trajectories of children’s adjustment. Replication of this study including a longitudinal component will be necessary in order to assess change and continuity in children’s adjustment. The examination of the adolescent period would indicate whether the processes seen in middle childhood continue through adolescence. For example, will the favourable adjustment found for children of traditional parents still hold in adolescence, or do conflicts in cultural identity become more salient as children gain more independence? This may be especially salient for girls, as the differences in the rights and position that females possess in the Indian and British cultures are substantial and may be a major source of conflict (Ghuman, 1999, 2003).

Summary and conclusions

This investigation of behavioural problems of ethnic minority and majority children revealed that, according to parents’ reports, Indian children exhibited higher levels of internalising problems than did their English peers. However, children in both groups did not differ in the levels of externalising and total problem behaviour they exhibited. Furthermore, no differences between children in both groups were revealed when using teachers’ reports of children’s problem behaviour. This suggests that, overall, Indian children are relatively well-adjusted in Britain, but that more attention should be given to internalising symptoms.

Although these are important findings, this investigation has also shown that variation within the Indian group must also be considered. The findings clearly demonstrate that although Indian families have all gone through an immigration process, their psychological adaptation is variable. Living in a more traditional home and with a parent who uses the Indian language to a greater extent was related to better adjustment. These results support the necessity of preserving the native culture and language for immigrants. Finally, the current research reveals that the process and consequences of acculturation may be different across home versus school settings. The implication here is that researchers must be sensitive to possible differences in acculturation processes and patterns across different contexts and in different life domains (cf. Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2003), and need to conduct studies in more than a single life domain in order to capture a veridical account of the actual lives and experiences of minority children.
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