Pre-print AUTHOR VERSION
Please cite as:
Haan, M. de (2011) The reconstruction of parenting after migration: A perspective from cultural translation. *Human Development*, 54 (6), 349-367.

The reconstruction of parenting after migration: A perspective from cultural translation

Mariëtte de Haan
Utrecht University The Netherlands

Short title: The reconstruction of parenting

Key words: Child rearing, parenting, migration, acculturation, cultural translation

Corresponding author:
Mariëtte de Haan
Utrecht University
Heidelberglaan 1
308 TC Utrecht
The Netherlands
31 (0)30-2537735
M.dehaan@uu.nl

Abstract

Migration induces complex processes of human transformation that are usually not reflected in theories that describe these changes. In most theories regarding these transformations, the implicit assumption is that immigrants undergo a transition to the culture of the mainstream population according to a modernization perspective. Based on a review of the literature as well as through illustrations with empirical data, it is argued that current conceptualizations, such as acculturation, cannot capture the complexities of the transformations that take place when multiple cultural traditions come into contact with each other. In this paper, alternative models of understanding the cultural complexities in migration settings are proposed with a focus on how these apply to child rearing practices.

Contemporary visions of how to understand social life are increasingly based on the idea of mobility, the circulation of flows and connectivity, as opposed to a view regarding life as stationary, with stable structures. Nevertheless, studies of migration seem to stay behind in this respect, as they continue to conceptualize migration as a linear movement from place A to B (Castle, 1010; Diminescu, 2008). This bias seems to be reflected in how the social, human and cultural processes of transformation associated with migration are conceived as these transformations likewise continue to be conceptualized basically as a transformation from culture A to culture B. However, such a view cannot account for the cultural complexities and dynamics characteristic of migration settings, or of cultural change in general (Hannerz, 1992; Hermans & Kempen, 1998).

One social domain heavily impacted by migration is child rearing. Caregiver arrangements and family systems tend to react strongly when confronted with new cultural and social systems. "Old" systems of child care do not function readily in "new" circumstances which can be seen as problematic but also as proof to the vitality and transformative potential of these systems. This transformative potential, as I will argue here, is misrepresented in most theories on child rearing in migration settings. The implicit idea is that transformation in child rearing equals a gradual development from culture A (the 'old' culture or the one that is 'brought along') to culture B (the host or the 'new' culture). Here, I will elaborate an alternative conceptual framework on how to understand transformations in migration based on the idea of cultural translation. I will do so while focusing on the cultural practice of child rearing in migration.

In current conceptualizations, length of stay and number of generations born in the new country are often seen as indicators of a gradual change towards mainstream practices and values. This is the case despite the extensive debate about how acculturation, the concept often used to explain such transformations, is specific to certain groups and practices (Berry, 1980; Kwak & Berry, 2001), and that contextual factors in the formation of parenting processes after migration are ignored (Perreira, Chapman, & Stein, 2006). Although it is acknowledged that acculturation varies in each ethnic group, studies continue to describe acculturation as something that can be measured along two dimensions. In these theories, the degree to which migrants hold on to the country of origin (or stay 'the same') is set against the degree to which they seek contact with the host culture (or transform into the cultural system of the other) even if these are not seen as mutually exclusive (Bornstein & Cote, 2004; Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Transformation in this case is seen as a matter of degree of adaptation or distantiation from an otherwise static and closed system. Moreover, the interactivity between cultural systems such as the home culture and the host culture, and how this can play a role in these transformative processes is not acknowledged.

In this journal, Bhatia & Ram (2001) have argued that these theories of acculturation, while focusing on universal psychological experiences related to the migratory processes, continue to view cultures as having sharp boundaries and fail to explain the cultural complexities that characterize a globalized world in which cultures merge and are re-invented in new "contact zones." In line with this critique, my aim here is to consider alternatives for the acculturation paradigm in particular in the area of child

raising practices. By starting from the basic proposition in socio-cultural theory that individual development and culture co-define each other, and borrowing from recent reformulations on culture and identity from Cultural Studies and Anthropology, I will argue that the outcome of these transformative processes in child rearing is impacted by the particular confrontations between specific cultural practices. Instead of the linear model of transformation currently utilized in much of the research on how immigrant child rearing practices develop after migration, I propose to instead use "cultural translation" as a model (Papastergiadis, 2000) by taking into account the history of confrontations between different cultural systems as well as the fact that translation involves qualitative changes for both systems.

Below, this position is elaborated further through an analysis of how transitions are conceptualized in the literature. First, I will focus on explanatory concepts that aim to explain change or transformation in migration settings. Then, I will review the literature on child rearing practices in migration while also evaluating the usefulness of these explanatory concepts to understand the empirical work described in the literature. Finally, I will illustrate my position through a study of 28 first generation, "non-Western" immigrant parents in the Netherlands who were interviewed about how they perceive their roles as parents since their migration.

Conceptualizing transitions in migration settings: from assimilation to cultural translation

Although the idea that the transformations immigrants experience after migration should primarily be conceptualized in terms of a gradual adaptation to the newly encountered cultural system is still the dominant paradigm in studies of migration, this idea is at the same time seriously challenged. Research has shown that length of residence does not always lead to a smoother integration into the mainstream culture. This is sometimes referred to as the immigrant paradox (Suárez-Orozco, Rhodes, & Milburn, 2009). Contrary to the idea that more time in the host country leads to a better adaptation to the new culture and to more well being, immigrants seem to show less 'adaptive' behavior over time. Adaptive here means accommodating culturally to the host culture while also experiencing more wellbeing and doing better in terms of, for instance, language skills or academic performance. For example, Suàrez-Orozco & Suàrez-Orozco (2001) show that, for Latino immigrants, length of residency in the United States is associated with declining health, school achievement and aspirations. They also report, from a National Research Council study, that although immigrant children were initially healthier than native born American children, their physical and psychological health deteriorated as they stayed longer. Likewise, Rumbaut (1995) reports that length of stay in the United States corresponds positively with language skills but negatively with academic achievement and aspirations. A similar effect can be observed for the changes ascribed to "generation." The idea that each subsequent generation will better accommodate to the mainstream culture does not seem to be supported by research. For instance, Portes and Zhou's (1993) study shows that each generation forms a different "ethic", or general attitude towards schooling and upward mobility. Whereas first generation Latino families in the US have a strong ideology of upward mobility through schooling, the second generation's ideology is much more diverse and dependent on their

ideologies with respect to upward mobility. These ideologies are framed, amongst other things, in terms of how they situate themselves relative to the mainstream group. These studies warn us that changes in situations of migration cannot simply be captured as a process that always moves in the same direction, that is, towards a better adaptation to mainstream culture which eventually also leads to more wellbeing. Instead, over time, the course of change can be varied depending, for instance, on the particular relationship with the mainstream culture.

Furthermore, another problematic aspect of how change is described is that the cultural systems that are confronted seem to stay largely "in tact" and are not fundamentally impacted by their confrontation. The influential work of Berry, most frequently used in psychology-oriented studies on migration, provides perhaps the clearest example of this stance. Berry used the term acculturation to describe the process that results from the first-hand contact that mutually affects individuals and groups from different cultural backgrounds (Berry et al., 1986). Acculturation describes how immigrants adapt socially, psychologically and academically to their "new" societies. Berry designed a typology representing both the extent to which immigrants want to participate in the new culture as well as the extent to which they are ready to give up their old culture. This taxonomy distinguishes between assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization. In this model, immigrants can either "become like" the mainstream culture or hold on to their old culture in varying degrees.

Newer notions that describe how immigrants deal with the divergence between their own traditions and those of the host country including Berry's more recent work, acknowledge the complexity of this process by referring to a) the fact that immigrants can both hold on to certain aspect of their culture and at the same time adopt new values and practices (Gibson, 1987; Joe, 1994; Kwak & Berry, 2001; Suàrez-Orozco & Suàrez-Orozco, 2001), b) by stating that acculturation is multivariate and modular (Bornstein & Cote, 2004) and c) by stating that acculturation can develop at a different rate and to different degrees for different domains of acculturation depending on the nature of the contact with mainstream cultures.

