

Evaluation of Eltern-Aktiv – a Parenting Program for Refugee Families in Germany

Christina Nieder¹, Gisa Müller-Butzkamm², & Joscha Kärtner¹

¹University of Münster, Germany

²Christophorus-Kliniken GmbH, Coesfeld, Germany

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Joscha Kärtner, Department of Psychology, University of Münster, 48149 Münster, Germany. Phone: +49 - (02 51) 83 - 34 33 1, Fax: +49 - (02 51) 83 - 34 34 1. Email: j.kaertner@uni-muenster.de

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Barbara Abdallah-Steinkopff and the team of Eltern-Aktiv from Refugio München e.V. for the organization and implementation of the program and their support throughout the process of planning and realizing of the evaluation study. Furthermore, the authors would like to thank Dr. Celeste Brenneka for proofreading the manuscript.

Abstract

In addition to their own acculturation efforts, refugee parents must shape educational and upbringing processes for their children. This may be challenging, especially for parents with traumatic refugee experiences. To support refugee parents, the program Eltern-Aktiv was developed. To evaluate Eltern-Aktiv, we used a mixed-method approach, namely a standardized questionnaire-based interview with refugee parents before ($N = 39$) and after ($N = 21$) the program and qualitative interviews with $N = 5$ trainers of the program. Results indicated the effectiveness of the program in terms of increased positive parenting behaviors (i.e., positive conflict behavior, support, and structuring). However, we found no significant effect of the program regarding attitudes, namely the awareness of norms and values in parenting, parenting efficacy, acculturation orientation and fears regarding cultural differences. Implications of our findings are discussed as well as the question of how to access the vulnerable group of refugee families.

Key Words

refugees, integration, parenting program, evaluation

Introduction

Each year, several thousand people migrate to Germany. In 2020, nearly 60% of migrants came from a country within the European Union (EU) for work, study, or family reasons. The largest group of migrants from non-EU countries came to Germany to seek asylum. Refugees originated mainly from Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq (Sachverständigenrat für Integration und Migration, 2021). Due to the migration process as well as traumatic experiences in the country of origin or on the run, refugees face additional challenges that also have implications for and may alter the dynamics associated with the adjustment processes that all migrants face in the receiving country (Echterhoff et al., 2020; Johansson, 2016; Morrice et al., 2021). From a psychological perspective, we define refugee migration primarily based on the individual experience, namely the perceived forcedness of migration, rather than legal or political considerations and consider refugee migration as a continuous rather than categorical variable (Echterhoff et al., 2020). One of the core challenges that migrants and the host society face is the acculturation process, namely the integration of cultures through psychological and pedagogical learning (Rudmin, 2009). This process may be challenging, especially for families, because they may be confronted with alternative conceptions of childhood education and care in the host society (Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2018; Schöllhorn et al., 2016) as well as changes in family dynamics that may cause intrafamily conflicts (Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2015; Uslucan, 2010). Due to increased stress, not all families manage to deal with these challenges alone (Abdallah-Steinkopff and Akhtar, 2015).

To support migrant and refugee families in Germany, regional psycho-social centers offer psychotherapy or psychological counseling. Moreover, to meet the specific needs of migrant and refugee parents concerning parenting, Refugio Munich developed the parenting program Eltern-Aktiv (Parents-Active; Abdallah-Steinkopff et al., 2015). This program aims to support families in reflecting on their own parenting norms and values, strengthening their resources and parenting strategies and, as a consequence, building a stable family system in

Germany, while preserving their own cultural roots, and to enable a successful acculturation of both parents and children (Abdallah-Steinkopff et al., 2015). As there is no systematic evaluation of the program to date, the main objective of the present study is to evaluate the effectiveness of Eltern-Aktiv for refugee families in Germany based on a mixed-method approach including responses from both parents and trainers.

Migration or forced displacement and their effect on parents and families

Migration or forced displacement comes with general challenges (e.g., learning a new language, dealing with possible health problems) that all migrants or refugees face and specific challenges that are unique to families (e.g., dealing with power shifts within the family or different ideas of education in the receiving country). A first challenge after migration is often to learn the new language (Morrice et al., 2021), which is a key competence to enter the labor market (Morrice et al., 2021). Furthermore, previous studies have shown that asylum seekers (with a work permission) had a low employment rate, especially in the first years post migration, and that there was a significant wage gap to average earnings in Germany (Brücker et al., 2019). In addition, refugee families may have to live for several years in collective accommodation which is often characterized by cramped housing conditions (i.e., families living together in one room) and poor infrastructural connections, which further complicates the acculturation process (Johansson, 2016). For refugee children, the access to early childhood education and care (ECEC) institutions is often difficult due to limited spaces available (Schroeder and Seukwa, 2017). Thus, refugee children are underrepresented in ECEC, especially when they live in collective accommodation (Gambaro et al., 2017; Schroeder and Seukwa, 2017). Overall, refugee and migrant families face several unfavorable living conditions that can have a negative impact on the family life.

Regarding the health of migrant and refugee families, several studies have shown that families often have to deal with physical and mental health problems after migration. For instance, because of living in collective accommodation, there is an increased risk for

infectious diseases (Alberer et al., 2018). As a consequence of war, fleeing, and resettlement, refugees showed increased rates of psychological stress (Hajak et al., 2021) and symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD; Renner et al., 2020). Further risk factors for poor mental health are, including some of those mentioned above, an uncertain asylum status (Hajak et al., 2021; Schober and Zocher, 2022), living in collective accommodation, lacking German language skills, having trouble with the integration process, and discrimination experiences. Employment, on the other hand, serves as a protective factor (Hajak et al., 2021). Refugee children also showed an increased prevalence of PTSD as well as psychological and mental health problems (Gavranidou et al., 2008). As, according to federal laws in Germany, refugees have limited access to the health care system (Bozorgmehr et al., 2019; Gottlieb and Schülle, 2021), this may aggravate the above mentioned health problems. Further barriers to access the health care system are poor information, stigma, and language difficulties (Renner et al., 2020).

Besides unfavorable living conditions and health problems, families are often confronted with a new cultural system in the receiving country. In this study, we define culture as a set of behaviors, attitudes, values, norms, and traditions that is shared among a group and that informs everyday experience and behavior (Keller, 2007; Keller and Kärtner, 2013). Thus, culture is a process of social interaction and is acquired by children through everyday practices within the family and larger social group (Keller and Kärtner, 2013; Rogoff, 2003). In the eco-social model of development, Keller and Kärtner (2013) describe two prototypical cultural models based on the socio-cultural context (i.e., socio-economic status, level of education, family form), namely psychological autonomy and hierarchical relatedness. For instance, families from hierarchical, relationally organized cultural contexts usually lived in extended family systems (Keller and Kärtner, 2013), often with strictly defined family and gender roles (Borke et al., 2015). Moreover, many child-rearing tasks are handled by grandparents and other close relatives (Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2015). With the

migration to Germany, most families lose the extended family. Accordingly, parents must take on new educational tasks, which often means an additional burden for them. In addition, the change to a more autonomy-oriented cultural context can lead to a shift in the balance of power within the family (i.e., towards women and children; Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2015; Uslucan, 2010). Additionally, as children often take over more responsibility after migration (e.g., translating for parents in official matters), this further strengthens the role of the child in the family. In summary, these role shifts and additional educational tasks for parents can lead to intrafamily conflicts and feelings of excessive demands (Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2015; Uslucan, 2010).

