Preface

Culture is perhaps the most neglected topic in the study of risk and resilience. (Feldman & Masalha, 2007, p. 2)

In 1955 Emmy Werner and Ruth Smith began their longitudinal study of children from diverse cultural ancestries, born in America's western-most state, namely Kauai. In many ways, their related 1982 publication, 'Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth', galvanised resilience research in the social sciences. Despite the field's roots in a multi-cultural context, the irony of resilience research is that for the next two decades it would be dominated by a focus on minority world contexts, and informed by minority world perspectives.

By the twenty-first century an increasing number of authors began voicing their critique of the field's narrow investigation of children's constructive adjustment to adversity. Esteemed resilience scholars (see, for example, Boyden, 2003; Cicchetti, 2010; Masten, 2011, 2014; Masten & Wright, 2010; Panter-Brick & Eggerman, 2012; Ungar, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2013; Wright, Masten, & Narayan, 2013; Zautra, Hall, & Murray, 2010) emphasized that until researchers and theorists account for the complex relationship between resilience and culture, explanations of why some individuals prevail in the face of adversity would remain incomplete.

This edited volume is in many ways a response to this critique. It comes literally 10 years after the Resilience Research Centre (RRC) hosted in 2005, the first international conference that focused on cross-cultural understandings of resilience. At this conference, the RRC and its network of resilience-focused researchers from all five continents showed that resilience processes are not culturally neutral. In the intervening years, work emerging from the RRC has continued to foreground the cultural relevance of resilience processes. Studies such as Ungar's International Resilience Project (IRP), an 11-country, 14-site exploration into cross-cultural understandings of resilience, changed how resilience was conceptualised and measured (Ungar & Liebenberg, 2011). This is seen, most notably, in the development of Ungar's Social Ecology of Resilience Theory (2008, 2011). It also spurred the Pathways to Resilience Research Project (led by Ungar, and funded by the Social

Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the International Development Research Centre of Canada, and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment in New Zealand). This mixed methods study investigated the pathways youth travel through formal services and informal supports as they navigate complex and challenging contexts. It has paid close attention to how these various resources support youth resilience processes in the culturally diverse contexts of Canada, China, Colombia, New Zealand, and South Africa, and how these processes are impacted by culture. Its findings echo the theme of the 2005 RRC conference: culture is a heavily nuanced construct and begs much greater consideration in investigations of resilience processes.

The complex import of culture to resilience is underscored by the consideration of other researchers. For example, some researchers are increasingly considering how acculturation processes influence the resilience of highly mobile youth in European and American countries (see, for example, Masten, Liebkind, & Hernandez, 2012); and/or how culturally salient values inform (i.e., promote and/or restrain) resilience processes of youth in Afghanistan (Panter-Brick & Eggerman, 2012); and/or the need to account for how African youths' resilience processes are informed by traditional African culture, rather than in ways that echo Eurocentric theories of resilience (Theron, 2012; Theron & Donald, 2013; Theron, Theron, & Malindi, 2013). Other researchers (e.g. Brown & Tylka, 2011; Neblett et al., 2008) have begun to document how cultural practices (such as racial socialisation) support youth resilience in race-conscious contexts such as America.

Despite this mounting interest in the role of culture in resilience processes no book has been published that focuses exclusively on resilience and culture. *Youth Resilience and Culture: Commonalities and Complexities* addresses this gap. It brings together emerging discussions of the ways in which culture shapes resilience, the theories that inform these various studies, and important considerations that should be borne in mind as researchers continue to investigate resilience. The volume is divided into four parts, reflecting these components.