Still, what is still lacking in these newer perspectives is a model that can explain that the confrontation between cultural systems can also induce the formation of new practices that are qualitatively different from the ones that previously existed. These qualitative changes cannot be understood in terms of more or less, in term of process speed nor in terms of processes that are uni linear and have a pre-defined 'end stage'.

Instead of a concept of change that is linear and considers parenting practices as part of a dichotomous model with static underlying categories, a different conceptualization of how parenting develops in migration is needed. In order to capture the process of confrontation between communities and traditions while also considering the fact that traditions might develop into qualitatively different practices and experiences, we need to look at conceptualizations that can explain these more complex dynamics of change. In my attempt to provide such a perspective, I base myself on the following theoretical notions which can not just be applied to transition processes of parenting, but speak to the nature of human and cultural development in general. I believe that these more general notions are insightful to understand child rearing processes that happen in settings in which there is pressure for change. Moreover, they help us to think

about change in cultural environments that are characterized by multiple, different cultural traditions, as is typical for migration settings.
a) a conceptualization of change as "cultural translation," which conceives of the process of confrontation between cultural systems as involving a qualitative change of these systems themselves,
b) a view of cultural identities as hybrid in nature, and
c) recent reformulations of the nature of culture in which difference is defined as the accumulating effects of the various meeting points between the cultural traditions.

The idea that origins and influences on identities are multiple, complex and contradictory can be found in the work of authors such as Bhabha (1994) and Hall (1997). Given that the self is formed *in* the process of interaction with others, and that multiple forces operate together in the formation of this new identity identities are necessarily multiple and hybrid in nature. Identities or productions of culture reflect their former encounters and shared constructions, which then become the key sites of production of identity and culture (Mannheim & Tedlock, 1995).

In this view every notion of identity refers back to the lived encounters in which these notions were articulated, analogous to the Bakhtinian view that 'each word tastes of the dialogical encounters in which it has lived its socially charged life' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 293). The precise form of these newly formed 'hybrids' will be determined by the specific nature of these encounters. This perspective contradicts essentialistic perspectives on identity and points to the flow of the ongoing process of identity formation. It leads to an understanding of the self and the other as multiple, and as being composed of a history of encounters with others.

In addition to the concept of hybridity, which speaks primarily to the nature of identity and culture, it is important to consider the process of confrontation between different cultural spheres to understand how immigrant parenting transforms in migration settings.

I would like to propose the notion of cultural translation, as used by Papastergiadis (2000), to address this issue, as it is particularly helpful to understand what happens when cultures of different origin meet and develop. I see this notion as a further elaboration of how hybrid identities are formed and how 'original' meanings are transformed when they are confronted with others.

The idea of 'cultural translation' solves the tension between two views on language translation. On the one hand is the idea that the most intimate ideas in one language can never be expressed in another language. On the other hand is the notion that meanings are universal and that therefore corresponding meanings between different languages can be found. In the first option, translation is impossible, in the second it is possible and unproblematic. The idea of cultural translation that is adopted here is one in which translation is possible but it is considered problematic, that is, translation cannot happen without changing the original meaning. In fact in every act of translation the original meanings are changed. Cultural translation is seen "neither as the appropriation of a foreign culture according to the rules of one's own culture (where the original is treated as an inferior source that needs correction), nor as a reproduction which totally reflects the world view of the other (where the aim of the translation is to be identical with the original), but rather as a dynamic interaction within which conceptual

boundaries are expanded and residual differences respected" (Papastergiadis, 2000, p. 131).

I think both the concept of hybridization and cultural translation shed light on the processes of transformation in migration settings. They are able to explain why immigrant practices do *not* always develop according to mainstream practices, that immigrants sometimes seem to become more 'traditional' and develop new solutions which result from the tension of having to live in between contradicting traditions. When considering these solutions as the result of processes of translation between two or more practices in which the original systems change, it becomes possible to understand why immigrant practices are neither like those of the country of origin, nor like that of the mainstream culture, and develop according to a separate, situated dynamic.

In addition, the idea of translation is in line with newer conceptualizations of culture. According to these views, in order to understand a particular phenomenon as 'cultural', it is understood in terms of its 'travel' relations in stead of linking that phenomenon back to the place of origin. It is through the linkage of different social spaces and the travel through these that the nature of the cultural can be captured (Hannerz, 1992), see also (de Haan & Leander, in press).

This notion is particularly useful for understanding the social dynamics of migration-determined settings. For instance, when analyzing the authoritarian attitudes of recent immigrated parents, it makes more sense to look at the interaction between the disciplinary practices brought along and the ones encountered in the new country in stead of just looking at the disciplinary practices in their homelands. It is in the 'in between' the here and now and the then and there that differences are formed and articulated. It is by studying these confrontations and processes of cultural translation that the cultural nature of the practices of recent immigrant communities can be understood.

"Transformation" in studies of child rearing as related to migration: a review of the literature

How is immigrant parenting described in the literature? And how are changes over time conceptualized? Here I will review the literature on immigrant parenting with a particular interest in how processes of transformation after migration are (implicitly) theorized in these studies. I will also highlight which concepts are in particular useful for understanding the phenomena described in these studies.

Cultural distance in parenting traditions as input for losing control

To begin with, the literature on immigrant parenting has traditionally stressed the problematic side of parenting in migration settings. Pointing to contrasting parenting traditions between the immigrant group's country of origin and the host country, studies have focused on parents' experienced stress, their loss of status, and their inability to be develop effective parenting strategies in the new setting. These contrasting parenting traditions and their negative consequences have been documented for many different immigrant populations in Western countries (Kibria, 1993; Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Sims

& Omaji, 1999; Suàrez-Orozco & Suàrez-Orozco, 2001; Roer-Strier, Strier, Este, Shimoni, & Clark, 2005; Perreira, Chapman, & Stein, 2006). An example of such a contrast that is widely documented is the difference in disciplining practices of immigrants and those of the new country. For instance, Suàrez-Orozco & Suàrez-Orozco (2001) report that Latino immigrants practice more severe punishing methods (e.g., withholding meals, spanking) in comparison to American middle class norms. Also, they report that immigrant parents take a critical stance towards these middle class norms, as they find that American schools lacking in discipline. Likewise, Sims & Omaji (1999) show how immigrant parents of African descent in Australia experience a contrast between their own disciplining practices, in which physical punishment is important, and the Australian setting, in which this practice is seen as child abuse. Similar differences have been found for other Mexican immigrant communities in the United States (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994) and also for Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands (Pels & de Haan, 1996). The cultural distances described in these studies are often seen as the reason for stagnation in parenting practices, as evident in the loss of power positions in the family or the inability to find appropriate solutions in the new setting.

Transitions to the "modern" model?

However, many studies also report that parenting after migration changes form. In most of this literature, the transformation to new forms of parenting is associated with a change from a "traditional" or "pre-modern" model of parenting to a "modern" model of childhood.

By a modern model of childhood, I am referring to the concept of childhood that gradually developed in Western countries in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as described by authors such as Stearns (2006), Le Vine (2003) and Koops (2003). Without necessarily retaining a concept of modernization that presumes that all non-Western countries will follow what was developed in the West, these authors describe the rise of the modern model of childhood. The rise of this model has its base in economic and social developments, such as decreasing family size and increasing investment in children's education through formal schooling, as well as in the principles that children's development should be carefully crafted by adults and that children should be released from work and adult responsibilities. Overall, this model sets childhood apart from adulthood, shifts the care and training from parents to professional caregivers and provides children with life trajectories outside of their parents' scope, which has tremendous consequences for the position of children and the investments made in their development by caregivers. For instance, one consequence is related to the authority relations between parents and children. In the traditional model, obedience and interdependency guarantee the family loyalty of the child; in the modern (urban) setting, egalitarian relationships and independency of the child are more adaptive (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005).