When families have been socialized in a different cultural context, they most likely have alternative socialization strategies and ideas about optimal parenting behavior (Keller, 2007; Keller and Kärtner, 2013). For instance, respect, obedience, and fitting in are considered more important in hierarchical relational contexts. This corresponds to an authoritarian parenting style (i.e., rigid enforcement of parental authority with a high degree of external control and little autonomy of children; Kimil et al., 2013). In contrast, in ECEC institutions in Germany, self-determination, self-confidence and the expression of one's own ideas are usually fostered (i.e., autonomy-oriented development goals; Bossong and Keller, 2018). As a consequence, children from refugee families are often confronted with different educational styles, which may lead to intrafamily conflicts (Abdallah-Steinkopff and Akhtar, 2015). In fact, Uslucan (2010) found that parents who have migrated from Turkey disciplined their children even more, as they felt their children were moving away from them and felt threatened by that. Moreover, refugee parents often tend to see ECEC as an institution for formal learning (i.e., prefer a more didactic approach) and are critical about the benefit of free play for young children's development (Bossong and Keller, 2018; Nieder and Kärtner, 2020). These alternative conceptions of parenting and education can lead to conflicts in the

ECEC and school context between refugee parents and teachers (Abdallah-Steinkopff and Akhtar, 2015).

Eltern-Aktiv – a native speaker parenting program for migrant and refugee families

Addressing key challenges in the receiving country, the program Eltern-Aktiv (Abdallah-Steinkopff et al., 2015) aims to support families in coping with these challenges. Eltern-Aktiv is a manual-based program to strengthen parenting skills for refugee and migrant parents who have children up to age 13. The program contains twelve sessions and can be conducted for both groups and individuals. If possible, the twelve modules are taught in the native language of participants and the program is available in 30 different languages. The trainers of Eltern-Aktiv hold a relevant University degree (e.g., pedagogy or psychology) and receive a special training by Refugio Munich e.V.

The content of Eltern-Aktiv is largely based on the program Familienteam (Family team, Graf, 2013) and enhanced by the concept of culture-sensitivity, both as a topic and a methodological approach. Familienteam is a program to strengthen parents' education skills, based on a systemic view of family and education (i.e., considering the interactions between the individual family members as well as between behavior, thoughts, and feelings). Graf (2013) emphasizes the importance of the affective quality of the parent-child relationship and emotional competencies such as mindfulness, empathy, communication, and emotion regulation in the family system. Other cornerstones of the program are to give children orientation through clear rules and to promote children's autonomy. As the program has not been developed for migrant and refugee parents, Abdallah-Steinkopff et al. (2015) expanded and modified Graf's program to meet the specific needs of families who are living in a new culture and have to deal with the challenges of migration or forced displacement. In total, the program Eltern-Aktiv covers 17 topics that can be aggregated to five general modules, namely (1) norms and values in parenting, (2) parental resources, including self-care (3) knowledge about child development (i.e., attachment, development of children, crying and sleeping,

playing and media, clinical and migration-related problems), (4) normative knowledge about parenting behavior (i.e., attention and praising appropriately, dealing with emotions, preventing escalation, setting limits, handling acute conflicts, handling recurring conflicts), and (5) knowledge about integration (e.g., information about kindergarten and school, legal issues, health, dealing with separation and divorce). While all five modules are obligatory, the specific topics of the modules child development and integration were adjusted to the children's age and families' needs.

The methods of Eltern-Aktiv include inputs by the trainers and moderated group discussion that support parents in integrating new perspectives. Moreover, to practice parenting skills, role-plays that simulate parent-child-interaction are used in most modules. Most sessions end with a 'homework'; this may consist of reflecting on certain thought-provoking impulses or trying out specific parenting or interaction strategies in the family. Across topics, the program aims to encourage participants to reflect on their own culture-specific ideals and routines and to identify similarities and differences with the ideals and routines of the receiving culture. Furthermore, it supports families in finding viable options in navigating associated tensions and conflicts, including, if considered necessary, adjusting own cultural parenting routines. In this context, the method of intercultural commuting is considered fundamental (Abdallah-Steinkopff, 2015). Here, the trainer – who in most cases has cultural expertise in both the receiving culture and the culture of origin – acts as a 'mediator between the two cultures'. Abdallah-Steinkopff (2015) describes intercultural commuting in several steps: (1) inquiring about parenting ideals, (2) explaining dominant parenting ideals in the receiving culture, (3) jointly evaluating both strategies for the current life situation, (4) if necessary, deciding for an alternative strategy, (5) jointly identifying possible obstacles for the implementation of the new strategies, and (6) searching for solutions to overcome these obstacles and to successfully implement the new strategy.

Evaluation model and hypotheses

To evaluate Eltern-Aktiv, we used the evaluation model by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) and assessed outcomes at three levels, namely participants' reaction to the program, learning (i.e., attitudes), and behavior. Research questions and hypotheses were developed in close cooperation with the Eltern-Aktiv team of Refugio Munich. Based on a single group pre-post intervention design, reactions were assessed at the post-assessment and the specific hypotheses were specified as changes from pre- to post-assessments.

Reaction. As one objective of the evaluation of Eltern-Aktiv was to identify possibilities to improve the program, we formulated four research questions concerning participant's reaction to the program: (1) How satisfied are participants in general with the program? (2) How do participants perceive the specific topics of the program? (3) How do participants perceive the methods of the program? (4) How do participants perceive the general success factors of the program (e.g., native speaking trainers)?

Learning. On this level, we focused on changes of attitudes. More specifically, we formulated the following hypotheses: (1) Participants show an increase of awareness concerning their parenting norms and values. (2) Participants will show an increase of self-efficacy in parenting. (3) Participants will show more positive attitudes concerning the acculturation process (i.e., an increased orientation towards receiving culture with no influences on the culture of origin). (4) Participants will show less fears regarding cultural differences.

Behavior. On the behavioral level, we focused on specific parenting behavior. Accordingly, we formulated the following hypotheses: Participants will show (1) more positive parenting behavior, (2) less negative and more positive conflict behavior, (3) more support of children's curricular and extracurricular activities, (4) more structuring of children's daily routines and activities, and (5) more monitoring behavior of children's activities.