Part I addresses the central constructs underpinning any theorising about resilience and culture, namely resilience, culture, the complexity inherent to each, and how this is magnified when research accounts for both. In **Chap. 1, Margaret Wright and Ann Masten** review the concepts and lexicon central to resilience, outline several models that facilitate investigation of resilience processes, and briefly synthesise what the last five decades of resilience research reveal about why and how some young people adjust well to potentially disruptive circumstances and events. Their authoritative synthesis flags how culture has, traditionally, been given short shrift in investigations of resilience. In **Chap. 2, Linda C. Theron and Linda Liebenberg** review understandings of culture and comment on the variable ways in which macro- and micro-cultural contexts promote cultural guidelines for everyday living. They conclude that classical views of culture have limited utility for explaining the complexity of how culture matters for resilience, and suggest, therefore, that culture be understood as socially-constructed and socially-shared ways-of-being-and -doing. In **Chap. 3, Michael Ungar** challenges simplistic understandings of either culture or resilience, and draws attention to the diversity

of protective processes and positive adaptation. In this process he reviews the seven tensions – highlighted by the initial International Resilience Project (2003–2005) – that continue to be reflected in emerging research findings. He explains that youths need to resolve these tensions in meaningful collaboration with their social ecologies and highlights how dominant culture, and resistance to dominant culture, informs resilience processes in complex ways.

Part II comprises ten chapters that illustrate the many different ways in which culture and resilience processes intertwine to facilitate and/or hinder youths' positive adjustment to a variety of risks (including poverty, sexual abuse, orphan-status, racism, marginalisation, physical disability, violence, etc.). Importantly, these chapters do not report systematic, cross-cultural work which typically aggregates large-scale study results to offer cultural stereotypes that can be widely generalised. Instead, each of these chapters draws on previously documented research, or current/on-going research, to demonstrate which culturally relevant resources (e.g., worldviews, parenting practices), values, and goals impact youths' resilience processes and how this occurs in variable ways. In doing so, these ten chapters show how cultural resources can sometimes be allied to, or obscured by, ethnicity, race, and religion. In short, each of these chapters provides deeper understanding of the unique, and often complex, ways in which micro- and/or macro-cultural influences sculpt resilience processes. It is our hope that these understandings will prompt follow-up, systematic, robust research that tests their generalizability.

Beginning the part with an African focus, **Linda C. Theron and Nareadi Phasha** (Chap. 4) report two instrumental case studies of black South African youths, who were placed at risk by their social ecologies, to illustrate how traditional African culture (i.e., *Ubuntu* values and practices) underscored, but also complicated, their resilience processes. This is followed by **Elias Mpofu, Nancy Ruhode, Magen Mhaka-Mutepfa, James January, and John Mapfumo's** report in Chap. 5 on an exploratory survey with 18 Zimbabwean youth that shows how traditional, extended family systems mostly facilitate resilience processes when Zimbabwean youth are orphaned.

Moving across to the South Pacific, **Jackie Sanders and Robyn Munford** (Chap. 6) report the varied resilience processes of 605 Māori, Pacific and Pākehā youth and explain how these youths' cultural allegiances shape their resilience processes and related outcomes.

Entering the Northern hemisphere, **Guoxiu Tian and Xiying Wang** (Chap. 7) report how the Chinese cultural emphasis on human interrelatedness provided 220 at-risk youths with nuclear and extended family support, as well as support from 'sworn brothers/sisters' and *tongxiang*, that mostly facilitated these youths' resilience processes.

Next, **Linda Liebenberg, Janice Ikeda, and Michele Wood** (Chap. 8) move the focus to North America where they unpack the ways in which the land/place-based culture of the Inuit supports positive outcomes for youth living in remote coastal communities of Labrador within the Land Claim area of the Nunatsiavut Government. In Chap. 9 **Davido Dupree, Tirzah Spencer, and Margaret Beale Spencer** draw on relevant studies of African American youths and integrate

Spencer's (1995) phenomenological variant of ecological systems theory (PVEST) to illustrate that racial socialisation promotes resilience through positive racial identity and less internalisation of racism. In contrast, **Patrick Russell, Linda Liebenberg, and Michael Ungar** (Chap. 10) explore the ways in which the invisibility created by belonging to dominant cultural groups can hamper the resilience processes of youth, with white youth in Atlantic Canada presented as an example. In Chap. 11**, Elizabeth Moore and Donna Mertens** draw on studies framed by transformative theory (Mertens, 2009) to illustrate how a micro-culture of pride, mentorship, and advocacy along with a macro-culture that advocates for inclusive, quality education for the Deaf, supports resilience processes in Deaf American youth in general, and Deaf American youth of colour in particular. **Shelly Whitman and Linda Liebenberg** (Chap. 12) then explore the ways in which conflicting cultures can both undermine and promote the adaptive processes of former child soldiers moving as refugees from conflict-contexts in sub-Saharan Africa to new homes in a Canadian context, echoing many of the themes highlighted in Chap. 4.

