This article discusses influences of historical time and place on the development of children and youth of Asian descent in the U.S. Chinese, Indian, Hmong, and Filipino American experiences illustrate how history has defined race and racial stereotypes, determined cultural and community contexts, established pre-/post-migration circumstances, and influenced oppression and discrimination. Cross-cutting issues as applied to other ethnicities are discussed. By recognizing history’s reach on child development, this article intends to inspire others to acknowledge and consider historical influences in their work. It also lays a foundation for the two ensuing articles within this Special Section, which present a novel conceptual framework (Mistry et al., this volume) and methodological recommendations (Yoshikawa, Mistry, & Wang, this volume) for research.

Prominent developmental theorists have written about historical influences on children’s development (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Elder, 1998). Yet, when it comes to Asian Americans, the corpus of historical research has rarely made its way into the developmental literature. Instead, much of the developmental research on Asian Americans lacks attention to historical time and place. The goal of the present article is to highlight history’s importance to Asian American development, which we hope will drive richer conceptual models and empirical work in the field (e.g., Mistry et al., this volume; Yoshikawa, Mistry, & Wang, this volume). We merge perspectives from historical research, child development theory and research, and related social science studies of Asian American children and youth to examine how history shapes developmental contexts and processes.

Consistent with the other articles in this Special Section (Mistry et al., this volume; Yoshikawa et al., this volume), we consider Asian Americans as those individuals, children, and youth who reside in the United States whose ancestry stems from Asia (e.g., Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam). Our panethnic definition involves multilayered identities with vast heterogeneity and flexible boundaries across time and context (Okamoto, 2014). As described by Lowe (1991), we move forward assuming that Asian Americans are not any one entity: they are “born in the United States and born in Asia; of exclusively Asian parents and of mixed race; urban and rural; refugee and nonrefugee; communist-identified and anticom- munist; fluent in English and non-English speaking; educated and working class” (p. 27). More recently, Hune and Takeuchi (2008) have similarly argued that the term Asian American is fluid, flexible, politically determined, and open to interpretation depending on the situations and individuals involved. Although there are limitations to adopting such a broad panethnic perspective, our hope is that our historical perspective will inform and tease apart similarities as well as differences among this enormously diverse group.

A focus on Asian Americans is necessary for a number of reasons. Asian Americans represent a rapidly growing demographic whose growth rate is currently the fastest in the nation, even surpassing Latin Americans (Tseng, this volume). Given such growth, research and scholarly attention toward Asian Americans in general, and Asian American
youth in particular, has been strikingly scarce, especially in comparison to other ethnic minority and immigrant groups. Distinct from other ethnic minority groups who have had to overcome deficit models of development, Asian Americans have the added model minority myth to undo (Tuan, 1998). An analysis on Asian Americans is also critical due to their unique experiences of being cast as perpetual foreigners (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Goto, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2002). Such contrasting stereotypes have structured not only their daily milieu but also have contributed to a skewed research focus on academic development and success. A timely historical analysis that centers on Asian Americans is also consistent with other reviews in psychology (e.g., McLoyd, 1990; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998) that have similarly centered on specific ethnic and racial groups and have served to inform and inspire extensions to developmental science. Given the heterogeneity of Asian Americans, both broadly and specifically defined, greater attention to historical influences can help contextualize individuals’ experiences and advance science by deepening our understanding of Asian American child development.

Insights From Existing Developmental Frameworks

There are several notable theoretical frameworks that explicitly incorporate historical influences on child development, but they are still too rarely brought to the forefront in developmental science (Table 1). For example, Bronfenbrenner’s (2005) biocultural model emphasizes how multiple, interrelated layers of the social environment influence children’s development. The chronosystem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical frameworks</th>
<th>Historical influences</th>
<th>Cross-cutting themes</th>
<th>Developmental challenges and implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronfenbrenner’s</td>
<td>Historical events</td>
<td>(a) Shifting</td>
<td>Racial socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronosystem (and</td>
<td>(e.g., Gold Rush,</td>
<td>conceptions of race</td>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cascading impacts</td>
<td>WWII, Japanese</td>
<td>and racial stereotypes</td>
<td>Model minority image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through proximal</td>
<td>Internment, Vietnam</td>
<td>(b) Cultural–community contexts</td>
<td>Social milieu, public perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecological contexts)</td>
<td>War, 9/11)</td>
<td>for development</td>
<td>Social milieus, infrastructure, resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder’s developmental</td>
<td>Immigration policies</td>
<td>(c) Pre- and postmigration experiences</td>
<td>Ethnic/cultural support, socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence of history</td>
<td>(e.g., 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act; 1965 Hart-Celler Act; 1980 Refugee Assistance Act, DACA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social segregation, marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>García Coll et al.’s</td>
<td>Historical time and place, timing in lives, linked lives, human agency (e.g., generational status, age of migration)</td>
<td>(d) Experiences of oppression and discrimination</td>
<td>Racism, discrimination, microaggressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrative model of</td>
<td>Social stratification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internalized oppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic minority child</td>
<td>Racial structures (e.g., racism, oppression, segregation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coping with race-related stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive culture and family (e.g., ethnic identity, acculturation, socialization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. DACA = Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals; WWII = World War II.
encompasses sociohistorical events. These historical conditions then exert influence through their cascading impacts on the macrosystem of societal values, the exosystem of indirect contextual factors, the microsystem of proximal processes, and the mesosystem of interacting microsystems. Large-scale events in Asian American history—the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, World War II (WWII) and internment of Japanese Americans, the Hart-Celler Act of 1965, bias against South Asians after 9/11, to name just a few—all fall under Bronfenbrenner’s conceptualization of the chronosystem, and the impacts of such events can alter developmental trajectories through their influences on more proximal ecological settings. For instance, as we later highlight in more specific detail, the exclusionary policies that restricted immigration from Asia in the early history of the United States (chronosystem) gave way to society-wide stigma and negative valuation of Asian immigrants (macrosystem) and state and local policies that limited economic and individual growth of specific classes of immigrants (exosystem). In turn, these broader influences all worked to influence development by dictating the nature of children’s daily interactions within and between family, school, peer, and community settings (microsystem and mesosystem).

Another perspective is Elder’s (1998) work on children of the Great Depression—and later of WWII, rural disadvantage, and China’s Cultural Revolution—which yielded four principles for understanding the developmental influence of history: (a) historical time and place: life courses are embedded in and shaped by the historical times and places experienced by individuals over their lifetime; (b) timing in lives: the developmental impact of life transitions or events is contingent on when they occur in a person’s life; (c) linked lives: lives are lived interdependently, and social and historical influences are expressed through networks of shared relationships; and (d) human agency: individuals construct their own life course through their choices and actions within the opportunities and constraints of history and social circumstances.