Method

Study Design and Procedure

To evaluate the program, we used a mixed-method approach. The quantitative part of the study consisted of a standardized, questionnaire-based interview based on a single group pre-post intervention design. More specifically, interviews were conducted with the participants at pretest (T1; i.e., approx. 1 week before the start of the program) and again at posttest (T2; i.e., approx. 1 week after the end of the program). Between pre- and posttest, participants took part in two two-hour sessions per week over a period of approximately three months. The program was conducted by professional trainers in participants' mother tongue or another officially spoken language in the country of origin (i.e., English for participants from Nigeria). In addition to the quantitative data assessment with the participants, we conducted qualitative interviews with the trainers after the program was completed to receive further insight into their perspectives on program effects.

Sample

The sample of the present study consists of $N = 39$ refugee parents who took part in the program Eltern-Aktiv in 2017 and 2018 as well as all trainers ($N = 5$) who conducted the program.

Participants of Eltern-Aktiv were mostly women (82.1%), aged 16 to 58 years ($M = 32.87$, $SD = 9.45$) and had between one and six children ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.64$). Eighteen participants did not complete the program, resulting in a retention rate of 53.8% ($N = 21$) at post-assessment. All participants came to Germany between the years 2002 to 2016, whereas the majority (69.2%) came in the years 2015 and 2016. Most participants (38.5%) originated from Syria, further countries of origin were Nigeria (25.6%), Somalia (15.4%), Iraq (15.4%), Lebanon (2.6%) and Pakistan (2.6%). More than half of the participants (53.8%) had a limited residence permit, two participants (5.1%) were granted a permanent residence permit, and one

participant (2.6%) received German citizenship. Around a quarter of participants (25.6%) were in an ongoing asylum process, whereas five participants (12.8%) were not granted asylum. Most participants (59.0%) lived in a temporary, collective accommodation for refugees, whereas 41.0% had their own home.

Almost half of the participants (48.7%) stated Arabic as their native language. Further native languages were regional Nigerian languages (25.6%), Somali (15.4%), Aramaic (5.1%), Urdu (2.6%) and Kurdish (2.6%). Most participants were Sunni Muslims (56.6%), followed by Protestants (17.9%), Catholics (12.8%) and other religious groups (12.8%). Participants went to school for an average of 6.36 years ($SD = 3.91$). Six participants (15.4%) never attended school, while twenty-five participants (64.1%) attended school, but did not graduate. Three participants (12.8%) graduated from school and five participants (12.8%) held a university degree. Around one third of participants (35.9%) stated that they had learned a profession.

Trainers of Eltern-Aktiv were all female and between 35 and 50 years old. All trainers had a migrant background and held a university degree. They were trained by Refugio Munich for conducting the program with regular supervision groups during the program. All trainers were part-time staff.

Data Collection

The program was conducted as an individual training for 19 parents ($N = 9$ at posttest) or as a group training for 20 parents ($N = 12$ at posttest) in four different groups (i.e., two Arabic groups, one Somali group, and one English group for parents from Nigeria). For participants from Nigeria, the program was conducted in English due to fact that parents spoke different regional languages and because English is both an official as well as written and spoken language in school in Nigeria. Similarly, the standardized, questionnaire-based interviews (pre- and posttest) was performed in three different languages (i.e., Arabic, Somali, and English).

The pre- and posttest interviews were conducted either by the second author or a trained employee of Refugio Munich. In eleven pre-interviews and four post-interviews, this process was supported by a translator. Pretests were conducted in the temporary, collective accommodation for refugees or participants' own home. Prior to data collection, parents were informed about the research project and asked for their written consent. After that, the instruction of the interview was presented and any open questions were clarified. The duration of the pretest interview was approximately 120 minutes and the duration of the posttest interview was around 90 minutes.

The qualitative interviews with trainers of Eltern-Aktiv were conducted after the program by the second author. Data were recorded via Skype.

Measures

To evaluate the program Eltern-Aktiv, we used a standardized questionnaire-based interview that was conducted with parents before and after the program. After the program, qualitative interviews were conducted with trainers of Eltern-Aktiv.

Standardized Questionnaire-Based Interview. Following the evaluation model by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006), outcomes were measured on three different levels, namely participants' reaction to the program (only at posttest), learning (i.e., attitudes), and behavior. On the reaction level, we included all topics of the program, whereas on the other two levels, we focused on key outcomes. For each level, several subscales were applied. The questionnaire was translated to English, Arabic, and Somali following the guidelines for the translation of questionnaires by Harkness et al. (2004). Thus, the English and Arabic translations were done by two independent translators who compared their translations and agreed on a final version. As there was only one translator for Somali available, the Somali translations were prepared by only one translator, who also worked as a trainer for the program.

Reaction. To measure participants' reaction to the program, the post questionnaire included several items regarding the acceptance and satisfaction with the program. The first four items focused on *General Conditions* of the program (e.g., reasons for missing a session). Additionally, five items focused on *Key Success Factors* of the program (e.g., the native language of the trainer). The *Importance of the Content* of the program, namely the importance of the 17 different topics, was rated per topic (i.e., via 17 items) on a 4-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 ("not useful at all") to 4 ("very useful"). Similarly, the *Appropriateness of the Methods* of the program (e.g., role plays) was rated by five items on the same scale. In addition, participants were asked (1) which topics had given them new insights into parenting or life in Germany, which aspects of the program were (2) the most useful and (3) the least useful, and (4) which aspects were missing. Finally, participants were asked for an *Overall Rating* of the program on a 4-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 ("poor") to 4 ("very good").

Learning. All learning outcomes were assessed on a 4-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 ("not at all") to 4 ("very much"). *Norms and Values in Parenting* were assessed by two items (e.g., 'I know which norms and values I would like to teach my children') with Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$ at pretest. To assess participants' perception of their ability to successfully raise children, we used the *Parenting Efficacy Scale* (Fragebogen zur Selbstwirksamkeit in der Erziehung, FSW; Kliem et al., 2014). The scale consists of nine items (e.g., 'I can easily set limits to my children.') with Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$ at pretest. To measure acculturation, we developed two subscales based on the bidimensional model by Berry (1997, 2005), namely *Orientation towards Culture of Origin* and *Orientation towards Receiving Culture*. The development of the two subscales was guided by existing acculturation scales, namely, the Frankfurt Acculturation Scale (Bongard et al., 2020) and an acculturation scale developed by Maehler (2012). *Orientation towards Culture of Origin* was assessed by five items (e.g., 'It is important to me to safeguard the norms and values of my home culture.') with Cronbach's $\alpha =$

.77 at pretest. *Orientation towards Receiving Culture* was assessed by six items (e.g., ‘I like reading German newspapers or watching German TV news.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .67$ at pretest. Finally, *Fears regarding Cultural Differences* were assessed by five items (e.g., ‘I fear people in Germany expect me to give up the values of my home culture.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .75$ at pretest.