Bringing the part to a close, with continued attention to the complexity of cultural influences, **Wendy Kliewer and Roberto Meijia** (Chap. 13) report a mixed methods study with 310 Colombian youth living in the city of Itagui to document how a culture of violence and the culture of specific *comunas* both supported and obstructed resilience processes.

Part III foregrounds the methodological complexities of researching how resilience and culture interlink, and how this impacts the ways in which youth respond to circumstances and events that threaten their wellbeing in ways that promote positive outcomes. To this end, in Chap. 14, **Jia He and Fons Van de Vijver** use their extensive knowledge of quantitative cross-cultural methods to review construct, method, and item bias that are potentiated in resilience research across multiple cultures, and the corresponding levels of equivalence in cross-cultural comparisons. Using examples from relevant studies, they overview the approaches developed in quantitative studies and how these apply to qualitative studies, before commenting on how best to combine qualitative and quantitative evidence in the study of resilience and culture. **Linda Liebenberg and Linda C. Theron** (Chap. 15) then argue for greater critical consideration when integrating innovative methodologies into resilience-focused qualitative research. In particular, they make a case for culturally-sensitive choices of inventive, qualitative approaches. Using examples from the Pathways to Resilience study, they highlight the value of culturally-congruent, visual, participatory approaches to access the taken-for-granted in person-environment interactions, and the ways in which this enhances understanding of how culture shapes resilience processes. **"Lali" McCubbin and Jennifer Moniz** (Chap. 16) round this part on research off by drawing attention to the criticality of the ethical principles of respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility in studies that explore resilience, particularly when researchers and participants do not share cultural roots, and/or when resilience studies are conducted in marginalised communities. They conclude that in the absence of respectful, relevant, reciprocal, and responsible research, studies will yield

superficial and/or inaccurate understandings of how culture sways resilience, potentially furthering the marginalising effects of oppressive structures.

Part IV consists of a single, compelling chapter authored by **Catherine Panter-Brick**. In this concluding chapter, Catherine flags the dangers of researching how culture impacts resilience in simplistic, reductionist, or categorical ways. She urges future, methodologically robust, multi-systems research that takes a 'fine-grained' approach to culture, especially if resilience is to be understood as a complex, normative concept, and if the differential nature of functional outcomes, and the pathways to them, are to be meaningfully grasped. Importantly, naive or romanticized interpretations of the ways in which culture impacts resilience are derided. Accordingly, the concluding chapter underscores the way in which this collection provides an opportunity to pause and take stock of the progress, or lack thereof, made in explorations of how culture informs resilience. Importantly, while this chapter brings the volume to a summative close, it also points the way forward for future research efforts, thereby positioning this publication as a stepping stone on the path to systematically explaining why and how culture shapes resilience processes.

In summary, this book does not offer exhaustive explanations or illustrations of how culture and resilience processes interact to facilitate positive outcomes (or not). For example, no chapter explicitly addresses how youth, who are confronted by several contrasting and/or shifting cultural paradigms, navigate and negotiate such realities. Nor does any chapter speak of youth resistance to dominant or disruptive cultures and how such resistance informs resilience processes. Likewise, comment on gene X culture interactions is absent. Nevertheless, *Youth Resilience and Culture: Commonalities and Complexities* is a first and important step to sensitising researchers and practitioners in the field of resilience to the magnitude of culture in explanations of resilience processes and subsequent translation of such understandings into culturally-congruent interventions. In short, the central message of this book is that non-stereotypical, critical appreciation of the culture, and often conflicting systems in which youth find themselves, and those with which they affiliate, is pivotal to comprehending why particular resilience processes matter for particular youth in a particular life-world at a particular point in time. Grasping such particularity demands on-going, sensitive research into why and how culture matters for resilience.