Elder’s work is consistent with Bronfenbrenner’s chronosystem, but more specifically details the importance of timing, recognizing that the age at which certain events are experienced can have meaningful and differential implications. For instance, Southeast Asian children who fled war and violence in the home country and who might have directly encountered loss and trauma have different sets of experiences compared to their parents who fled and compared to similarly-aged children who were born in the United States to refugee parents. As another example, first-, second-, and third-generation Japanese Americans experienced the impact of WWII in different ways. Elder’s model thus highlights the transaction between historical circumstances and individuals’ active roles in responding to and constructing their own contexts over time.

Also acknowledging the impact of history and context, but focusing more specifically on the experiences of ethnic minority youth, García Coll and colleagues proposed an integrative model for understanding ethnic minority children’s development that puts social stratification, racism, and oppression at the center of developmental science (García Coll et al., 1996). By pinpointing constructs related to social position, García Coll and colleagues expanded the theoretical foundations of development so that it could better account for the diversity of children’s experiences. As applied to Asian Americans, the integrative model can be useful in delineating contextual risks (e.g., racism, discrimination) and promotive factors (e.g., cultural strengths) that may serve as mechanisms that explain associations between historical forces and developmental outcomes.

Taken together, conceptual models that recognize the importance of history on child development do exist and have served the field well in driving empirical research. However, none of these existing models have addressed the unique circumstances of Asian American children’s development. Inspired by theoretical and conceptual lessons from Bronfenbrenner, Elder, and García Coll and colleagues, we address this literature gap and offer an analysis of how Asian American child development has been affected by historical time and place.

Historical Influences on Asian American Child Development

Our analysis focuses on the four major ways that history influences proximal developmental contexts and processes: (a) shifting conceptions of race and racial stereotypes, (b) cultural–community contexts, (c) pre- and postmigration experiences, and (d) experiences of oppression (Table 1). The reach of historical context is wide and deep. The themes that we discuss are intended to reflect diversity in scope but are not meant to be exhaustive. Rather, we aim to provide fodder for research to continue enriching our basic understanding of how history has shaped Asian American child development, and to inspire
more theory and research that intentionally and meaningfully incorporates historical perspectives.

We illustrate these four mechanisms of historical influence through the lenses of various ethnic groups: Chinese, Indian, Hmong, and Filipino Americans. We do this intentionally to provide specific examples of how history can be taken into account in the development of Asian Americans. These groups have ancestry from different regions of Asia and were, in part, chosen to reflect the diversity of Asian Americans. The historical experiences of these particular ethnic groups are also especially relevant to each of the themes we discuss. However, we stress that the historical influences outlined are not limited to the ethnic groups we use as illustrations, and a later section of our article discusses cross-cutting themes that are relevant to other Asian American groups. Hence, our use of one group to illustrate each mechanism should not be seen as isolated examples. We also note the immense heterogeneity not only across Asian American groups (e.g., Hune & Takeuchi, 2008) but also within groups (e.g., generational status, immigration history, socioeconomic status, gender). We caution readers against the threat of essentializing and, as Elder (1998) and others have noted, stress that historical context interacts with human agency in shaping each individual’s life course. We also recognize that this article cannot do justice to the full historical experiences of different Asian American groups; entire books have been written on Asian American history, and we refer readers to Chan (1991), Okihiro (2014), Takaki (1998), and Wu (2014) as starting points.

**Shifting Conceptions of Race and Racial Stereotypes**

For Asian Americans, history has brought along with it dramatic changes in the ways race and racial stereotypes have been defined (Okamoto, 2014; Omi & Winant, 2004). These influences can be witnessed through the experiences of Chinese immigrants, in juxtaposition with Japanese Americans, and later, of the broad Asian American panethnic group.

**Illustration: Chinese Americans**

The earliest Asian immigrants to the United States were from mainland China. They were mostly men crossing the Pacific in pursuit of opportunities in the gold mining, railroad, and farming industries. They were initially welcomed by capitalists as diligent, hardworking laborers exploited for their cheap labor (Kim, 1999). However, as their presence increased and White laborers saw them as economic competition, they became a *yellow peril*—heathens who threatened race mixing in jobs, schools, and families (Okamoto, 2014; Takaki, 1998). A flurry of anti-Chinese policies followed, coming to a head with the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, which banned Chinese laborers and then all Chinese from immigrating to the United States (Takaki, 1998). This was first time in the United States history that a federal law excluded immigrants on the basis of ethnicity or race (Chan & Chen, 2011).

Societal portrayals of Chinese Americans shifted again around WWII as China became an ally and Japan an enemy (Wu, 2014). Mainstream America began to racially differentiate and subsequently stereotype the two groups in oppositional ways. Popular press such as *Time* (1941) and *Life* (1941) featured articles on how to distinguish the facial features of “Chinese friends” from “Japanese enemies.” The former were described as placid, kindly, and open, and the latter as domineering and arrogant. Such sentiment was codified into law when Congress repealed exclusion policies and extended citizenship to Chinese immigrants, while 120,000 Japanese Americans, many of whom were citizens and half of whom were children, were placed in internment camps (Weglyn, 1976).

The model minority stereotype arose in the 1960s (Suzuki, 2002) when the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements were underway and communities of color—most visibly, African Americans—were demanding systemic changes. Ethnic distinctions between Chinese and Japanese receded as the media, social scientists, and politicians emphasized the racial boundaries between Asian Americans, as a collective group, and African Americans (Wollenberg, 1978; Wu, 2014). U.S. News and World Report (1966) reported that:

> At a time when it is being proposed that hundreds of billions be spent to uplift Negroes and other minorities, the nation’s 300,000 Chinese-Americans are moving ahead on their own—without help from anyone else... applying the virtues of hard work, thrift, and morality (p. 73).

If Asian Americans were the models of hard work, perseverance, and accommodation, then other racial minorities could be cast as lazy, complaining, and disruptive (Suzuki, 2002). Racial stereotypes of Asian Americans and African Americans were thus socially and historically constructed...
in relation to one another (Kim, 1999; Omi & Winant, 2004; Wu, 2014). These intertwined stereotypes contributed to a broader narrative that biased societal structures could be preserved because some minorities can achieve success simply through hard work (Chun, 1980; Lee, 2009).