Studies that describe the parenting practices of immigrants who immigrate from non-Western to Western-oriented communities have reported that, after migration, support relations in the family are reorganized, and become more geared towards child support rather than towards dependence and mutuality between the generations. Delgado-

Gaitan (1994), for instance, reports that, for Mexican families who migrated to the United States, independence, a value associated with the American school context and middle class parenting, became more important as a socialization goal in the American context at the cost of traditional values of mutuality and dependence. Parents started to invest more in the development of their children, which fundamentally changed the relationships between generations in the family. Along with these changes, the communicative roles assigned to children started to change in the post-migration setting. As a consequence of the contradictions between the communicative roles expected from children in Mexico and in the United States, children were challenged and allowed to take on different attitudes towards adults. Where respect for elders was valued in the Mexican culture, children in the United States were expected to confront parents and teachers through arguing and reasoning, thus taking an independent stance towards adults. Reese (2002) reports that Mexican immigrant families in the United States were more consciously involved in parenting compared to families in Mexico. After migration, they started to invest more consciously in organizing their children's lives in order to promote positive developments; for instance, they facilitated their children's participation in organized sports or other educational leisure activities. Similar effects have been found by Perreira et al. (2006) for Latino immigrant parents coming to the United States. Likewise, Dutch studies have shown that after migration, the position of children, the relationships between adults and children and the disciplinary practices started to change. For instance, studies on Moroccan parents (Pels, 1998; Pels & Haan, 2006) have shown that younger generations of Moroccan immigrant parents started to use more authoritative techniques in comparison to the older generations. Instead of using discipline based on the direct exertion of power commonly practiced by the older generation, the newer generation started to set rules and negotiate with children in line with the practices of Dutch middle class families. Sims & Omaji (1999) found similar effects for recent immigrants from Africa who adjusted their disciplining according to the norms of the Australian society.

The migration setting as a catalyst of change

However, some of the same studies show how changes are more complex than a simple assimilation with modernized parenting or a continuation of traditional parenting. On the one hand, it is shown that the outcome of being confronted with modernized forms of parenting does not always result in a smooth process of adoption. A study by Pribilsky (2004) is a good example of how, in migration, particular versions of childhood and parenting are developed that do not resemble mainstream practices. The study describes how, after the migration of fathers from Ecuador to the United States, childhood in the Ecuadorian Andes starts to look different. Children are able to go school, no longer need to take part in agricultural work and are provided with all kinds of consumption goods. Parenting also changes in the sense that, instead of being strict and demanding respect, fathers start to value personal involvement with their children's lives and start to tune into their individual needs and identities. However, the new childhood that is evolving is also marked by contrasting worlds, the absence of their fathers, and by navigating between the obligations that belong to both kinds of childhood. Apart from having to cope with long periods of their fathers' absence and more time on their own, they have to deal with their parents' high expectations regarding their school success and

the loss of status that comes from only partially being involved in communal responsibilities. The particular version of modern childhood that is developing in this setting is clearly marked by being confronted with both childhood models and the uncertainty for children that this produces. Thus, as this study shows, 'modern' childhood that develops in this migration area is not a copy of childhood as it is practiced in Canada, to which the fathers have access, nor resembles traditional Ecuadorian childhood in the Andes region. The changes that childhood goes through in this migration area is defined by being in touch with both kinds of childhood and the compromises and interpretations that are made by both children and parents to cope with the contradictions and contrasts between them. Compare the studies by Sims & Omaji (1999) and Roer-Strier et al. (2005), which also show how new parenting practices were not copies of mainstream practices but rather were born out of the tension between the new and the old parenting practices.

On the other hand, studies have shown that what seems to be a continuation of traditional parenting is in fact a reaction to being confronted with a (culturally) different environment. In a comparative study between immigrant Latino Families in the Los Angeles area and their relatives in Mexico, Reese (2002) found that immigrant parents kept their children under tight control and were extremely vigilant in monitoring their children's friendships and free time activities compared to the Mexican parents, who granted their children more freedom. Parents found these measures necessary as they experienced the neighborhoods they were living in as highly unsafe. In the same vein, Bacallao & Smokowski (2007) found that both first generation Mexican immigrant parents and their children in the United States perceived that parental discipline had become more severe after migration, often causing conflict between adolescents and their parents. Both studies show that severe discipline and vigilance is not a continuation of traditional parenting practices from the home country, but is clearly a response to the new setting which demands new strategies of child rearing. See also the studies by Pels (Pels, 1998; Pels & Haan, 2006), which show that a return to traditional religious education by Moroccan immigrant parents is a response to their new environment rather than a continuation of old practices.

Other studies have more explicitly paid attention to how new hybrid parenting practices develop from living in between different cultural practices of parenting. Kağitçibaşi (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005) has shown how, contrary to what is expected according to a modernization paradigm, new family models develop through the confrontation of different parenting models in trans-local migratory settings. She demonstrates that, under the influence of urbanization, family models have not developed from interdependent, collectivistic, obedience-oriented child rearing to independent, individualistic, autonomous and self-reliance-oriented child rearing. Instead, material interdependencies in the family decreased in the urban setting, but the emotional and psychological interdependency remained. In this hybrid model, autonomy of the child is combined with closely knit family ties. The child's autonomy is fostered without giving up on family interdependency. Kibria (1993) shows how Vietnamese immigrant families in the United States struggle with being in between the Vietnamese and American cultural spheres and finally are able to develop new strategies in which they combine elements of both. She describes how Vietnamese families found the traditional, cooperative and patriarchal family system to be an effective means to run small

businesses, which helped them survive economically. However, as adolescents expressed a growing discontent with the hierarchical aspect of this traditional family model, at the same time the model was challenged, and bended towards more egalitarian parent-child relationships.

These studies challenge a model of change based on a gradual move towards the mainstream culture or one based on a balance between retaining the old values versus adopting the new. The instabilities and complex reconfigurations found in these studies require a different approach to capture the processes that result from living "in between" traditions.

Changes in immigrant parenting: a study on how immigrant parents reflect on transformations.

Below I will present the results of a study that focused on how immigrant parents experience their parenting over time and if they had noted important changes or reorientations. The study illustrates of the position defended in this paper, namely that transitions in parenting should be seen as of a set of translations between particular cultural practices, the results of which differ, depending on their specific history.

Background and methodology

The study is part of a larger project aimed at understanding how diversity shapes education in multi-ethnic schools (NWO-411-21-003 (de Haan & Elbers, 2005a; de Haan & Elbers, 2005b). The researchers established a long-term relationship with a multi-ethnic school in one of the big cities in the Netherlands and were participant-observers in classrooms and teacher-parent meetings from 1999 through 2004. For the present study, an in-depth interview was conducted in 2003 and 2004 during home visits involving 28 immigrant families that had at least one child in the seventh or eighth grade.

The sample consists of immigrant parents, mostly from Morocco (67.9 % of the mothers, 60.7 % of the fathers, N = 28), while the rest of the sample has diverse countries of origin, including Angola, Aruba, China, Curaçao, Ghana, Kurdistan, Malaysia , Pakistan, Thailand and Turkey. All parents except one were born in these respective countries. Most parents started families as a migrant in the Netherlands but they can be considered experienced caregivers as siblings given the on average large family size in their birth countries (SCP, 2005). The parents in our sample migrated to the Netherlands in their early twenties and were at the time of the interview on average 45 years (fathers) and 41 years (mothers) old. A large part of the parents was unemployed (fathers 41 % and mothers 70%) and had a limited schooling record which is not uncommon for the first generation labor immigrants from 'non-Western' countries that came to the Netherlands in this same time period, that is in the early eighties (SCP, 2005). The sample consisted of the parents of the two highest grades of the primary school in our research which means that all of them had a child between 10 to 12 years old.