Behavior. Parenting behavior was measured by several subscales on a 4-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (“hardly ever”) to 4 (“most of the time”). We used 10 items (e.g., ‘I play with my children.’) from the *Positive Parenting Behavior Scale* (Fragen zum positiven Erziehungsverhalten, FZEV; Heinrichs et al., 2006) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .72$ at pretest. *Negative Conflict Behavior* was assessed by five items (e.g., ‘When I argue with my children it may happen that my words are not enough and I have to slap them occasionally.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .62$ at pretest: Three items were taken from the subscale Corporal Punishment from the German version of the Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) for primary school children (DEAPQ-EL-GS; Reichle and Franiek, 2009), the other two items came from the subscale Other Discipline Practices from the German version of the APQ for preschool children (Jäkel and Leyendecker, 2009). *Positive Conflict Behavior* was assessed by seven items (e.g., ‘When my children get angry or sad, I try to understand them and be there for them.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .62$ at pretest. *Support* (i.e., how parents support their children’s curricular and extracurricular activities) was assessed by five items (e.g., ‘I help my children with their homework.’) that were taken from the DEAPQ-EL-GS (Reichle and Franiek, 2009) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .70$ at pretest. *Structuring* (i.e., the degree to which parents structure daily routines and activities) was assessed by three items (e.g., ‘I set hours for my children to watch TV.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$ at pretest. Two items came from the APQ for preschool children (Jäkel and Leyendecker, 2009). Finally, *Monitoring* of children (i.e., in how far parents check activities of their children) was assessed by three items (e.g., ‘I check which TV programs my children are allowed to watch.’) with Cronbach’s $\alpha = .71$ at pretest.

Qualitative Interview Guide. The first part of the interview guide included questions regarding the basic conditions of the program, namely (1) the cooperation with participants, (2) key success factors, and (3) methods of the program. In the second part, the specific topics were addressed in thematic blocks, namely reflection of norms and values, strengthening of parental resources and self-care, knowledge about child development, parenting behavior, and integration knowledge. For each thematic block, the following aspects were addressed, namely (1) relevance of the topic, (2) resistance towards topic, and (3) indicators of attitude or behavior change. Finally, the interview guide included questions regarding the achievement of the overall goals of the program as well as the improvement of the program and reasons for the high dropout rate.

Data analysis

Data analysis covered both quantitative and qualitative methods. For statistical analyses, we used SPSS Version 25. Preliminary data analyses covered descriptive statistical analyses. To test for changes across time (i.e., from pre- to post-test), we performed paired sample t-tests. Effect sizes reported for t-tests are Hedge's *g* (Lakens, 2013).

To analyze the qualitative data (i.e., interviews), we used qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2014). Interview recordings were transcribed using the program f4 based on transcription rules by Dresing and Pehl (2015). Due to the explorative research design and a predefined interview guide, we decided to combine deductive and inductive procedures for analysis (i.e., content structuring/ theme analysis; Mayring, 2014). Moreover, we defined the coding units (i.e., the smallest component of a text that can be coded) as a word (Dresing and Pehl, 2015). To develop the coding scheme, we initially categorized the content on a rather specific level. After that, we formulated categories on a more abstract level and defined specific coding rules as well as anchors. In addition to the qualitative content analysis, we analyzed frequencies for dichotomous and scaling questions. Data were coded using the program MAXQDA.

Results

Drop-out rate

Nearly half of participants (46.2%) did not complete the program and were not present at the time of posttest. To determine if drop-out was systematic, we computed Cramer's V , but there were no significant associations with gender, education, language, nationality, family situation, resident status, or format (i.e., group vs. individual setting), $|V|s < .49$, $ps > .32$.

To learn more about reasons for the high drop-out rate, we asked trainers of Eltern-Aktiv. All trainers mentioned a lack of motivation as one possible reason for the high drop-out rate. Even though most parents were advised (e.g., by the youth welfare office) to take part in the program, participation in Eltern-Aktiv was voluntary (i.e., no sanctions, no rewards), which led to a low level of extrinsic motivation. Moreover, because participants were often not fully aware of the aims of the program and the benefits it can have for them personally, trainers assumed that the intrinsic motivation was low as well. Additionally, because of the lack of information, participants may have had different expectations and were disappointed when they attended the program. A second reason (mentioned by all trainers) was a possible cognitive overload (e.g., due to a low level of education), emotional overload (e.g., because of being mentally preoccupied with other issues) or time constraints (e.g., having too many other appointments or no one to look after the children).

Reaction

Concerning participants' reaction to the program, we considered four aspects, namely participants' satisfaction (1) overall, (2) with the content, (3) with the methods and (4) with the assumed key success factors of the program.

Overall satisfaction. In general, participants showed a high satisfaction with the program at the post-test. More specifically, 23.8% of participants rated the program as good and 76.2% of participants rated it as very good ($M = 3.76$; $SD = 0.44$).

Satisfaction with the content. Concerning the content of the program, participants showed a very high satisfaction with each of the five topics (see Table 1 for more details), namely values and norms in parenting ($M = 3.86$; $SD = 0.36$), parental resources and self-care ($M = 3.71$; $SD = 0.59$), knowledge about child development ($M = 3.69$; $SD = 0.28$), parenting behavior ($M = 3.82$; $SD = 0.24$), and integration ($M = 3.89$; $SD = 0.20$). In the open questions, all participants stated they had learned something new about child development and life in Germany. The two topics that participants mentioned as most helpful were (1) dealing with conflicts, especially setting limits, and (2) dealing with emotions.

While parents evaluated all topics as helpful, trainers of Eltern-Aktiv had a more differentiated view. For instance, trainers perceived no resistance from parents towards the topics parental resources and knowledge about integration. However, concerning parenting behavior, three trainers mentioned that parents were resistant and had a different understanding about ‘good’ parenting behavior. Concerning child development, four trainers stated that parents were resistant towards three sub-topics, namely media, nutrition (i.e., only parents from Somalia), and sex education. In this context, one trainer (T2) explained that “many parents don’t like to have sex education in school. When you talk about sexuality, parents don’t want that. It is a taboo subject; it doesn't belong to the child.” The topic that produced most resistance from parents (according to four trainers) was norms and values in parenting, especially when gender roles were concerned.

Satisfaction with the methods. The methods of the program were generally highly accepted by parents. More specifically both inputs by trainers and role-plays were evaluated as very helpful by 90.5% of parents. This was followed by homework (83.3%), poster and visuals (77.8%) and intercultural commuting (71.4%).

When trainers were asked about the acceptance of methods by parents, they confirmed that intercultural commuting, posters and visual as well as exercises were highly appreciated

by parents. However, they also stated that the benefit of lectures depended on the level of education and that, at least in the beginning, some parents were shy to take part in role-plays.