**Developmental Implications**

We begin with this recapitulation of the Chinese American experience because it illustrates how history has shaped the somewhat fickle public perceptions of Asian Americans that, in turn, have immediate and sustained implications for racialization, accompanying stereotypes, and child development. Views of Chinese Americans have ranged from valued laborers to treacherous foe to wartime allies to the model minority. In Elder’s language, we are reminded that the immigrant and minority experience is embedded within time and place. In Bronfenbrenner’s framework, it means recognizing how events in the chronosystem affect the proximal systems of children’s development. More specifically, race and the model minority stereotype is linked with shifting social perceptions and social status (García Coll et al., 1996), and affects children through its impact on developmental competencies such as ethnic identity, academic outcomes, and social and peer relationships.

Indeed, the experiences of a single ethnic group, the Chinese Americans, trace the historical roots of the model minority stereotype that has come to dominate the lives of nearly all members of the larger panethnic group of Asian American children and youth as well as developmental science itself (Lee, 2009). In one study of high school students in the Southeastern United States, over 99% of Asian Americans, which included Chinese Americans as well as other East, Southeast, and South Asians, reported having been stereotyped as model minorities (Thompson & Kiang, 2010). The developmental implications of being cast as an exemplar for other groups are diverse and divisive. Although the generally positive views that characterize this stereotype can promote self-esteem and ethnic pride, some youth actively resist the model minority stereotype by rebelling against academic success and dissociating from an Asian American identity (Lee, 1994). Identity implications can also be found in terms of parenting and parental influences. For instance, parents’ internalization of the stereotype can shape their parenting practices and socialization strategies, and the ethnic-related messages that are subsequently transmitted to children (e.g., ethnic pride, warnings about possible mistreatment from others) could then have consequences for children’s cultural awareness, knowledge, and ethnic identity development (Hughes et al., 2006; Mahalingham, 2012).

Fueled by the model minority stereotype, considerable research in developmental science has examined Asian Americans’ academic adjustment. How the data are presented, however, can lead to vastly differing conclusions. Exploring aggregate-level data, Asian Americans perform relatively well; however, data disaggregated by ethnicity find notable disparities with Indian and Taiwanese Americans reporting the highest levels of educational attainment, 58% and 67% earning bachelor’s degrees, respectively. In contrast, Cambodian and Laotian Americans report 7% and 5% attainment, well below levels reported by Black and Latino Americans (Hune & Takeuchi, 2008). The model minority stereotype can therefore not only be erroneous and mask the developmental challenges faced by Asian youth, but it can also create harmful pressure for struggling children and youth to live up to the image (Mahalingham, 2006).

Moreover, at the core of the model minority stereotype is the notion that Asian American students are unencumbered by racism and discrimination. Instead, their cultural values regarding hard work, family, and education enable their success (Lee, 2009). In arguing against a purely cultural explanation, Sue and Okazaki (1990) propose a theory of relative functionalism, suggesting that academic pursuits do not signify lack of racism; rather, they are a reaction to racial, cultural, and political barriers. Asian Americans, they argue, pursue education because they perceive blocked mobility in nonden educational endeavors (e.g., entertainment, sports, politics). Xie and Goyette (2003) build on this theory arguing that Asian Americans respond to these barriers not simply by pursuing education but by pursuing particular fields that are in demand in the labor market. There is strikingly little developmental research that has directly examined structural explanations for Asian Americans’ academic outcomes, but related work yields supporting evidence for both theories. Tseng (2006), for example, finds that children of Asian (as well as Black and Latino) immigrants were more likely than their later generation peers to pursue math and science fields. Mediation analyses indicated that they were drawn to these fields as routes to economic mobility and because of language barriers in other fields.
Peer relationships are also affected by the troubling construction of Asian Americans as model students compared to Blacks and Latinos (Tseng, Chao, & Padmawidjaja, 2007). Studies suggest that teachers’ expectations of African American and Latino youth as unsuccessful are constructed in contrast to their expectations of Asian Americans (Gibson, 1988). Lee (2009) quotes a science teacher who liked Asian American students because they were easy to teach and don’t cause any trouble . . . Of course, some Asians aren’t as good. But even those who cut class—at least they don’t flaunt it in your face . . . Anyway, most of my Asians are good, hard-working students. [p. 75]

Rosenbloom and Way (2004) argue that these racial constructions affect adolescents’ interactions as they step out of classrooms and into peer-dominated hallways, lunchrooms, and school buses. Teachers’ preferences for Asian Americans become a source of peer resentment that can be channeled into bullying and teasing. These trends are reflected in alarming reports of race-related bullying and violence against Asian American youth (Texeira, 2005). Peer discrimination research finds that Asian American youth report higher rates of bullying than their African American and Latino peers (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000; Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006). These concerns are magnified by findings that peer harassment and discrimination are associated with developmental outcomes such as truancy, depression, and loneliness (Benner & Graham, 2013; Benner & Kim, 2009; Huynh & Fuligni, 2010; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2000).

Historically, the construction of race and racial stereotypes has been intricately intertwined with context, migration flows, and events in the chronosystem of development. In turn, shifting conceptions of race cast a wide influence on children’s developmental pathways. Although science has been heavily biased toward examining academic adjustment as an artifact of the model minority stereotype, implications related to more diverse dimensions of adjustment including self and identity development and peer relationships are also relevant to consider.

Cultural–Community Contexts for Development

Illustration: Indian Americans

Similar to Chinese Americans, Asian Indian immigrants arrived early in the United States history, settling in areas of the West and welcomed in the farming industry. Fears of labor competition with Whites soon led to government actions, such as a California state law in 1913 that banned foreigners from owning land and a 1923 Supreme Court decision that barred Bhagat Singh, a high-caste Indian immigrant, from obtaining citizenship. Until 1965, progress in Indian immigration had been essentially stalled. In that year, the Hart-Celler Act swiftly changed the ethnic landscape of the United States by attracting skilled labor not only from Europe but also from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Post-1965, the first wave of Indian immigrants largely consisted of middle-class professionals. They were admitted under the Hart-Celler Act’s occupational preferences category, which favored doctors, nurses, and engineers who were in high demand and short supply in U.S. labor markets (Rangaswamy, 2000). These highly educated, professional immigrants predominantly settled in the suburban communities in which these job opportunities were found, which tended to have relatively low racial and ethnic diversity.