Despite differences between these varied cultural backgrounds, the parents shared the fact that, in their country of origin, they all had been relatively removed from the child-centered parenting practices associated with Western middle class milieus. To illustrate this point for the Moroccan parents, traditional child raising practices in the rural area

'The Rif' were most of these parents come from, are documented as in some ways distant from the typical modern childhood described earlier, see Pels & Haan (2006). For instance, childhood is not so much 'designed' for the benefit of the child's development but is lived more integrated with adult life. Moreover, children are raised in multiple social networks in stead of only in the nuclear family so that children have usually multiple caregivers, although there is a strong gender segregation. Child rearing beliefs, heavily inspired by Islam, often center around the moral obligation to comply with the social order. For instance, the concept of 'aql', inspired by Islam which means both 'mind' and 'social responsibility', is a leading concept for the child's development. It refers to the child's ability to control his impulses and show social sense. Conformity with the social order, and respect for older people who are supposed to guide the child along the right path is more central than, for instance, individual growth, a value central in middle class parenting. The parents all lived in the urban neighborhood in which the school was located and were through this neighborhood confronted with multiple ethnic groups, including native Dutch inhabitants. This urban, multi-ethnic setting was to most of them a rather big change compared to the mostly rural, ethnically more homogenous settings they came from. The interview focused on how parents experienced their role as educators, what possible transformations their parenting had undergone since migration and how they viewed their own parenting with respect to other parenting practices, leaving the definition of "other" intentionally open. Most parents were able to speak sufficient Dutch to participate in the interview, but, in a few cases, it was necessary to hire an interpreter or ask an older sibling to assist us with the translation. All the interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and analyzed using MAXqda2 software. The analysis was based on interpretative interview analysis methodologies (Kvale, 1996; Perreira et al., 2006), although some outcomes of this analysis were quantified. The coding was performed by the author with help of a research assistant. As a first step, recurrent themes were identified while comparing and contrasting experiences of the participants. Further, typologies were developed that were first double coded by both the author and the research assistant on a sample of four interviews and compared until full agreement was reached. Apart from the relationships between the individual interviews to assess the representation of certain themes for the group as a whole, we paid attention to how the coding affected the story line of each interview by making extensive summaries per interview in which interpretative work prevailed. By going back and forth between individual codes and entire interviews, which was facilitated by MAXqda, the process of analysis and reporting was contextualized within the interview as a whole.

Results

When asked if they had to re-direct their parenting over the course of time, almost all the parents indicated some process of change in their role as a parent over time (96.4%, N=27, 1 missing). Of this group 83,3% reports a 'conscious' process of change, while 16,7% was derived from what parents said about change during the interview by the analyst. As this result in itself might not be specific to being a migrant parent, we paid attention to the quality of these changes and if they could be deemed specific to the situation of immigrants. One issue addressed was if the parents perceived differences between their own parenting and other child rearing practices, such as those of other

parents, the school or parenting in the Dutch society in general. We did not specify beforehand what was meant by "other" practices in order to see what practices they would mention spontaneously when identifying these differences. Parents predominantly described the differences between the parenting in their own community and "Dutch" parenting. In some cases they also distinguished between the parenting in the migrant community and that in the homeland community. Not all parents reflected extensively upon the differences experienced, and I based the analysis on those instances where parents made a clear point in this respect (16 out of 28 cases). In terms of the thematic categories that were mentioned, it was possible to distinguish between five different domains of parenting that the immigrant parents experienced as different from their own parenting and that were so to speak confronted with each other during the interview. More than one response per respondent was possible although most of the interviews focused on a limited number of domains. These were 1) discipline (7 times), 2) monitoring (2 times), 3) child support (7 times), 4) adult-child relationships (4 times) and 5) promoting independence (2). These differences were also discussed in terms of how they were acted upon, as in most cases the distance between these parenting practices was experienced as a challenge that somehow needed to be addressed. Increased monitoring (9 times) and increased investment in child support (15 times) were mentioned most when parents were asked what they needed to change over the course of their parenting since their migration.

For the purpose of this paper, I will elaborate on how cultural translation functions as an analytical model to understand the confrontation between the different parenting practices that were mentioned in these thematic areas. I will select two parenting domains here that were often mentioned in these interviews and that were also often mentioned as being different between the old setting and the new one, namely disciplining as related to authority relationships and monitoring of the child as related to child support. Two cases are selected to illustrate how cultural translation can serve as a leading principle for the analysis but also to show the process and outcome can be different depending on the practices involved and on how parents act during this process.

I will pay attention to the following questions as far as they can be derived from the discourses of these immigrant parents, see also table 1 in which the answers to these questions are summarized.

- What parenting practices were confronted?
- What actors are evoked in the process of translation and how are these actors linked to these practices? What can be said about the positions of the actors?
- How can the process of translation be described? Are both systems involved in the translation brought under tension? How? Are the boundaries of both stretched? How?
- How is the migrant parenting practice changed by the confrontation? What is the impact or the result of the translation?

Confronting two disciplining practices: 'an impasse'

When parents mentioned discipline as an area of difference, without exception they characterized discipline as being stricter in their homeland compared to disciplining practices they had come across in the Netherlands in which children are given more freedom. This issue seems to be related directly to the issue of authority relationships in

the sense that the authority of the parent was often more strict and unquestioned in the country of origin, whereas parents felt that authority figures in the Netherlands were often, unjustly, challenged by children. But how do parents navigate between these different regimes of disciplining? What does this mean for their own parenting? The following example of a Moroccan father demonstrates how two different models of discipline and authority relations were confronted. Although every case is particular, this case is illustrative for the process most parents go through when they confront so called indirect disciplining practices coming from more strict, direct disciplinary traditions.

Excerpt 1: Moroccan father on the impossibility to reconstruct traditional disciplining measures in the Netherlands, 2095-2112.

F:	1) Is heel anders (...) een kind bijvoorbeeld heeft iets gedaan verkeerd op straat gedaan of iets heeft gestolen van een winkel of iets	F:	1) Is very different (…) a child, for instance, has done something wrong on the street or has stolen something from a store or something.
I:	2) Hmm hmm	I:	2) Hmm hmm.
F:	3) Komt kind naar huis krijgt een klap van ouders of zo, weet je	F:	3) The child comes home and gets spanked by the parents or so, you know.
I:	4) Hmm hmm.	I:	4) Hmm hmm.
F:	5) Of ja, zeg maar een hele, hele zware straf.	F:	5) Or well, let's say, a very, very tough punishment.
I:	6) Hmm hmm	I:	6) Hmm hmm.
F:	7) Dat mag niet, dat mag niet van het wet , van de overheid	F:	7) That is not allowed by law, by the state.
I:	8) Nee	I:	8) No.
F:	9) Nee, dat vind ik heel jammer, ouders krij, krijgen ze daar heel weinig ehh, zeg maar ehh, macht over hun ki, over hun kinderen.	F:	9) No, I think that is very much a shame, parents get, get very little ehh, say ehh power over their chi, over their children.
I:	10) Hier?	I:	10) Here?
F:	11) Hier in Nederland.(..) Daarom is het ehh, daarom is het ehh, zoveel ehh, misgegaan	F:	11) Here in the Netherlands. ( ) That is why ehh, why ehh so many things went wrong.
I:	12) Maar wat zouden die ouders dan voor meer macht moeten hebben dan?	I:	12) But what kind of power should these parents then have then?
F:	13) Ehh, hun kinderen, ze moeten hun kinderen op hun manier op- opvoeden	F:	13) Ehh, they have to, they have to raise their children on their own way.
I:	14) Ja.	I:	14) Yes.
F:	15) Ja, op hun manier, op ons op op ons eigen manier opvoeden	F:	15)Yes. On their own way, raise them on our own, on our own way.
I:	16) Hmm hmm (.) maar ehh, maar dat, dat, dat kan dus hier niet blijkbaar?	I:	16) Hmm hmm (.) but ehh, so that, that is not possible here obviously?
F:	17) Dat kan, n-nee.	F:	17) That is not possible, no.