Table 1

Reaction to the Content of the Program

| | <i>n</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> |
|---|----------|------------|------------|---------------|
| Norms and values in parenting | 21 | 3 | 4 | 3.86 (.36) |
| Parental resources and self-care | 17 | 2 | 4 | 3.71 (.59) |
| Child development¹ | 19 | 3.25 | 4 | 3.69 (.28) |
| Attachment | 20 | 3 | 4 | 3.85 (.37) |
| Development of children | 19 | 3 | 4 | 3.79 (.42) |
| Crying and sleeping | 13 | 3 | 4 | 3.54 (.52) |
| Playing and media use | 21 | 2 | 4 | 3.67 (.58) |
| Clinical and migration-related problems | 9 | 3 | 4 | 3.56 (.53) |
| Parenting behavior | 19 | 3.33 | 4 | 3.82 (.24) |
| Attention and praising appropriately | 20 | 3 | 4 | 3.95 (.22) |
| Dealing with emotions | 20 | 3 | 4 | 3.85 (.37) |
| Preventing escalation | 19 | 3 | 4 | 3.84 (.37) |
| Setting limits | 21 | 3 | 4 | 3.95 (.22) |
| Handling acute conflicts | 19 | 2 | 4 | 3.58 (.61) |
| Handling recurring conflicts | 20 | 3 | 4 | 3.70 (.47) |
| Integration¹ | 19 | 3.33 | 4 | 3.89 (.20) |
| Information about kindergarten and school | 18 | 3 | 4 | 3.89 (.32) |
| Legal issues | 12 | 3 | 4 | 3.67 (.49) |
| Health | 18 | 3 | 4 | 3.94 (.24) |
| Dealing with separation and divorce | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 (.00) |

Note. ¹ Specific topics were chose depending on children's age. Scores range from 1 ("not helpful at all") to 4 ("very helpful").

Satisfaction with key success factors. All participants of the post-test whose training took place in their native language (66.6%) found this to be ‘very helpful’. Moreover, 93.9% of parents stated that the fact that the trainer came from the same cultural background was very helpful. Finally, 90% of parents mentioned that they felt highly valued by the trainers.

These findings were confirmed by trainers of Eltern-Aktiv: they reported that the same cultural background facilitated the interaction with parents and made it easier to understand parents’ perspectives. However, all trainers reported that working with parents, at least initially, was characterized by high levels of mistrust. In this context, one trainer (T4) mentioned that “for them [the parents], I am the enemy first.”

Learning

Concerning the effects of the program on attitudes, we considered changes in participants’ (1) awareness of parenting norms and values, (2) parenting efficacy, (3) attitudes towards the acculturation process, and (4) fears regarding cultural differences. Since some of the topics of Eltern-Aktiv were optional, sample sizes for outcome measures differ accordingly.

Norms and values in parenting. Regarding the awareness of parenting norms and values, we found no significant changes between pre- and posttest ($t(15) = 0.00, p = .500, g = 0.00$, see Table 2 for *Ms* and *SDs*).

Similarly, trainers were cautious regarding an increased awareness of norms and values in parenting. Generally, trainers stated that participants had difficulties grasping these concepts. However, one trainer (T4) stated that she believed parents had an increased understanding of what was expected from them in Germany regarding parenting and that the program “always expands the perspective” concerning norms and values in parenting.

Parenting efficacy. Regarding parenting efficacy, we found no significant difference between pre- and posttest ($t(17) = 1.17, p = .129, g = 0.27$). However, when looking at items regarding parenting efficacy that were only assessed at posttest, participants perceive positive effects of the program. More specifically, 90% of parents stated that, after the program, they

understood their children better (80% = “very much”, 10% = “considerably”). Furthermore, 85.7% of parents stated that, after the program, they knew better what needs they had as a mother or father (71.4% = “very much”, 14.3% = “considerably”). Regarding conflicts, 81.0% of parents stated that, after the program, they found it easier to deal with their children in difficult situations (66.7% = “very much”, 14.3% = “considerably”). Finally, 90.5% of parents mentioned that the program had helped them in successfully implementing the things they wanted to change in their family (61.9% = “very much”, 28.6% = “considerably”).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Outcome Variables

| | <i>n</i> | T1 | T2 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|
| | | <i>M (SD)</i> | <i>M (SD)</i> |
| Attitudes | | | |
| Norms and values | 16 | 3.63 (.56) | 3.63 (.39) |
| Parenting efficacy | 18 | 3.35 (.34) | 3.45 (.37) |
| Acculturation process | | | |
| Orientation towards country of origin | 19 | 3.25 (.74) | 3.22 (.82) |
| Orientation towards host culture | 19 | 3.56 (.39) | 3.51 (.38) |
| Fears regarding cultural differences | 19 | 1.74 (.67) | 1.74 (.53) |
| Behavior | | | |
| Positive parenting behavior | 18 | 3.66 (.41) | 3.66 (.32) |
| Conflict behavior | | | |
| Negative conflict behavior | 18 | 1.74 (.51) | 1.46 (.44) |
| Positive conflict behavior | 18 | 3.32 (.55) | 3.56 (.39) |
| Support | 15 | 2.49 (.73) | 3.02 (.42) |
| Structuring | 18 | 2.80 (1.04) | 3.61 (.45) |
| Monitoring | 17 | 3.48 (.78) | 3.69 (.38) |

Note. T1 = Pretest, T2 = Posttest. For Attitudes, scores range from 1 (= “not at all”) to 4 (= “very much”). Higher scores indicate more favorable attitudes, except for ‘fears regarding cultural differences’. For Behavior, scores range from 1 (= “(almost) never”) to 4 (= “(almost) always”). Higher scores indicate more favorable behavior, except for ‘negative conflict behavior’. Since some of the topics were optional, sample sizes differ accordingly.

Acculturation process. Regarding the acculturation process, we considered two aspects, namely the orientation towards the country of origin and towards the receiving culture, which both did not change between pre- and posttest ($t(18) = -0.25, p = .405, g = 0.05$ and $t(18) = -0.62, p = .273, g = 0.14$, respectively).

In terms of the acculturation orientation according to Berry (1997, 2005), three participants showed an assimilated acculturation orientation and 17 participants showed an integrated acculturation orientation at the time of pretest. At the time of posttest, two participants showed an assimilated acculturation orientation and 18 participants showed an integrated acculturation orientation.

Fears regarding cultural differences. Regarding fears of cultural differences, we found no significant difference between pre- and posttest ($t(18) = -0.02, p = .494, g = 0.00$).

Behavior

Concerning parenting behavior, we considered five different aspects, namely (1) positive parenting behavior, (2) negative and positive conflict behavior, (3) support, (4) structuring, and (5) monitoring.

Positive parenting behavior. Regarding positive parenting behavior (e.g., praising, playing, cuddling), we found no significant difference between pre- and posttest ($t(17) = 0.00, p = .500, g = 0.00$).

In accordance with these findings, one trainer (T1) mentioned that praising and attention are “a very sensitive subject” and that although parents say “so ‘yes, we love our children’ [... there is] no bit of praise and no direct attention.”.

Negative and positive conflict behavior. Regarding negative conflict behavior, we found a small to medium effect that was marginally significant ($t(17) = -1.70, p = .054, g = 0.39$). While negative conflict behavior decreased, positive conflict behavior significantly increased from pre- to post-test with a similar small to medium effect size ($t(17) = 1.78, p = .047, g = 0.40$).