Immigration by Indian professionals continued and was joined by a second wave of immigrants in the 1980s and 1990s. The second group migrated under the relative preferences category and represented more varied socioeconomic backgrounds (Wong & Hirschman, 1983). Because the immigration law allowed for family reunification, this newer wave largely comprised the less educated
kith and kin who were sponsored by the prior wave of Indian immigrants (Rangaswamy, 2000). A large proportion of these later immigrants established well-connected ethnic enclaves in major cities such as New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

Developmental Implications

These historical trends and related developmental implications can be understood through Elder’s principle of linked lives—the idea that history is experienced through its influence on networks of people and their interrelationships. This is demonstrated through the distinct ethnic socialization contexts that were created by different waves of immigrants (Mistry & Wu, 2010). For example, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) suggest that a combination of contextual and community factors structure children and adolescents’ daily experiences and ultimately shape their developmental trajectories as well as the way they define themselves. Indian children of the first wave of immigration experienced life as ethnic minorities in predominantly White suburban neighborhoods; hence, maintaining cultural traditions and practices had to be more consciously negotiated (Bhatia, 2007; Purkayastha, 2005). The experiences of Indian American immigrants also illustrate Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory in which major events in the chronosystem (e.g., Hart-Celler Act) influence the more proximal microsystems that shape child development.

In terms of ethnic identity formation, the salience of being in the ethnic minority can introduce challenging circumstances in which to negotiate one’s cultural identity while assimilating to the mainstream culture. In his ethnographic research, Bhatia (2007) found widespread evidence that middle-class, suburban immigrants from India felt accepted by their communities at times yet also marginalized due to cultural differences in food, dress, and other aspects of daily life. For youth who must cope with this sense of “otherness,” perceived from the mainstream, the process of identity development can be fraught with ethnic repudiation and anxiety (Mistry & Wu, 2010, p. 20). In such contexts, social and cultural support from others could be particularly meaningful in easing adaptation and promoting adjustment. Some research among Asian American adolescents indeed finds that contact with other Asian Americans is especially influential for the positive ethnic identity development of students attending predominantly White high schools (Yip, Douglass, & Shelton, 2013). However, other work suggests that this same-race influence could be detrimental, such as when negative stereotypes, deviance, or alienation are perpetuated through divisive social interactions (Lee, 2005).

In contrast to the earlier suburban contexts in which Indian immigrants settled as the ethnic minority, the later wave of Indian immigrants settled in metropolitan areas and established thriving ethnic communities. In these neighborhoods, children’s ethnic socialization was nurtured not only by parents but also by Indian cultural institutions such as temples, community centers, and small businesses. These cultural resources helped to sustain individuals’ native language and traditions (Khandelwal, 2002). Child development in the context of ethnic enclaves can enhance early support for and awareness of ethnic identity, which, in turn, has important implications for child adjustment and well-being (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). Given the urban setting, children in these immigrant families were also exposed to other communities of color and grew up in more ethnically diverse contexts, which have been associated with positive youth development in the form of high academic achievement, positive emotional development, and low incidents of peer victimization (Graham, 2011).

Neighborhood racial composition can also predict different types of parenting and ethnic and racial socialization messages that are communicated from parents to children (Hughes et al., 2006). For instance, more racially diverse neighborhoods and areas with a negative social climate (e.g., racial segregation, lack of social support from neighbors) could promote perceptions of social disorder and, in turn, drive cultural socialization messages in which parents prepare their children for possible encounters with bias and caution them about potential experiences with discrimination (Caughy, Nettles, O’Campo, & Lohrfink, 2005). Given the reality of such negative interactions, these socialization strategies could be particularly adaptive for children amid contexts characterized by social tension and inequality. In contrast, in predominantly White or European American neighborhoods, the most adaptive socialization messages for parents of color could include preparation bias but also messages of egalitarianism or the idea that all people are equal regardless of their race, given these families’ underrepresentation among the White majority (Hughes et al., 2006). Fostering messages of cultural pride could also be adaptive for youth in largely White majority contexts who might have few situational resources to maintain connections to their ethnic heritage. Taken together, specific messages...
about race, culture, and identity that parents transmit to their children, as well as their impact, can strategically vary based on the environmental context in which families reside.

History’s changing social ecologies thus suggest that care must be taken in interpreting empirical findings across different studies and even within projects focused on the same ethnic group. As shown through the experiences of Indian Americans, differences in research findings could reflect differing waves of immigration, the characteristics of those immigrants, and the varying cultural–community contexts that shape their development trajectories.

Pre- and Postmigration Experiences

U.S. immigrants are influenced not only by postmigration contexts, but they are also shaped by premigration experiences in their home countries and the broader historical context in which pre- and postmigration experiences take place (Mistry et al., this volume; Yoshikawa et al., this volume). The Vietnam War, for example, had profound impacts on both the pre- and postmigration experiences and developmental pathways of Southeast Asian refugees (Lee, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Sattin-Bajaj, 2010; Tatman, 2004). Moreover, as captured by Elder’s principle of timing in lives, the influence of family migration experiences varies depending on developmental timing.

Illustration: Hmong Americans

The fall of Saigon and Laos in 1975 triggered the first large waves of Southeast Asian refugees to settle in the United States (Chuong & Ta, 2003). Unlike immigrants from other parts of Asia, many Southeast Asian immigrants were displaced from war-torn contexts laden with violence and personal trauma. Hmong Americans comprise a notable proportion of these refugees and are particularly unique due to their status as ethnic minorities in their countries of origin. They were living in the mountains of Southeast Asia (Laos and other areas in China and Vietnam) when they were recruited by the U.S. government to combat communism (Yau, 2005). Because the Hmong allied themselves with the United States in its Cold War efforts, the U.S. government supported their migration after communism took over (Chan, 1994). Approximately 90% of Hmong refugees have been resettled to the U.S., mostly establishing themselves in California, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. As refugees, they were provided government resources to assist in their resettlement as well as other social services not available to voluntary immigrants (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

The first wave of Hmong refugees comprised mostly soldiers and their families. They were generally educated, English proficient, from urban areas, and had served as American and French allies. In a theme that echoes other Asian groups, the later waves were very different. Later Hmong refugees fled Southeast Asia after experiencing severe postwar hardships, including Communist oppression, refugee camps, poor economic conditions, and few educational opportunities. Migration from Southeast Asia continued to increase through the decades with the Refugee Act of 1980, which made it easier for refugees from any part of the world to gain asylum, as well as with policies targeting that geographic area (e.g., 1975 Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, 1987 Amerasian Homecoming Act; Hune, 2002). At the same time, changes to the social safety net—specifically the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996—restricted eligibility and imposed time limits on federal assistance, with implications for low-income legal immigrants, including those from Southeast Asia.