F = Father, I = interviewer

In this transcript, a Moroccan father starts out by explaining that discipline in the Moroccan culture is different from that in the Netherlands. He then gives the example of a boy who steals something from a store. In the home setting, the child would receive a severe punishment for this misbehavior (turn 5). However, Dutch authorities do not allow this (turn 7), as spanking is forbidden by law in the Netherlands. He continues to use this example to argue that this is precisely the reason "why things have gone wrong" in turn 11. With things that have gone wrong, he is likely referring to the problems with Moroccan youth, especially boys, whose misbehavior has lead to both increased police control as well as to setting up parental vigilance groups in the neighborhood. Immigrant parents do not have power over their children (turn 9), he claims, and therefore their parenting has become less effective. He claims that authorities should better not have interfered with traditional disciplinary practices (turn 15). In the interview, the father then

continues to explain me how Moroccan immigrant children had become aware of the norms in Dutch society, which are against harsh discipline, and that they confront their parents with these norms when they are punished according to traditional norms. He continues to explain me how children feel supported by the norms of disciplinary practices elsewhere in the Dutch society and how this has weakened the position of immigrant parents versus their own children. Overall, parents experienced a large distance between what they considered good disciplining and what they perceived as 'Dutch' disciplining. Dutch disciplining was sometimes criticized as 'soft', but parents also wondered how Dutch parents managed these in their eyes 'soft' measures effectively. As also evident from Excerpt 1, this situation leads to a vacuum or impasse in the domain of disciplining as parents felt that through the confrontation with Dutch disciplining practices, their own traditional practices had become less effective. In terms of cultural translation, this example shows how a traditional model of disciplining based on harsh punishment and strict authority relationships is confronted with a model of disciplining which is more based on reasoning, and less strict and hierarchical authority relationships between parents and children. In this case the first is associated by the parent with migrant practices and the second with the Dutch society or Dutch public authorities although the confrontation effectively happens between immigrant parents and their children. Of course these associations between parenting practices and to whom they are ascribed are not the only ones that are possible or accessible to this parent and the example is not meant to show or argue that they are necessary associated. It should be noted that this confrontation happens at the backdrop of many public and private discussions in, for instance, the Dutch media, the migrant community or even in scientific discourse on migrant parenting on how these two disciplinary practices relate. In his account on 'difference' and how he deals with it this father borrows from these sometimes stereotyped versions of parenting practices of both parties. What I want to focus on here, is that in this account, the result of the confrontation of these diverse parenting practices is neither a continuation of the traditional practice of disciplining, nor an adoption of the newly encountered one. Both practices have been changed by their translation into the framework of the other. The traditional harsh disciplining and strict authority relations have become instable through the confrontation with the more child-centered model that enter these immigrant families through their children. The 'Dutch' disciplinary model with its more child-centered approach was criticized by immigrant parents as 'soft' and doubt is raised on its effectiveness set against the normative frame of traditional disciplining. The disciplinary practice of immigrant parents that results from this confrontation is one that is informed with these contradictions, and, as is documented in a study by (Jonkers, 2003) on Moroccan immigrant mothers in the Netherlands, might lead to an eclectic practice in which both models are alternated and held in constant comparison. Finally, although the analysis focuses on the translation process of migrant parents and how they bring in these different cultural practices, in the Discussion Section I will argue that in a multi-cultural society the burden of translation is not just on the shoulders of immigrants. However, their position as immigrants no doubt also defines and limits their possibilities to, for instance, confront mainstream parenting in the public domain.

Confronting two support & monitoring traditions: a chance for bridging

In those cases where parents reported that the most important difference between their own parenting and that of others was how children were monitored, parents stated that, in the old country, monitoring was much more intensive as compared to the guest country. In particular, parents reported that there were more eyes and ears out on the street to keep an eye on their children and to keep them on their right path. Re-establishing the social control as they knew it in their home country was seen as difficult. It seemed that in the case of monitoring, what bothered parents, was that the kind of community that is needed to keep an eye on children in the public sphere was not re-established after migration. However, at the same time, parents also stated that they had shifted their parenting in the new county towards monitoring. This 'new' monitoring was presented as something they had developed in their parenting practices as a response to the needs they had encountered in the migration setting. The example I would like to elaborate makes clear how this 'new monitoring' grows out of the need to deal with the tension of living between two different parenting traditions.

Excerpt 2: A Moroccan mother's critique on mothers who do not go outside, 2288-2301.

M:	1) Ja omdat toch mensen gaan inzien van eh toch veel moeders gaan inzien van hoe ze hoe ze de kring hoe ze leven, de opvoeding die ze hebben die niet kloppen	M:	1) Yes, because people will see that eh, many mothers are becoming aware how they, how the circle in which they live, how they live, the child rearing that they have that is not right
I:	2) Hmm	I:	2) Hmm
M:	3) Want vrouwen die worden dan eh zeg maar binnen opgesloten	M:	3) Because, women are being ehh say locked inside
I:	4) Ja	I:	4) Yes
M:	5) En de mannen gaan naar buiten	M:	5) And the men go outside
I:	6) Hmm hmm	I:	6) Hmm hmm
M:	7) En de kinderen die gaan ook naar buiten en de kinderen gaan eigen gang en de moeders zien dat niet, omdat ze dus die vrijheid niet kunnen hebben om de kinderen te opvoeden, Want op 't kind hoor je controle te hebben en dat hebben zij niet, dat inzicht hebben zij niet.	M:	7) And the children, they also go outside, and the children do their own thing and the mothers are not aware of that, because they cannot have that freedom to raise their children. Because, you ought to have control over your children and they do not have that, that insight they do not have.

M = mother, I = Interviewer

In contrast to the example in Excerpt 1, the confrontation and translation between these traditions results in a monitoring practice that is defended as effective and as 'the right thing to do'. In this example, which starts in Excerpt 2 and continues in Excerpt 3, a Moroccan mother reflects on the problem that many Moroccan mothers try to keep their children at home in their attempts to monitor them, but that children nevertheless do not stay inside. In turn 1, she tells me that people start to see that their own child rearing practices are not "right" while she makes the connection between "their child rearing" and the "circle in which they live." She extends this argument by referring to the fact that women are locked up inside in the home (turn 3) while the men go outside (turn 5). The children, she states in turn 7, are also outside, and they do their own things. Mothers do not have the freedom to go outside, she states, referring most likely to a traditional norm in the Moroccan community that women are only granted limited access to the public sphere. She links this limited mobility of women directly to their possibilities to bring up their children and brings in another normative statement in turn 7 "You ought to have control over your child".

Excerpt 3: “Closeness for moral guidance” as a parenting strategy that bridges traditions, 2363-2397