In accordance with these findings, also the trainers mentioned a positive development in terms of a decrease of negative and an increase of positive conflict behavior. Thus, one trainer (T2) stated that concerning corporal punishment there “is a shift in thinking. [...] What does my child feel? It's about what can I do when my child is angry? How can I regulate his feelings?”.

Support. Regarding support, we found a significant increase between pre- and posttest with a medium effect size ($t(14) = 2.57, p = .011, g = 0.65$).

This finding is again supported through the interviews. For example, one trainer (T4) stated that as a consequence of the program “if parents can do something for their children, in the educational field, they definitely do it. [...] So in this area definitely very much investment.”.

Structuring. Regarding structuring, we found a significant increase between pre- and posttest with Hedge's g indicating a large effect ($t(17) = 3.81, p < .001, g = 0.86$).

In support of this finding, also trainers mentioned that there were changes regarding structuring. One trainer (T2) stated that these changes mainly concern media usage: “media usage is an issue that is not so easy. Many [parents] understand it. And try to reduce it.”.

Monitoring. Regarding monitoring, we found no significant difference between pre- and posttest ($t(16) = 0.98, p = .171, g = 0.23$).

In this context, one trainer (T1) explained how difficult it is for parents to monitor their children. Thus, she explained that “parents simply lose control and of course in this case by the fact that the children tend to speak the German language much better than the parents, there arises such a gap where the parents are very insecure.” However, the same trainer also observed a positive effect of the program on monitoring behavior. According to her, parents show increased awareness and start to monitor the media use of their children: “In this case, I can simply confirm that the parents benefit a lot from this topic”.

Discussion

In the present study, we evaluated the short-term effects of the parenting program Eltern-Aktiv for refugee parents in Germany. As expected, parents showed a high overall satisfaction with the program as well as with the content, methods and assumed key success factors. Concerning the content of Eltern-Aktiv, all topics were rated very positively. In addition, parents evaluated the sub-topics ‘setting boundaries’ and ‘dealing with emotions’ as most helpful in an open response format. Despite the positive evaluation of parents, trainers noticed resistance towards certain topics (e.g., ‘norms and values in parenting’). However, as this was the first topic of the training and parents’ resistance could probably be dissolved during the training through the interaction between trainer and parents, this may explain why parents still rated the content positively. Similarly, parents rated role-plays as the most helpful method, whereas trainers perceived parents as shy to engage in role-plays. However, as parents may have noticed the usefulness of role-plays throughout the training, this may explain why this method was evaluated as very helpful after the program. Finally, parents were highly satisfied with the program, even though trainers described a high mistrust of parents at the beginning of the program. Besides the fact that distrusting parents may have dropped out before post-test, this may be explained by the assumed key success factors of the program, namely that the program is (generally) conducted in participants’ mother tongue and that the trainers came from the same cultural background as parents. According to trainers, this facilitated the interaction between parents and trainers. Similarly, in previous studies, the conduction of a training in participants’ mother tongue was found to be beneficial (Meidert, 2006).

Concerning the effects of the program on attitudes, we found no significant effects on the awareness of norms and values in parenting, parenting self-efficacy, acculturation orientation, and fears regarding cultural differences. Thus, none of our four hypotheses concerning changes of attitudes could be confirmed. One explanation for the non-significant findings regarding an increased awareness of norms and values in parenting could be

comprehension problems. Thus, it appeared that parents had difficulties in understanding the meaning of the two terms norms and values. However, even though no significant changes of awareness were found, trainers observed that the discussion of the topic broadened parents' perspective and that changes probably appeared on a more specific (e.g., concerning discussions of gender roles) rather than on a more abstract level as assessed through the questionnaire-based interview. Concerning parenting efficacy, one explanation for the non-significant findings could be a ceiling effect since parents started already with high scores at the pretest. In fact, the mean value of our sample at pre-test ($M = 3.35$ with 4 as maximum) was much higher than the mean value of the German sample ($M = 2.08$), which was used to validate the questionnaire (Kliem et al., 2014). This left little room for a significant increase of parenting efficacy from pre- to posttest. One reason for the high pretest scores may be parents' fear of the youth welfare office in Germany. Because some parents were advised to take part in the program by the youth welfare office, they may have been scared that their responses (though they were confidential) could give the false impression that they are not fit to raise their children and that, consequently, their children could be taken away from them. Similarly, concerning the acculturation orientation and fears regarding cultural differences, we already found high scores at pretest or, more specifically, most parents already showed an integrated acculturation orientation (i.e., high orientation towards receiving culture as well as towards host culture) before participating in the program. However, as the acculturation process is based on intensive contact with the receiving culture and most parents had only been in Germany for a comparatively short time (i.e., on average for three years), parents may still be at the beginning of the acculturation process (Zick, 2010). Thus, it is not sure whether the phase of conflictual confrontation with the receiving culture has taken place. Accordingly, the high pretest scores may be influenced by the desire to make a good impression.

Regarding parenting behavior, we found no effect of the program on positive parenting behavior as well as monitoring. However, there were significant effects of the

program on conflict behavior (i.e., a decrease of negative and an increase of positive conflict behavior), support, and structuring. Thus, four of our six hypotheses could be confirmed. This indicates that the program is effective in terms of increasing positive parenting behavior, which is important for the development of children as well as the parent-child-relationship. Regarding the non-significant findings on positive parenting behavior and monitoring, similar as above, the scales already showed high pretest scores. Concerning positive parenting behavior, the high pretest scores may be explained by the fact that most items were obviously to be understood as something positive (e.g., cuddling, saying something nice) so that responses may have been biased by social desirability. Especially people from a relational cultural background tend to present themselves in a socially desirable manner, since conformity has a particularly high value (Ataca and Berry, 2002). The monitoring scale mainly focused on the control of media usage. As most parents had children of preschool and primary school age, children did not possess their own phones or tablet and most likely used parents' devices. This itself represented a high degree of control. Moreover, due to cramped housing conditions (i.e., families living in one room), parents and children are usually always together in one room, which may further explain the high pretest scores concerning monitoring.

Overall, the findings presented demonstrate that Eltern-Aktiv was highly valued by refugee parents and that the program was effective in increasing positive parenting behaviors. Even though there was no significant change in attitudes, the program represents a promising starting point to support refugee parents in dealing with post migration challenges in terms of parenting.

Strengths and limitations

A major strength of the program Eltern-Aktiv is its design that carefully considers the specific needs of refugee parents after migration. Thus, the program does not only include knowledge on integration and child development, strengthening parental resources through self-care and

the practice of parenting skills, but it considers the unique position of refugee parents who are confronted with the challenge of raising children in a new culture while preserving their own cultural roots (Abdallah-Steinkopff et al., 2015, see Abdallah-Steinkopff et al., 2020 for a revised version, also based on the results of the evaluation presented here). The fact that the training is provided in participants' mother tongue or another well-spoken language and by a trainer with the same or a similar cultural background, the program facilitates that parents can build a trustful and beneficial relationship with the trainer who possess knowledge of both cultural contexts (i.e., the host and receiving culture).