Developmental Implications

Historical impacts on development vary depending on when in the life course they are experienced (Elder, 1998). Hmong children who stayed behind after the fall of Saigon and Laos felt more direct consequences of the War. They were more likely to be separated from one or both parents in the aftermath and as they fled to refugee camps. Many directly experienced or witnessed acute violence, and they tended to spend their formative years in crowded and poor conditions (Freeman, 1989; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). Research on the impact of trauma on child development suggests that both the age in which adverse circumstances are experienced and the duration of traumatic experiences have socioemotional and neurological implications (Zeanah et al., 2003). Furthermore, plasticity and sensitive periods in language development and attachment relationships translate into different developmental outcomes depending on whether migration occurs during toddlerhood, childhood, or adolescence (Yoshikawa et al., this volume). Asian Americans’ premigration experiences can thus interact with the age of exposure to trauma and/or age of migration to influence children’s life course.
For Hmong children who were infants during the war or for those with few, if any, direct experiences of the conflict itself, historical influences can be observed through parenting goals and practices (Zhou & Bankston, 1998). The consequences of historical context on young children’s trajectories illustrates Elder’s linked lives principle in terms of the socialization practices and environments established by parents who were more directly affected. The effects of premigration trauma and violence experienced by parents are persistent and have the potential to transcend generations. As one notable example drawing from the experiences of another group of Southeast Asian refugees, even 20 years after resettlement, adult refugees from Cambodia still exhibit high rates of PTSD and major depression, with poverty, low English proficiency, and older age exacerbating these negative effects (Marshall, Schell, Elliott, Berthold, & Chun, 2005). Moreover, the majority of these adult refugees (70%) continued to experience neighborhood and community violence even after resettlement, which can, in turn, increase risk for subsequent generations of youths’ maladjustment and delinquency (Tam & Freisthler, 2014). Trauma can thus be experienced by children at an intergenerational level, with cycles of poverty and violence that are perpetuated over time.

Links to poverty are also relevant to the pre- and postmigration experiences discussed here. Although many Asian immigrants voluntarily migrated to the United States in search of the American Dream, Hmong Americans largely migrated under involuntary and traumatic circumstances. Many parents and grandparents have low levels of educational attainment or lack formal schooling altogether, and approximately one third of the Hmong American community lives in poverty—one of the highest rates among Asian groups and comparable to those from African and Latin American backgrounds (Asian American Federation, 2014). Similar reports suggest that foreign-born Asian Americans and more recent arrivals have higher rates of poverty than their counterparts who were either U.S. born or have been in the United States for longer periods of time, and these characteristics are particularly pronounced among Asian refugee groups (e.g., Hmong, Bangladeshi, Cambodian; Takei & Sakamoto, 2011). These conditions likely contribute to these youths’ troubling outcomes in the United States—risk for developing academic problems and internalizing and externalizing behaviors (Supple et al., 2013). Given their unique cultural history and background, the Hmong and other youth with refugee backgrounds do not readily fit the model minority image of success. Their narratives highlight the importance of considering contextual influences that stem from both premigration histories and postmigration conditions.

**Oppression, Colonialism, and Discrimination**

Developmental psychologists are increasingly examining how children’s (and their parents’) experiences of discrimination influence development (Benner & Kim, 2009; Brown & Bigler, 2005). Such intergenerational research has tended to focus on individual-level interactions, and although this work has been important, it is also useful to consider the deeper institutional and historical roots of oppression and colonization. This more systemic view recognizes the long reach of history.

**Illustration: Filipino Americans**

Filipinos have endured both Spanish and U.S. colonization (David & Okazaki, 2006). The Filipino culture reflects a multifaceted heritage due to early settlers from Indonesia, China, Malaysia, Borneo, India, and Java, among others, who were drawn to the Philippine Islands (Rita, 1996). The influence of Spanish colonization began in 1521 (Rafael, 2000). For over 300 years, the Philippines were under direct subjugation from Spain before being sold to the United States in 1898 (Rafael, 2000). Under both regimes, Filipinos’ experiences with colonialism inculcated the belief that Spanish and American cultures and languages were superior to that of their native culture (Bergano & Bergano-Kinney, 1997; Rafael, 2000). Such experiences can lead to a colonial mentality in which historical socialization experiences that emphasize the value of Western ideals and standards and that reject ethnic ancestry, darker skin tone, and non-Western features contribute to an internalized oppression whereby individuals feel that they fall short of society’s standards and engage in self and cultural denigration (David & Okazaki, 2006; Kiang & Takeuchi, 2009).

The extensive history of Spanish and U.S. occupation suggests that generations of native Filipinos and Filipino Americans have been raised in the context of ethnic suppression and messages of inferiority. Rapid growth in the Filipino American population makes investigation into the implications of oppression and colonization especially urgent (Agbayani-Siewert, 1994). However, despite the fact that Filipino Americans are now the second largest Asian group in the United States (Barnes &
Bennett, 2002; Lott, 1997), they remain largely understudied in psychological research. Yet, their experiences are particularly relevant in terms of illustrating the complex ways in which history, race, social stratification, and oppression come together to influence youth identity and development.

**Developmental Implications**

García Coll et al. (1996) integrative model highlights how racism, prejudice, discrimination, and oppression contribute to the macrosystem of children’s environments. Direct influences are manifested in the ways that social stratification prevents children from gaining educational access or social resources. Perhaps more insidious are the indirect effects through messages of inferiority, subtle forms of racism (e.g., microaggressions), and modern-day discrimination (Mossakowski, 2003; Perreira, Kiang, & Potochnick, 2013; Sue, Buccheri, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007). Such mechanisms (see Mistry et al., this volume) demonstrate the prominent impact that oppression and stigma can have on development and how they continue to influence the self-concepts, adjustment, and developmental competencies of Filipinos and other Asian Americans today.

The consequences of the oppression experienced by Filipino Americans are reflected in their high prevalence of internalizing symptoms such as depression and suicidality (Tompar-Tiu & Sustento-Seneriches, 1995), as well as externalizing problems (Nadal, 2000). Although much of the work on Filipino colonial mentality has been done with adults, more general research on racial bias and discrimination suggests that even preschool-aged children can identify bias and unfair treatment, and many in elementary and middle school report having already experienced both covert and overt discrimination (Brown & Bigler, 2005).