M:	1) Dat is, soms meestal is dat niet goed gezien, zeg maar ze zien ’t verkeerd van oh die zit op slechte pad en dan heb ik zoiets van dat is niet waar, want als je, als je buiten komt en je controleert je kinderen, je weetwaar je kinderen naartoe zijn, of je gaat met die kinderen naar ??speeltuin of je gaat met je kinderen voetballen of je gaat met je kinderen fietsen of je gaat, dan ben je toch niet, dan ben je toch niet verkeerd bezig juist	M:	1) That is, sometimes most of the times (they) do not see things properly. Say, they see it wrong, like, oh, that one is on the wrong path and then I think that is not true, because if you, if you come outside and you control your children, you know where they have gone to, or you go with your children to the playground or you go play football with your children or you go biking or you go, then you are not, then you are not wrong,
I:	2) nee	I:	2) No.
M:	3) Je bent met je opvoeding bezig, je bent juist met je kind bezig, de aandacht aan je kinderen, dat je kinderen goed, goeie pad te brengen zo van je leert je kind wat slecht en wat niet goed is	M:	3) You are busy with upbringing, you are busy with your child, the attention for your children, that your children are right, bring (them) on the right path, like you know what is wrong and what is not right.
I:	4) Hmm hmm	I:	4) Hmm hmm.
M:	5) Dat doe je.	M:	5) That is what you do.
	(...)		(…)
M:	6) Ik vind ‘t, ik vind ‘t, nou, ik ???? ja, ik ken ook Nederlandse moeders, ik bedoel ??? Nederlandse opvoeding, Nederlandse opvoeding is ook niet altijd perfect, Nederlandse moeders doen ’t ook niet altijd goed	M:	6) I think, I think, well, I ????, yes, I also know Dutch mothers, I mean ??? Dutch parenting, Dutch parenting is also not always perfect. Dutch mothers do not always do things right.
I:	7) Hmm hmm	I:	7) Hmm hmm
M:	8) want ik, want eh je hebt een goede tussen, je hebt ook een slechte tussen, je hebt ook Ma, Nederlandse moeders die dan precies	M:	8) Because I, as eh, you have good ones, and you also have bad ones, you also have more..Dutch mothers who then precisely….
I:	9) ja	I:	9) yes
M:	10) die komen die zijn heel vrij, die komen buiten, maar over opvoeding is niet geïnteresseerd nee	M:	10) who come, who are very liberal, who come outside, but who are not interested in parenting, no.
M:	11) dat heb je wel, dat zie je ook wel	M:	11) That is something you also see.
I:	12) ja	I:	12) Yes.
M:	13) dus dat is niet alleen maar, eigenlijk ja, ik wil niet naar Nederlands gaan vergelijken, ik wil gewoon dat vrouwen zelf dingen kunnen doen	M:	13) So, it is not just, in fact, I do not want to compare with the Dutch, I just want that women can do things themselves.
I:	14) Hmm hmm.	I:	14) Hmm hmm.

M= Mother, I = Interviewer

At some point later in the same interview (see Excerpt 3), she continues the argument that close monitoring is necessary in the public sphere while she advocates a parenting style in which parents put children at the center of their attention, communicate with them and are responsive to their individual needs (turn 1). Interestingly, in turn 2, she links this child-centered discourse in which individual needs of children are key with guiding them on the right path, with teaching them what is good or bad. Being close to your child, and being informed about their needs is necessary in order to guide them morally, to show them the right path. This “closeness for moral guidance”, is, as I am arguing a clear hybrid of parenting practices that draws upon the parenting practices this mother has come across in the heterogeneous setting in which she lives. On the one hand it seems to draw upon a professional discourse on child rearing this mother had come across in her career as a para-professional. During the interview the mother told me that she had worked as a social worker in a Dutch welfare centre. During this time, she told me, she had learned a lot about parenting, and about the importance of tuning into the (developmental) needs of children as a parent, which points back to the modernistic

discourses on parenting mentioned in the introduction of this paper. On the other hand, this mother is in close contact with more traditional parenting practices, both through her contacts with her family in Morocco and through the older women she meets in the migrant neighborhood. As is documented in former research (Pels 1998; Pels & De Haan, 2006) the parenting practices of these parents are inspired by Islamic values. This research shows that while for native Dutch parents the individual development and the autonomy of their children are key values, for these parents moral guidance, and teaching the child her/his position in the social order are key values in child rearing.

In terms of cultural translation, a tension is created between various culturally different worlds and associated practices that seem incommensurable. On the one hand there is the need for women to stay home, and to stay within their own cultural world. On the other hand, there is the need to be responsive to your children's needs, irrespective of where they are. The mother's plea for "closeness in order to establish moral guidance" is a bridging strategy which seems to brake the law of both worlds. Borrowing from a liberal discourse, the traditional norm that women are granted limited access to the public sphere is challenged: women should be 'free' to educate their children (turn 13). But also the individualistic parenting which she associates with the Dutch society is criticized which is clear from turn 6 to 13 in Excerpt 3. When I ask her if she would see this strategy as Dutch or Moroccan, she explicitly distances herself from taking the Dutch parenting as the only example in turn 6 (Dutch parents are not perfect). Nor the Moroccan, nor the Dutch way is the perfect example. Neither of these is as such ready to inspire her search for the solutions to the problems she and other migrant parents are facing. As she states, some Dutch parents are even too liberal (turn 10); they do come out of their houses, but some are not good caregivers as they seem to have lost interest in care giving. Thus, the confrontation of both these traditions, and especially judging them from the framework of the other tradition, makes each of them instable, but also makes them ready to attach new meaning to them. It seems that the comparison and critique of both traditions provide her with a unique position to redefine her parenting as one that is both liberal *and* based on moral guidance.

Aspect of Cultural translation: / Example	**Moroccan Mother on Support & Monitoring**	**Moroccan Father on Disciplining & Authority relations**
What parenting practices were confronted?	- Collective caretaking that takes place in a confined place versus liberal individualized parenting in which the parent's action radius is undefined. - Guiding children to the right path versus tuning into children's individual needs	- Harsh punishment and strict authority relations versus a children's right discourse

Who is involved? How does the person involved situated him/herself?	Immigrant mother who situates herself between (the discourses of) traditional immigrant mothers and Dutch welfare workers.	Immigrant father adopting a traditional discourse on disciplining and who situates himself in opposition to 'Dutch' parenting practices as represented by Moroccan immigrant youth.
How can the process of translation be described? How are both systems brought under tension? How are the boundaries of both stretched? How is the agency of the parent evident?	The mother criticizes both the traditional and the liberal position, but actively borrows elements from both position in order to solve a practical problem: how to guide your children on the right path in a new setting where children have more freedom as compared to the mothers.	The traditional disciplining practice is destabilized by the children's right discourse. The liberal 'Dutch' parenting is criticized as leaving children too much freedom. The confrontation of both practices leads the parent to hold on to 'his own' disciplining.
How is the migrant parenting practice changed by the confrontation? What is the impact or the result of the translation?	A new hybrid parenting is defended, namely close monitoring in order to guide children to the right path, in which elements from both traditions are visible.	There is an 'impasse', the parent feels that disciplinary practice is temporarily 'paralyzed' by the confrontation. The authority position of the father is challenged. This might lead to eclectic, exploratory parenting in which several models are alternated.

Table 1: Aspects of Cultural Translation applied to two cases

Discussion

How can alternative conceptualizations, such as cultural translation and hybridization, be effective tools to understand the parenting practices that evolve in migration settings? And, how is the study presented illustrative of the shortcomings of older models that build upon an assimilation paradigm in which a transition to modern childhood is implied?

As indicated in the introduction of this paper, the idea of cultural translation adopted here is one that sees the process of transformation in migration settings neither as the appropriation of the guest culture according to the frame of the culture that is brought along nor as the incorporation of the culture brought along into the frame of the guest culture. Through their confrontation, both frames are transformed so that their result is by definition not a perfect translation but basically a reformulation of both frames. Only when during the confrontation the boundaries of both frames are stretched, through, for instance, dialogue and negotiation of parties who represent either of the frames, new understandings can rise.

The new frame reflects the history of its translatory process, and thus, in a sense, "remembers" the old contradiction, so that a chain of translations is created characterized by their history of oppositions and reframings. At the same time, as both frames cannot

be fully understood in each others' terms, "residues" will remain. Residues are those parts that fall outside of the act of translation due to a lack of common language, rules or viewpoints to address the initial difference. For a more in depth discussion of residue, see Papastergiadis (2000, pp. 122-145), in particular the parts based on Maharaj (1994), who claims that translation is as much about making signs intelligible and transparent to the other as about producing difference. This difference is based on the idea of 'differend' by Lyotard (1988), who describes the residue as a conflict resulting from the lack of rules that are legitimate to the arguments of both parties. This residue may transform into an isolated space and through its tension, can form the energy for new confrontations and new translations.