A key methodological strength of the evaluation is the study design that considers both quantitative (i.e., standardized questionnaire-based interview with parents) as well as qualitative (i.e., qualitative interviews with trainers) methods. However, there are limitations of the present study as well. As nearly half of participants did not complete the program, this may distort the results and limit the validity of our data (Meidert, 2006). Moreover, as mentioned above, refugee parents are often in an extremely vulnerable situation, for example, due to an uncertain resident status or fear of authorities (e.g., the youth welfare offices). Accordingly, parents may have responded in socially desirable way, especially when sensitive topics (e.g., parenting efficacy) were addressed (Lee and Renzetti, 1990). Another concern, in terms of validity, is that some items were not well understood by parents, especially items on a more abstract level. Besides comprehension problems, there were language problems as well – some parents from Nigeria had quite limited English skills (though English is both an official as well as spoken and written language in school in Nigeria). Similarly, due to the variety of dialects in Somalia, some terms were unknown and had to be explained by the interpreter to Somali parents as well.

To address these methodological challenges, future studies could use case vignettes and additional visual material, especially for parents with a lower level of formal education, to improve parents' understanding. Furthermore, to reduce social desirability, a knowledge test

could be included in the survey, especially for knowledge about integration, child development, and parenting behavior. Finally, while the presented data based on a single group pre-post intervention design are promising, an important further step towards demonstrating the effectiveness of Eltern-Aktiv would be the implementation of a control group and long-term training effects. Moreover, future evaluation studies could investigate the effectiveness of the program on a broader level (i.e., including further topics, such as knowledge about child development and integration).

Implications and future perspectives

While the results presented here are promising, especially concerning positive effects of the training on parenting behavior, one major concern is the high drop-out rate. To improve this in future studies, various measures could be taken, based on ideas expressed by trainers in the qualitative interviews: First, to support trust between parents and trainer from the beginning, there should be a meeting prior to the start of the program. In this meeting, parents should receive detailed information about the goals of the program as well as the benefits that it can have for them personally. Second, trainers have reported resistance from parents towards several topics, especially ‘norms and values in parenting’. This could be another factor that hinders trust-building. Accordingly, less controversial issues, for instance knowledge about integration or parental resources, should be discussed at the beginning of the program. Third, considering parents’ different levels of education, it would be advisable to put together more homogenous groups. That would allow the trainer to adapt the methods of the program more specifically to the needs of the parents and might prevent parents from dropping out of the program due to cognitive overload. With increased retention rates, Eltern-Aktiv has the potential to support refugee parents, especially by strengthening and improving their conflict behavior, support, and structuring. Thus, the program can help parents in dealing with post migration challenges in terms of parenting as well as strengthen the parent-child-relationship.

References

- ABDALLAH-STEINKOPFF, B.** (2015) 'Kultursensible Elternberatung bei Flüchtlingsfamilien', *Zeitschrift für systemische Therapie und Beratung*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 109–117 [Online]. Available at <https://www.jfs.bs.ch/dam/jcr:74a385d8-380e-403d-b42a-f6a84e7fd832/2016-artikel-abdallah.pdf>.
- ABDALLAH-STEINKOPFF, B.** and **AKHTAR, F.** (2015) 'Kultursensible Elternberatung bei Flüchtlingsfamilien', in Honal, W., Graf, D. and Knoll, F. (eds) *Handbuch der Schulberatung*, 100th edn, München, Mediengruppe Oberfranken – Fachverlage, pp. 1–18.
- ABDALLAH-STEINKOPFF, B.** (2018) *Interkulturelle Erziehungskompetenzen stärken. Ein kultursensibles Elterncoaching für geflüchtete und zugewanderte Familien*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- ABDALLAH-STEINKOPFF, B., BUDIMLIC, M., FRAMHEIM, G., KRASNIQI, S., LAUB, R.** and **LWANO, F. M.** (2015) *Eltern-Aktiv - Muttersprachliche Elterntraining für Eltern mit Flucht- oder Migrationshintergrund*.
- ALBERER, M., MALINOWSKI, S., SANFTENBERG, L.** and **SCHELLING, J.** (2018) 'Notifiable infectious diseases in refugees and asylum seekers: experience from a major reception center in Munich, Germany', *Infection*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 375–383 [Online]. DOI: 10.1007/s15010-018-1134-4.
- ATACA, B.** and **BERRY, J. W.** (2002) 'Psychological, sociocultural, and marital adaptation of Turkish immigrant couples in Canada', *International Journal of Psychology*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 13–26.
- BERRY, J. W.** (1997) 'Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation', *Applied Psychology*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 5–34.
- BERRY, J. W.** (2005) 'Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 697–712.

BONGARD, S., ETZLER, S. and FRANKENBERG, E. (2020) *Frankfurter*

Akkulturationsskala, Göttingen, Hogrefe.

BORKE, J., SCHILLER, E.-M., SCHÖLLHORN, A. and KÄRTNER, J. (2015) *Kultur – Entwicklung – Beratung: Kultursensitive Therapie und Beratung für Familien mit Säuglingen und Kleinkindern*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

BOSSONG, L. and KELLER, H. (2018) ‘Cross-cultural value mismatch in German day care institutions: Perspectives of migrant parents and day care teachers’, *International journal of psychology : Journal international de psychologie*, 53 Suppl 2, pp. 72–80 [Online].

DOI: 10.1002/ijop.12559.

BOZORGMEHR, K., DIETRICH, A. and OFFE, J. (2019) ‘UN concerned about the right to health for migrants in Germany’, *The Lancet*, vol. 393, no. 10177, pp. 1202–1203 [Online].

DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30245-4.

BRÜCKER, H., CROISIER, J., KOSYAKOVA, Y., KRÖGER, H., PIETRANTUONO, G., ROTHER, N. and SCHUPP, J. (2019) ‘Language Skills and Employment Rate of Refugees in Germany Improving with Time’, *DIW Weekly Report*, vol. 9, 4/6, pp. 49–61.

DRESING, T. and PEHL, T. (eds) (2015) *Praxisbuch Interview, Transkription & Analyse: Anleitungen und Regelsysteme für qualitativ Forschende*, 6th edn, Marburg, Dr. Dresing und Pehl GmbH.

ECHTERHOFF, G., HELLMANN, J. H., BACK, M. D., KÄRTNER, J., MORINA, N. and HERTEL, G. (2020) ‘Psychological Antecedents of Refugee Integration (PARI)’, *Perspectives on psychological science: a journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 856–879.

GAMBARO, L., LIEBAU, E., PETER, F. H. and WEINHARDT, F. (2017) ‘Viele Kinder von Geflüchteten besuchen eine Kita oder Grundschule: Nachholbedarf bei den unter

Dreijährigen und der Sprachförderung von Schulkindern’, *DIW Wochenbericht*, vol. 84, no. 19, pp. 379–386 [Online]. Available at <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/158828>.