Of course, families and youth are not simply passive actors in systems of oppression—they also exercise human agency in resisting and responding to bias (Elder, 1998). Cultural factors can serve as protective resources and promote developmental competencies (García Coll et al., 1996). For instance, research on Filipino and other Asian Americans has found that ethnic identity can mitigate the negative effects of discrimination and general stress on a range of outcomes, including academic achievement, smoking, depression, and daily well-being (Benner & Kim, 2009; Chae et al., 2008; Kiang, Yip, Gonzales-Backen, Witkow, & Fuligni, 2006). Not all research has consistently replicated these patterns associated with cultural strengths, and further work is needed to reconcile differences across studies (Yip, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2008; Yoo & Lee, 2008). More generally, research is needed on how to best intervene and attenuate the concurrent and longitudinal effects of discrimination and oppression.

**Cross-Cutting Historical Influences**

The intention of our analysis is to stimulate recognition and thinking about the role of history in child development. Inspired by existing developmental frameworks that have explicitly incorporated historical context, we discussed four themes with respect to history’s role in (a) shaping the meaning of race, (b) creating ethnic contexts for development, (c) influencing the pre- and postmigration circumstances that affect individuals’ life course, and (d) establishing a legacy of oppression and discrimination. Although these themes were illustrated through the lens of specific subgroups, it is important to note that they are not unique to each of the profiled groups.

**Race**

We used Chinese American experiences to illustrate the first theme of racialization in historical context, but similar implications can be seen among other Asian subgroups. The U.S. Census provides a particularly poignant example of how definitions of race and ethnicity have evolved over time, and how the availability and meaning of racial labels can constantly change with history. Prior to the 1870s, most of the Census racial categories revolved around free versus slaves, colored, mulatto, and it is unclear how early Asian immigrants were identified through this system. In the 1870s, a Chinese category was added that was intended to be a catch-all for East Asians, thereby obfuscating any heterogeneity among the Asian panethnic group. We begin to see some differentiations with the addition of Japanese a few decades later, but options to identify as Hindu, Korean, and Filipino were not added until 1920. Hindu and Korean categories were then removed in 1950. The categories used today are more flexible, and more than one ethnic category can be checked. However, race—its interpreted meaning, and the accompanying social perceptions of racial categories—remains in a state of constant revision, which has notable implications for researchers’ methods in studying Asian Americans, not to mention the identity development of...
Asian Americans themselves (Yoshikawa et al., this volume).

Cultural–Community Contexts

As exemplified by the Indian American experience, history has played a role in dictating the types of communities in which immigrant families settle. Going back further than 1965, there are other examples of how immigration policies influenced cultural–community contexts. The 1880 Chinese Exclusion Act created a bachelor society for early Chinese immigrants and impeded the growth of families and children. To be exempt from deportation, Chinese immigrants who originally arrived as laborers were forced to become businessmen (Chan & Chen, 2011). Coupled with the mainstream’s protest of the Chinese presence and refusal to conduct business with them, Chinese Americans developed their own commercial centers leading to the establishment of Chinatowns. Later, when immigration policies changed and families were reunified, immigrant children largely settled or were born into these ethnic enclaves and attended racially segregated schools (Wollenberg, 1978).

Settlement in urban Chinatowns, mostly in population-dense metropolitan cities in the United States West and Northeast, has continued with key developmental implications. Given their long history of settlement in these urban areas, children and youth from these immigrant families appear fairly well-acclimated today (Kiang & Supple, 2016). Many have a strong, integrated presence not only in their neighborhoods and communities but also within the school system, local businesses and services, and even the political environment through community-elected offices. However, Portes and Zhou’s (1993) model of segmented assimilation suggests that immigrant families can experience divergent acculturation paths. For instance, contrary to conventional models of upward mobility and assimilation to the White middle-class, some immigrant youth in segregated ethnic enclaves could assimilate downward in terms of social and economic status. That is, different patterns of adjustment might be observed in which some families achieve social and economic success, while others experience more marginalization and remain in impoverished conditions. Family mobility and socioeconomic resources still matter a great deal in children’s developmental outcomes (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; McLoyd, 1990), and many of these influences are tied to the contexts and communities in which families reside.

In recent years, overcrowded job markets and fewer social and occupational opportunities in traditional gateway communities such as San Francisco, Los Angeles, or New York City have caused new immigrants to search for jobs and other prospects in less urban areas (Massey & Capoferro, 2008; Parrado & Kandel, 2008). Current population trends indicate that we will continue to see the rise of new immigrant communities in the Midwest and South, particularly among small cities and rural towns with limited resources and infrastructure to support immigrant integration (Bailey, 2005; Massey & Capoferro, 2008). Notably, some of the shifts to new immigrant destinations are not necessarily voluntary. For instance, some Southeast Asian refugee families have been settled by the U.S. government or other sponsoring agencies with little knowledge or choice of their own. In an effort by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement to facilitate integration and economic independence in newcomers, many families have been dispersed in places with little history of immigration (e.g., New Orleans, Kansas City, Biloxi).

A small but growing body of research is examining how these cultural–community contexts shape children’s development and overall adjustment. For example, mirroring some of the experiences of post-1965 Indian immigrants, being a minority in new immigrant communities can introduce qualitatively distinct developmental circumstances. Kiang, Pereira, and Fuligni (2011) found that minority experiences can push and pull youth in different directions to either strongly identify or deidentify with their ethnic backgrounds. The paucity of translation services in new destinations also magnifies adolescents’ family obligations in that they are more likely to be called upon to be language brokers for their parents (Kiang & Supple, 2016). Such assistance can strain emotional development in some ways while also fostering strong ethnic affiliation (Morales & Hanson, 2005).

Pre- and Postmigration Experiences

Immigration does not occur in a vacuum and the subsequent adaptation and acculturation of immigrant families depend largely on their premigration circumstances as well as their postmigration contexts. Given historical changes in immigration policies and global politics, many individuals, across and within ethnic groups, have migrated under qualitatively different situations and experiences. As shown though Southeast Asian refugees,
some immigrants have arrived in the United States under conditions of extreme duress in search of social, political, or religious freedom. Other examples include religiously persecuted Sikhs, asylum seekers from war-torn areas such as Burma or Sri Lanka, and Korean War orphans adopted by non-Asian families. In contrast, voluntary immigrants include recent increases in wealthy, transpacific families who have a foot in the United States while maintaining connections to their home countries (i.e., astronauts; Da, 2003). As another example of historical differences in migration, unlike the general patterns of immigration exhibited by Chinese, Japanese, or Indian Americans, who were largely male laborers, early waves of Korean immigrants consisted of female picture brides who came to the United States to become wives of American men (Chan & Chen, 2011). Such trends could have implications in terms of understanding family structures, romantic relationships, and notions of sexuality—issues that research has yet to adequately address. Collectively, very little work has explicitly examined the importance of migration circumstances; hence, how such pre- and postmigration experiences specifically shape child and youth development among Asian immigrant families remains a key empirical question.