As the examples from the study show, the parenting that is typical for migration can neither be explained by referring back to how things were back home nor by referring to those of mainstream parents in the new country. The outcome of this confrontation was specific to the various parenting practices, as it depended on the particular systems involved in the translation. Furthermore, both the case of the Moroccan father, who reflects on the impossibility of continuing his traditional disciplining practices, and the case of the Moroccan mother, who critiques traditional monitoring, are illustrative of the fact that the confrontation of old and new practices leads to a tension that results in the reconsideration of both of them. In the case of the Moroccan father, the traditional harsh discipline common in traditional Morocco is impacted by the confrontation of the child-centered parenting practices Moroccan youngsters encounter in Dutch social settings such as school or sport clubs. On the one side, the traditional harsh disciplining was challenged, when considered in the light of a discourse on children's right in which the power balance between parents and children is fundamentally different from that of the traditional model. On the other side, the (Dutch) liberal model, as perceived and judged by the Moroccan father, has become distorted too by the confrontation with the traditional model. At least for the immigrant parents in this study, it is seen as a disciplinary practice that does not enable social control and that leads to too much freedom for youth, which in turn leads youth to head down the "wrong path". Given that the disciplinary practices of these immigrant parents seem to be "on hold" as both systems cannot be translated into a new practice, this example illustrates the idea of a residue or temporary impasse. In this case, the relevant practices are represented by the immigrant parents on the one hand and the immigrant youth who are impacted by the Dutch values on the other hand, but of course this contradiction could have been acted out or represented by multiple alternative actors. The case of the Moroccan mother who criticizes other Moroccan mothers that stay inside also illustrates a process of confrontation between two divergent models. As in the case of the disciplining example, both traditions of monitoring are impacted by their confrontation. On the one hand, her discourse reflects a traditional practice where mothers take care of their children collectively in a shared, confined and collective place. On the other hand, she draws on liberal discourse in which care taking is more individualized and in which mothers have more freedom to move. Seen from the traditional perspective, the liberal/individualized model can result in lack of care and disinterest. Seen from the liberal/individual perspective, the traditional model is dysfunctional as mothers do not have enough freedom to go outside and take care of their children. Thus, through their confrontation, neither of these stay the same. Moreover, this example also shows that new hybrid

models of parenting can grow out of these confrontations. The particular version of closeness this mother defends seems to bridge the morally inspired traditional parenting and modernized parenting practices in which the individual needs and development of children are the focus. Such a discourse on parenting, which was also echoed in other immigrant parents' accounts, is an example of how initially contradicting positions can result in workable solutions. In this particular case, its effectiveness rises from not losing touch with the immigrant parents' important moral grounding while also reaching out to the powerful and contagious ideology of child-centered parenting as well as from its translation into practical solutions (e.g., go out and search your children).

Returning to the modernization paradigm as described in the introduction of this paper, I would like to argue that instead of a pre-modern modern transition, what this material reveals is that the formation of new parenting practices is primarily defined by the simultaneous presence of both traditional and modern practices. Their simultaneous presence causes a constant tension, which provides a potential energy to create new solutions. This in between position has been associated in earlier work with the position of the exile or the migrant who, as a consequence of the distance between both the traditional *and* the modernized, provides the potential to reject and then reframe both (e.g. Braidotti, 1994). The case of the Moroccan mother clearly illustrates this position. Through rejecting both the Dutch *and* the traditional parenting, she is able to find a solution out of the impasse which many mothers apparently find themselves in. Thus, instead of a modernization paradigm in which the traditional gradually turns into the modern, what we see here is that qualitatively different traditions evolve out of their confrontation.

Although I think the model of cultural translation captures important elements of the transformation processes characteristic for migration settings, it primarily conceptualizes what happens when two different systems or practices are confronted. It does not focus so much on the role of the actors involved, their positions and on how these translations processes, and the meanings they draw upon, are also collectively produced. As was also evident from the analyses, these are important elements in the reconstruction of cultural processes in migration settings.

The role of agency: Through migration, parents are confronted with the need to redefine their parenting as their old practices are not supported anymore by the new environment. Parents may find that, given the particular circumstances in the migration setting, certain aspects of their parenting deserve more attention or that they wish to emphasize certain elements of their parenting more to foster particular outcomes. As the literature review has shown, parents stress particular aspects of parenting according to how they perceive the need to steer the development of their children in the new environment. Thus, what parenting practices look like in migration is not just the result of a series of meeting points between heterogeneous parenting practices and their transformative effects. New parenting practices are also defined by the directions that are chosen as well as newly experienced needs and problems.

Power relations, in particular minority-majority relations: These translational processes do not happen in a neutral space but almost always involve the confrontation of unequal positions. This aspect of meeting grounds and their transformative power has received

ample attention in the literature including in the work of Pratt (1992). She draws attention to the uneven encounters between the dominant and dominated culture, and the mechanisms of resistance and cultural survival that are developed by marginalized people. In work based on Gramsci, the argument is made that dominant or "hegemonic" cultures exercise power over the dominated or "subaltern" cultures by taking possession of certain themes of dominated cultures in an effort to legitimize the dominant culture as the normative one (see Aguirre Rojas, 2008). The lesson that can be learned from these perspectives is that in the translatory process, certain cultural themes receive more attention and become more dominant due to uneven power positions. For instance, in public discourses, the disciplinary practices of immigrants might receive an uneven amount of attention due to how these are negatively judged by mainstream populations from a perspective of child-centered parenting. However, although the analyses has focused on how migrants bring in different cultural systems and position them against each other, the burden of translation does not always lay entirely on the shoulders of the immigrant. Immigrant cultures can inspire to critique and reconsider mainstream cultures, as is, for instance, done in the work of Russel Peters, a Canadian immigrant and comedian who uses immigrant cultures to reconsider authority positions in middle class parenting. Or, to give another example from my own research practice, the morally inspired parenting of Moroccan immigrants has helped me see how Dutch parents are, through their focus on the self-reliance and self-discovery of children, unable or at least very reluctant to pass on morally based principles to their children.

Management of meaning by collectivities: As was already evident in the analysis of the example of the Moroccan father, the meanings that are the input of translatory processes are at least in part recruited from the wider public sphere, just like its output is again distributed to that wider public sphere. How meanings are interpreted in particular translations is not independent of this public distribution and the earlier interpretations and meanings given by others. Drawing on the idea of the distributive function of culture by Hannerz (1992), my claim is that the outcome of the confrontation of particular models is not automatic but instead constructed discursively in a field already loaded with meanings and interpretations. The interpretations given in the present bring about the possible range of interpretations of the future. Moreover, these meanings are socially distributed in that they happen through particular chains of encounters between people and objects throughout time. This means that these translational processes are socially channeled and actively organized in a fully charged semiotic space which calls for particular reactions to claims that are made earlier. In the example of the Moroccan father this is illustrated by the fact that he in his account on why "things had gone wrong" refers to a common knowledge he takes for granted in the interview, namely that the education of Moroccan youngsters has in some respects failed. This public notion asks for particular reactions and interpretations thus shaping the possible range of reactions on how traditional disciplining is positioned versus other child centered notions of disciplining.

Coming back to the questions asked at the beginning of this section, I believe that cultural translation does a better job in representing and analyzing the complexities of processes of change in migration as compared concepts such as assimilation or acculturation. Although the analysis becomes more complex, it does justice to reality of migration, or to any setting in which parents are confronted with contradicting parenting

traditions, in a number of ways. The innovative quality of using cultural translation as a conceptual grounding for the analyses of how change happen when people live in between traditions lays in that:

a) it acknowledges that change happens as a result of the particular confrontations of parenting traditions, and that it is therefore not possible to develop universal models that capture these changes thematically, e.g. from pre-modern to modern, or in terms of other pre-established categories such as those used by Berry. For instance, as an alternative to a vision in which parenting develops from pre-modern to modern, cultural translation allows us to judge and understand migrant parenting as the result of a coping with the tension between living in the traditional and modern simultaneously.

b) as the result of the translation is thus particular, using the idea of cultural translation helps understand why qualitatively different parenting practices develop which neither can be reduced to how things were back home, nor to the practices encountered in the new country. The particular hybrids that develop, should not be measured or described in the terminology of what was before, or what was the input of the translatory process, but instead seen and described as unique answers to the pressure of the contradictions that are faced.