Vanderbijlpark, South Africa   L. C. Theron
Halifax, NS, Canada   L. Liebenberg
Halifax, NS, Canada   M. Ungar

References

Boyden, J. (2003). Children under fire: Challenging assumptions about children's resilience. *Children, Youth and Environments*, *13*(1). Retrieved from http://colorado.edu/journals/cye

Brown, D. L., & Tylka, T. L. (2011). Racial discrimination and resilience in African American young adults: Examining racial socialization as a moderator. *The Journal of Black Psychology, 37*, 259–285.

Cicchetti, D. (2010). Resilience under conditions of extreme stress: A multilevel perspective. *World Psychiatry, 9*, 145–154.

Feldman, R., & Masalha, S. (2007). The role of culture in moderating the links between early ecological risk and young children's adaptation. *Development and Psychopathology, 19*, 1–21.

Masten, A. S. (2011). Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity: Frameworks for research, practice, and translational synergy. *Development and Psychopathology, 23*, 493–506. doi:10.1017/S0954579411000198.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development, 85*(1), 6–20. doi:10.1111/cdev.12205.

Masten, A. S., Liebkind, K., & Hernandez, D. J. (2012). *Realizing the potential of immigrant youth*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Masten, A. S., & Wright, M. O. (2010). Resilience over the lifespan: Developmental perspectives on resistance, recovery and transformation. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 213–237). New York, NY: Guilford.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Neblett, E. W., White, R. L., Ford, K. R., Philip, C. L., Nguyên, H. X., & Sellers, R. M. (2008). Patterns of racial socialization and psychological adjustment: Can parental communications about race reduce the impact of racial discrimination? *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 18* (3), 477–515.

Panter-Brick, C., & Eggerman, M. (2012). Understanding culture, resilience, and mental health: The production of hope. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *The social ecology of resilience. A handbook of theory and practice* (pp. 369–386). New York, NY: Springer.

Spencer, M. B. (1995). Old issues and new theorizing about African American youth: A phenomenological variant of ecological systems theory. In R. L. Taylor (Ed.), *African-American youth: Their social and economic status in the United States* (pp. 37–69). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Theron, L. C. (2012). Resilience research with South African youth: Caveats and ethical complexities. *South African Journal of Psychology, 42*, 333–345.

Theron, L. C., & Donald, D. R. (2013). Educational psychology and resilience in developing contexts: A rejoinder to Toland and Carrigan. *School Psychology International, 34*, 51–66.

Theron, L. C., Theron, A. M. C., & Malindi, M. J. (2013). Towards an African definition of resilience: A rural South African community's view of resilient Basotho youth. *Journal of Black Psychology, 39*, 63–87.

Ungar, M. (2008). Resilience across cultures. *British Journal of Social Work, 38*(2), 218–235.

Ungar, M. (2011). The social ecology of resilience. Addressing contextual and cultural ambiguity of a nascent construct. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 81*, 1–17.

Ungar, M. (Ed.). (2012). *The social ecology of resilience*. New York, NY: Springer.

Ungar, M. (2013). Resilience, trauma, context, and culture. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 14*(3), 255–266.

Ungar, M., & Liebenberg, L. (2011). Assessing resilience across cultures using mixed-methods: Construction of the child and youth resilience measure-28. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 5*(2), 126–149.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Wright, M. O., Masten, A. S., & Narayan, A. J. (2013). Resilience processes in development: Four waves of research on positive adaptation in the context of adversity. In S. Goldstein & R. B. Brooks (Eds.), *Handbook of resilience in children* (pp. 15–37). New York, NY: Springer.

Zautra, A. J., Hall, J. S., & Murray, K. E. (2010). A new definition of health for people and communities. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience* (pp. 3–29). New York, NY: Guilford.