Oppression

The consequences of colonialism and other forms of social oppression are certainly not limited to Filipinos. For instance, the French had a strong colonizing influence on Southeast Asia, the British on India, and Asian countries on each other (e.g., Japan’s invasion of Korea during WWII; Min, 2003). Within the United States, policies steeped in racism have influenced generations of Asian Americans. One of the most striking is the forcible removal of Japanese Americans from their homes and relocation to internment camps during WWII (Takaki, 1998; Wu, 2014). Studies have shown that the internment had profound influences on child development, impedance and having long-term effects on parenting, family communication, family distance, and ethnic preferences (Nagata, Trierweiler, & Talbot, 1999). Mainstream society’s mistrust of certain Asian groups can still be seen today, post-9/11, after terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center ignited a rash of discrimination and violence against Muslim Americans as well as other South Asians, even if they were not Muslim (Read, 2008). Examples of displaced retaliation can be seen in the racially motivated shooting at a Wisconsin Sikh temple in 2012, the over 300 hate crimes against South Asians that have been documented since 9/11, and a recent report detailing the impact of continued bullying and discrimination among South Asian children in schools (Sikh Coalition, 2013). Above and beyond such overtly racist incidents, microaggressions or more subtle forms of discrimination are also common (Huynh, 2012; Sue et al., 2007) with a recent study finding that 78% of Asian Americans reported some form of racial microaggression during a 2-week period (Ong, Burrow, Fuller-Rowell, Ja, & Sue, 2013). Research directly addressing the important implications of these social forces on child development is continuing to increase, and a stronger emphasis on understanding the historical roots of such oppression could be beneficial.

Current Historical Tides and Implications for Future Research

History is always in the making, and developmental science will need to adapt to it. Although a comprehensive review of historical influences was outside this article’s purview, we hope our analysis will provoke conceptual and empirical work that situates Asian American development within historical time and place. But what has changed in our understanding of Asian American child development? How does the current zeitgeist affect Asian Americans today? We offer some insight into these questions and discuss opportunities for future research with both Asian American and other panethnic groups.

Conceptions of Asian Americans as Model Minority and Fresh Off the Boat

The pitting of Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities continues today through, for instance, triangulation approaches that compare the social status of Asians to African Americans, as well as to White majority standards (Kim, 1999). Social comparisons between Asian Americans and other immigrant groups are also prevalent. For example, Latin Americans also represent a racialized and heavily stigmatized group, and social tension and resentment between Latin Americans and Asian Americans have been reported when these youth perceive unfair treatment in communities and in schools (Rosenbloom & Way, 2004). Indeed, the positioning of groups relative to each other results in a system of racial geometry (Gould, 1996) that has persisted.
since the inception of racial categories (Kim, 1999). Specifically, Asian Americans are valorized as honorary Whites who fall somewhere between Whites and African Americans (Tuan, 1998). In being positioned as an exemplary minority group, Asian Americans remain confined by the trappings of a stereotype that serves to reinforce and perpetuate racial stratification.

The model minority image has fueled an abundant focus on cultural explanations for academic success and a dearth of work on structural explanations. It has also focused research on academic, rather than social and emotional development, as well as anemic attention to risky developmental pathways. Acknowledging the historical context of race and racial stereotypes suggests that much more research can be done outside of the model minority frame. First, it suggests a need for research that examines not just how children develop a sense of their own ethnic and racial identity, but how they simultaneously develop an understanding of other groups and how that influences their peer relationships. We need work that investigates the intertwined development of Asian Americans and other ethnic groups, including African Americans, Latinos/as, other immigrant groups (e.g., Somali, Haitian), other minority groups (e.g., Native American), and European Americans. Second, research needs to reflect a more holistic view of Asian American child development—academic, social, emotional, and physical—the positive pathways, as well as the negative. More breadth in examining developmental outcomes would be crucial in moving the field forward. Third, a complementary effort to collect, analyze, and report data disaggregated by ethnic groups will provide a more nuanced analysis of the diverse developmental contexts and processes across Asian American groups. The model minority stereotype obscures the developmental challenges and risks that Asian American children, with diverse individual and group histories, endure.

Another common stereotype of Asian Americans is the perpetual foreigner who is fresh off the boat. The constant questioning of “Where are you from?” has profound influences on the development of both ethnic and American mainstream identities (Armenta et al., 2013; Gartner, Kiang, & Supple, 2014; Lee, 2009). The perception of Asian Americans as less American than their White counterparts is pervasive, despite Asian Americans reporting feeling just as American as their peers (Cheryan & Monin, 2005). Indeed, when Asian Americans experienced the denial of their American backgrounds from others, they responded with an even stronger assertion of their American identities. At the same time, recognizing their Asian heritage and establishing a positive sense of ethnic or cultural identity has widely beneficial consequences for youth development, including academic, health, and psychosocial adjustment (Rivas-Drake et al., 2014). Deeply woven throughout all of these issues are the influences that immigration, acculturation, identity, language proficiency, generational status, and other individually experienced contextual variables have on children’s and youths’ cultural adaptation. While more and more research attention has been directed toward these complex issues, the field has barely scratched the surface in terms of how social perceptions, bias, and perpetual foreigner status can introduce potential stressors as well as invite opportunities for cultural resiliency.

Multiracial and Multiethnic Asian Americans

With antimiscegenation prohibitions almost 50 years behind us, we also need to better understand how the current historical context shapes the identities of biracial and multiracial children and adolescents and their experiences of racism and discrimination (Root, 1998). Twenty-eight percent of Asian Americans indicated multiethnic or multiracial backgrounds in the 2010 Census (Asian American Federation, 2014). Many Asian ethnic groups are also inherently multiethnic, such as among Filipinos who often have both Asian and Spanish ancestry (Root, 1997). Yet, we know surprisingly little about how models of development, particularly in terms of ethnic identity and cultural adaptation, hold up for this burgeoning group of young Americans. Recent research suggests that others’ validation is related to identity development and sense of self among biracial (Black/White, Asian/White) individuals (Lou, Lalonde, & Wilson, 2011), but too little work has systematically examined the prevalence of societal views and discrimination, the nature these views take, and how they shape children and adolescents’ identities, relationships with each parent, and peer relationships. There is also little systematic examination of how parents negotiate their differing cultural beliefs, socialization goals, and parenting practices, and how those forces influence children’s development.