GAVRANIDOU, M., NIEMIEC, B., MAGG, B. and ROSNER, R. (2008) ‘Traumatische Erfahrungen, aktuelle Lebensbedingungen im Exil und psychische Belastung junger Flüchtlinge’, *Kindheit und Entwicklung*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 224–231.

GOTTLIEB, N. and SCHÜLLE, M. (2021) ‘An overview of health policies for asylum-seekers in Germany’, *Health Policy*, vol. 125, no. 1, pp. 115–121 [Online]. DOI: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2020.09.009.

GRAF, J. (2013) *Familienteam - das Miteinander stärken: Das Geheimnis glücklichen Zusammenlebens*, Freiburg, Br., Kreuz.

HAJAK, V. L., SARDANA, S., VERDELI, H. and GRIMM, S. (2021) ‘A Systematic Review of Factors Affecting Mental Health and Well-Being of Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Germany’, *Frontiers in psychiatry*, vol. 12, p. 643704.

HARKNESS, J., PENNELL, B.-E. and SCHOUA-GLUSBERG, A. (2004) ‘Survey questionnaire translation and assessment’, in Presser, S. and Rothgeb, J. M. (eds) *Methods for testing and evaluating survey questionnaires*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 453–473.

HEINRICHS, N., HAHLOWEG, K., BERTRAM, H., KUSCHEL, A., NAUMANN, S. and HARSTICK, S. (2006) ‘Die langfristige Wirksamkeit eines Elterntrainings zur universellen Prävention kindlicher Verhaltensstörungen’, *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie und Psychotherapie*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 82–96.

JÄKEL, J. and LEYENDECKER, B. (2009) ‘Erziehungsverhalten türkischstämmiger und deutscher Mütter von Vorschulkindern’, *Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht*, no. 1, pp. 1–15.

- JOHANSSON, S.** (2016) *Was wir über Flüchtlinge (nicht) wissen: Der wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisstand zur Lebenssituation von Flüchtlingen in Deutschland* [Online], Robert Bosch Stiftung. Available at https://www.bosch-stiftung.de/sites/default/files/publications/pdf_import/RBS_SVR_Expertise_Lebenssituation_Fluechtlinge.pdf.
- KELLER, H.** (2007) *Cultures of infancy*, Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.
- KELLER, H.** and **KÄRTNER, J.** (2013) 'Development: The Cultural Solution of Universal Developmental Tasks', in Gelfand, M. J., Chiu, C. and Hong, Y. (eds) *Advances in culture and psychology*, New York, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 63–116.
- KIMIL, A., WALDHOFF, H. P.** and **SALMAN, R.** (2013) 'Wer versteht schon diese Familien? Ressourcen und Schwierigkeiten von MigrantInnen und ihren Familien im Kontext von Beratung und Therapie', *Zeitschrift für systemische Therapie und Beratung*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 63–72.
- KIRKPATRICK, D. L.** and **KIRKPATRICK, J. D.** (2006) *Evaluating Training Programs*, San Francisco, Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- KLIEM, S., KESSEMEIER, Y., HEINRICHS, N., DÖPFNER, M.** and **HAHLWEG, K.** (2014) 'Der Fragebogen zur Selbstwirksamkeit in der Erziehung (FSW)', *Diagnostica*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 35–45.
- LAKENS, D.** (2013) 'Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs', *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 4, p. 863 [Online]. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863.
- LEE, R. M.** and **RENZETTI, C. M.** (1990) 'The Problems of Researching Sensitive Topics', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 510–528.
- MAEHLER, D.** (2012) *Akkulturation und Identifikation von eingebürgerten Migranten in Deutschland*, Münster, Waxmann.

MAYRING, P. (2014) *Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution* [Online], Klagenfurt. Available at <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-3951>.

MEIDERT, U. (2006) *Die Erreichbarkeit von Eltern für Präventionsprogramme: Wer kann mit einem universellen Präventionsprogramm erreicht werden?* [Online], Zürich, Universität Zürich. Available at https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/71118/1/2006_Meidert_Parents_Erreichbarkeit.pdf.

MORRICE, L., TIP, L. K., COLLYER, M. and BROWN, R. (2021) ‘‘You can’t have a good integration when you don’t have a good communication’: English-language Learning Among Resettled Refugees in England’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 681–699 [Online]. DOI: 10.1093/jrs/fez023.

NIEDER, C. and KÄRTNER, J. (2020) ‘Erfolgreiche Erziehung und Entwicklung aus den Augen geflüchteter Familien in Deutschland’, in Genkova, P. and Riecken, A. (eds) *Handbuch Migration und Erfolg*, Springer, Wiesbaden, pp. 169–188.

REICHLE, B. and FRANIEK, S. (2009) ‘Erziehungsstil aus Elternsicht: Deutsche erweiterte Version des Alabama Parenting Questionnaire für Grundschulkinder (DEAPQ-EL-GS)’, *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 12–25.

RENNER, A., HOFFMANN, R., NAGL, M., ROEHR, S., JUNG, F., GROCHTDREIS, T., KÖNIG, H.-H., RIEDEL-HELLER, S. and KERSTING, A. (2020) ‘Syrian refugees in Germany: Perspectives on mental health and coping strategies’, *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, vol. 129, p. 109906 [Online]. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2019.109906.

ROGOFF, B. (2003) *The cultural nature of human development*, Oxford UK, New York, Oxford University Press.

RUDMIN, F. (2009) ‘Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress’, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 106–123 [Online]. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.001.

SACHVERSTÄNDIGENRAT FÜR INTEGRATION UND MIGRATION (2021) *Fakten zur Einwanderung in Deutschland* [Online]. Available at https://www.svr-migration.de/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/SVR-Fakten-zur-Einwanderung_2.pdf.

SCHOBBER, T. and ZOCHER, K. (2022) ‘Health-Care Utilization of Refugees: Evidence from Austria’, *International Migration Review*, 019791832110610 [Online]. DOI: 10.1177/01979183211061091 (Accessed 5 March 2022).

SCHÖLLHORN, A., BORKE, J., SCHILLER, E.-M. and KÄRTNER, J. (2016) ‘Beratung mit Familien aus unterschiedlichen kulturellen Kontexten’, *Familiendynamik*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 284–292.

SCHROEDER, J. and SEUKWA, L. (2017) ‘Access to Education in Germany’, in Korntheuer, A., Pritchard, P. and Maehler, D. B. (eds) *Structural context of refugee integration in Canada and Germany*, Mannheim, Köln, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.

USLUCAN, H.-H. (2010) ‘Erziehungsstile und Integrationsorientierungen türkischer Familien’, in Hunner-Kreisel, C. (ed) *Kindheit und Jugend in muslimischen Lebenswelten: Aufwachsen und Bildung in deutscher und internationaler Perspektive*, Wiesbaden, VS, Verl. für Sozialwiss, pp. 195–210.

ZICK, A. (2010) *Psychologie der Akkulturation: Neufassung eines Forschungsbereiches*, Wiesbaden, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Data Availability

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.