Put in other words, I think cultural translation allows for a new vision on how to understand the process of becoming 'modern' when faced with practices associated with modern childhood. As Papastergiadis notices, this new modernity does not follow a clear path nor can its progress be plotted on to a lineair graph (p. 12). It can best be characterized as ongoing or transitional without a clear end goal. In conceptual terms, this means that, in stead of describing what is a modern childhood in terms of fixed conceptual categories, the potential categories are multiple and their nature is defined by the constant and simultaneous confrontations of heterogeneous categories. In practical terms this means that parenting processes in migration cannot be captured or measured with pre-defined research instruments, or that intervention programs for immigrant parents cannot be designed using standardized middle class parenting as the only input for their content. In stead researchers as well as practitioners should be open to take into account the new practices that immigrant parents are developing based on how they navigate between and translate seemingly incommensurable parenting practices in order to fit their own parenting needs. Qualitative, conceptually open methodologies are needed that study immigrant parenting practices as related to the multiple, heterogeneous spaces and social others these parents have access to.

This paper started by stating that migration induces complex processes of transformation that include all kinds of reactive processes between multiple cultural traditions which cannot be captured with the conceptual frameworks often used to interpret these processes such as acculturation or modernization perspectives. Both the literature review and the empirical study have given ample proof of these complexities. Through pointing at alternative ways of conceptualizing of these transformations, I hope to have contributed to understanding human transformative processes in migration, especially while considering how these transformations relate to the multiple socio-cultural worlds immigrants live in.

Acknowledgements
The empirical study was supported by the Dutch Program Council for Educational Research (PROO) of The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), project no. 411-21-003. I thank Eugene Matusov and Jaap Bos for their helpful input on previous drafts of the manuscript.

References

Aguirre Rojas, C. A. (2008). Popular culture and the teaching of history: A critical reflection. In D. Silberman-Keller, Z. Bekerman, H. A. Giroux & N. C. Burbules (Eds.), *Mirror images. popular culture and education* (pp. 199-214). New York: Peter Lang.

Bacallao, M., & Smokowski, P. R. (2007). The costs of getting ahead: Mexican family system changes after immigration. *Family Relations*, 56, 52-66.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson, M. Holquist Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Berry, J. W., Trimble, J. E., & Olmedo, E. L. (1986). Assessment of acculturation. In W. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 291-324). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking 'Acculturation' in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development*, 44, 1-18.

Bornstein, M. H., & Cote, L. R. (2004). Mothers' parenting cognitions in cultures of origin, acculturating cultures, and cultures of destination. *Child Development*, 75, 221–235.

Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Castles, S. (2010). Understanding global migration: A social transformation perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, 1565-1586.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Socializing young children in Mexican-American families: An intergenerational perspective. In P. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 55-86). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Diminescu, D. (2008). The connected migrant: An epistemological manifesto. *Social Science Information*, 47, 565-579.

Gibson, M. (1987). Punjabi immigrants in an American high school. In G. D. Spindler & L. S. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad* (pp. 274-281). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haan, M., de, & Elbers, E. (2005a). Peer tutoring in a multi-ethnic classroom in the Netherlands: A multi-perspective analysis of diversity. *Comparative Education Review*, 49, 365-388.

Haan, M., de, & Elbers, E. (2005b). Reshaping diversity in a local classroom: Communication and identity issues in multicultural schools in the Netherlands. *Language & Communication*, 25, 315-333.

Haan, M., de, & Leander, K. (to appear in Culture & Psychology). The construction of ethnic boundaries in classroom interaction through social space.

Hall, S. (1997). Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities. In A. King (Ed.), *Culture, globalization and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity* (pp. 31-68). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hannerz, U. (1992). Cultural complexity. Studies in the social organization of meaning. New York: Columbia University Press.
Hermans, H. J., & Kempen, H., J. G. (1998). Moving cultures. the perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*, 53(10), 1111-1120.
Joe, J. R. (1994). Revaluing Native-American concepts of development and education. In P. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross-cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 107-113). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Jonkers, M. (2003). Een miskende revolutie. het moederschap van marokkaanse vrouwen. (an unacknowledged revolution. motherhood amomg moroccan women). Amsterdam: Aksant.
Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three decade portrait from turkey. *Applied Psychology: International Review*, 54, 317-337.
Kibria, N. (1993). *Family tightrope. the changing lives of Vietnamese Americans.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Koops, W. (2003). Imaging childhood. In W. Koops, & M. Zuckerman (Eds.), *Beyond the century of the child. Cultural history and developmental psychology* (pp. 1-18). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews. an introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.
Kwak, K., & Berry, J. W. (2001). Generational differences in acculturation among Asian families in Canada: A comparison of Vietnamese, Korean, and East-Indian groups. *International Journal of Psychology*, 36, 152-162.
Le Vine, R. A. (2003). *Childhood socialization. Comparative studies of parenting, learning and educational change.* Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.
Lyotard, J. F. (1988). *The differend: Phrases in dispute [Le Diffe´rend]* (Georges Van Den Abbeele Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Maharaj, S. (1994). 'Perfidious fidelity: The untranslatability of the other'. In J. Fisher (Ed.), *Global visions: Towards a new internationalism in the visual arts* (pp. 28-35). London: Kala Press.
Mannheim, B., & Tedlock, D. (1995). Introduction. In D. Tedlock, & B. Mannheim (Eds.), *The dialogic emergence of culture* (pp. 1-1-32). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Papastergiadis, N. (2000). *The turbulence of migration: Globalization, de-territorialization and hybridity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Pels, T. (1998). *Opvoeding in marokkaanse gezinnen in nederland. De creatie van een nieuw bestaan* (child rearing in Moroccan families in the Netherlands. The creation of a new existence). Assen:Van Gorcum.
Pels, T., & Haan, M., de. (2006). Socialization practices of Moroccan families after migration: A reconstruction in an 'acculturative arena'. *Young*, 15, 69-87.
Perreira, K., M., Chapman, M. V., & Stein, G. L. (2006). Becoming an American parent: Overcoming challenges and finding strength in a new immigrant Latino community. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1383-1414.
Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals, AAPSS*, 530, 75-96.
Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. Londen:

Routledge.
Pribilsky, J. (2004). ‘Aprendemos a convivir’: Conjugal relations, co-parenting, and family life among Ecuadorian transnational migrants in New York City and the Ecuadorian Andes. *Global Networks*, 4, 313-312-334.
Reese, L. (2002). Parental strategies in contrasting cultural settings: Families in Mexico and "el norte". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 33, 30-59.
Rumbaut, R. (1995). The new Californians: Comparative research findings on the educational progress of immigrant children. In R. Rumbaut & R. Cornelus (Eds.), *California's immigrant children* (pp. 46-48). La Jolla, California: Center for the U.S.-Mexican Studies.
Roer-Strier, D., Strier, R., Este, D., Shimoni, R., & Clark, D. (2005). Fatherhood and immigration: Challenging the deficit theory. *Child & Family Social Work*, 10, 315-329.
Schwartz, S. J., Montgomery, M. J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, 49, 1-30.
SCP. (2005). Jaarrapport integratie 2005 (Year report Integration 2005). Den Haag: SCP.
Sims, M. R., & Omaji, A. K. (1999). Migration and parenting: A pilot study. *Journal of Family Studies*, 5, 84-96.
Stearns, P. N. (2006). *Childhood in world history*. New York: Routledge.
Suàrez-Orozco, C., & Suàrez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of migration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Suárez-Orozco, C., Rhodes, J., & Milburn, M. (2009). Unraveling the immigrant paradox: Academic engagement and disengagement among recently arrived immigrant youth. *Youth & Society*, 41, 151-185.