Immigration, Globalization, and Immigration Reform

The U.S. Census estimates that the Asian-descent population will continue to rise through 2050. Even if immigration growth remains constant by current
standards, the Asian American population will have increased by 79% between 2000 and 2050 (Ortmann & Guarneri, 2009). The next generation of developmental research must continue advancing our understanding of how changing waves of immigration and shifting cultural contexts in the United States affect child development. In 1965, the Hart-Celler legislation dramatically changed the face of immigration, ushering in the ethnically diverse population we witness today.

Looking ahead, immigration advocates are seeking comprehensive immigration reform. If they are successful, legislation will have important implications for the 5.3 million undocumented children and the U.S.-born children of undocumented parents (Passel, Cohn, Krogstad, & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014). These children are still largely invisible in developmental science. Although news headlines more often highlight Latino undocumented children, increasing numbers of undocumented immigrants have been coming from China since 1990 (Yoshikawa, Kholopstseva, & Suárez-Orozco, 2013).

We need a stronger understanding of the cognitive, social, and emotional development of these undocumented children, and how policy changes might influence their longitudinal trajectories. For example, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, implemented in 2012, allows undocumented youth who came to the United States prior to age 15 to apply for work permits and deferment status to protect them from deportation. This program marks an important shift in policy and presents an opportunity to examine how immigration policy and possible reform might shift youths’ developmental course (Gonzales, 2014). As also evident in other ethnic groups, the age and generational status of the undocumented population is particularly important to consider.

Increased global contact is also changing children’s developmental contexts in the United States and around the world (Mistry et al., this volume; Yoshikawa et al., this volume). Globalization has led to more flexible diasporas and the opportunity to practice “flexible citizenship” allowing individuals to select strategic sites and contexts for investments, work, and family (Ong, 1999, p. 6). For example, diverse constellations of transnational families are increasingly found, with some migrants sending children back to their home countries to be cared for by relatives (Da, 2003). Parent–child separation, and subsequent separations from non-parental caretakers, can then have implications for children’s mental health (e.g., anxiety, depression; Suárez-Orozco, Bang, & Kim, 2011). Family constellations that include multigenerational influences, which were perhaps facilitated by immigration laws that allowed for family reunification, have clear implications for childrearing, family relationships, and other family dynamics (Bengtson, 2001). Moreover, as Elder (1998) describes, the timing and age at which family separations and reunifications occur could have more or less notable influences on children’s development. Indeed, generational status and migration history can play an important role in child development, with research suggesting the need to distinguish developmental experiences of not only first-, second-, or third-generation youth, but also the “1.5 generation” (i.e., foreign-born individuals who immigrated as young children; Kim, Brenner, Liang, & Asay, 2003, p. 156).

Another dimension of migration and globalization can be seen in the prevalence of transnational adoptees of Asian children in the U.S. Children of Asian descent have the highest relative rates of adoption compared to other racial and ethnic groups and approximately 4% of all Asian American children are adoptees (Asian American Federation, 2014). These numbers vary by ethnic group; for instance, rates of post-War adoptees from Korea are among the highest, with adoptees comprising close to 10% of the total Korean American population (Lee, 2003). Given that many of these children have been adopted by non-Asian families, a growing sector of research has investigated issues of ethnic and cultural socialization and developmental outcomes among this group (Lee, Grotevant, Hellerstedt, & Gunnar, 2006). Moreover, a state-sponsored globalization initiative put forth by South Korea in the 1990s officially welcomed back Korean adoptees (many of whom are now adults), which resulted in opportunities and challenges in terms of the continued development of national and cultural identity and social relationships among the adoptees and their immediate families (Kim, 2007).

In the last decade, globalization has shifted U.S. pop culture, especially among youth, with growing popularity of Korean pop (K-pop) music, Bhangra, Bollywood movies, manga and anime, and Harajuku fashion. Fusion of language, clothing, food, and cultural traditions has increased. Asian Americans are also becoming more visible in the entertainment industry, with actors, directors, authors, and athletes gaining eminence in music, movies, sports, books, and television. Countering long-held stereotypes of Asian Americans as “geeks” and “nerds,” adolescents are actively forging their own distinctive youth cultures. These new
developments, in turn, have important implications for ethnic identity and other aspects of adjustment that social scientists are only beginning to understand (Lee & Zhou, 2004; Yip, 2016).

**Implications for Research With Other Groups**

By focusing our historical analysis on specific Asian groups, we have sought to elucidate the mechanisms by which historical context matters for the development of Asian American children. However, a historical perspective could be useful in understanding the development of other ethnic groups as well. For instance, Latino/as, like Asian Americans, are highly heterogeneous (Stepler & Brown, 2015). Their developmental pathways are also shaped by immigration laws (e.g., DACA, immigration reform), waves of migration (e.g., Hart-Celler Act also facilitated immigration from Latin American countries), and shifting cultural-community contexts (Stein & García Coll, 2016). Latino/as include both voluntary immigrants and refugees, whose premigration experiences and age of immigration influence subsequent development and adaptation in the U.S. Latin America, perhaps even more so than Asia, has been widely affected by oppression and colonialism. Such political, cultural, and linguistic forces affect not only children in those countries, but are carried forward by immigrant parents, families, and ethnic communities to shape children’s development in the United States (Hero, 2010). The precise historical details might vary across panethnic and ethnic groups, but we posit that there are cross-group similarities in the ways historical time and place matter for development.

**Conclusion**

Scientists have long appreciated the importance of school, family, and peer contexts for youth development. Our goal was to widen the discussion to capture the complex historical and sociological forces that influence youth from Asian American backgrounds. While the field has been slowly adapting to accommodate the particular characteristics of Asian Americans (e.g., in its increased attention to diverse, nonacademic developmental outcomes, growing awareness of the value of disaggregating panethnic data, recognition of issues related to generational status), the science itself still lags behind the urgent need to advance our historical understanding of Asian American development. Having established this historical landscape and identified key areas for future work, we hope to have set the stage for scholars to further advance developmental science and delve more specifically into the conceptual and methodological issues that face researchers who study Asian American child and adolescent development.
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