



# Patterns of relations between immigrants and host societies

Jan Pieter Van Oudenhoven\*, Colleen Ward<sup>1</sup>, Anne-Marie Masgoret<sup>1</sup>

*Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, Room 164, 9712 Groningen, TS, The Netherlands*

Received 12 September 2006

---

## Abstract

This paper provides an overview of migration and cultural diversity across seven countries in three major geographical regions. It describes the evolution of acculturation theory, models and research. Next, the paper briefly reviews the developments in the application of social psychological theory to the study of immigration and intergroup relations and illustrates the convergence of these approaches across ten studies. Finally, it makes recommendations for the course of future research. Specifically it recommends to clearly distinguish between cultural heritage and cultural identity, to take transnational contacts into account in models of acculturation, and to examine the concepts of pluralism and creolization as outcomes of culturally heterogeneous host societies.

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Acculturation; Immigration; Host society; Credization; Transnationalism

---

## 1. Introduction

Globalization, migration and increasing cultural diversity within nations have resulted in a growing need to understand and enhance intercultural relations in plural societies. This volume examines these issues in the international arena, bringing together leading social and cross-cultural psychologists whose contemporary research spans seven

---

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 50 3636426; fax: +31 50 3636304.

E-mail address: [j.p.l.m.van.oudenhoven@rug.nl](mailto:j.p.l.m.van.oudenhoven@rug.nl) (J.P. Van Oudenhoven).

<sup>1</sup>Both Colleen Ward and Anne-Marie Masgoret work at the “Victoria University of Wellington”, New Zealand.

countries. The purpose of this special issue on relations between immigrants and host societies is to highlight current trends and new advances in the study of acculturation and intergroup relations. To accomplish this, the introductory paper provides an overview of migration and cultural diversity across three major geographical regions; describes the evolution of acculturation theory, models and research; briefly reviews the developments in the application of social psychology theory to the study of immigration and intergroup relations; illustrates the convergence of these two approaches across the ten papers that follow; and makes recommendations for the course of future research.

## 2. Migration and cultural diversity in the 21 century

It is now estimated that there are almost 191 million international migrants on a worldwide basis. Europe currently hosts the largest number (64 million); however, relative to the total population, Oceania (15%) and North America (13%) are world leaders (United Nations, 2005). This volume draws together research from seven countries in these three migration regions, and brief synopses of their immigration trends and issues are presented in the following sections.

### 2.1. *Western Europe*

#### 2.1.1. *Germany*

Germany has a moderate level of immigration—9% of its 83 million population. Nevertheless, the immigration rates to Germany of approximately 650,000 per annum were amongst the highest in Europe at the close of the twentieth century (Berry et al., 2006). Approximately, 27% of Germany's migrants originate from other established European Union countries (e.g., Italy, Greece, Poland, and Austria) with approximately 24% Turks and 14% former Yugoslavs. Although Zick, Wagner, Van Dick, and Petzel (2001) reported a preference for assimilation among German nationals, others have suggested that segregation is explicitly encouraged (Brubaker, 2001).

#### 2.1.2. *The Netherlands*

Sixteen million people live in the Netherlands, and 10% of these were born elsewhere. The ethnic origin of the population is primarily Dutch (81%) with Dutch citizens from Surinam and the Antilles and migrants from Turkey, Morocco, and the former Yugoslavia being the largest overseas-born groups. Since 1973, the Netherlands has pursued a relatively restrictive immigration policy based primarily on family unification rather than skilled labor. Officially, the government endorses policies aimed at integrating immigrants while preserving cultural identity; however, surveys show that the attitudes of the Dutch towards immigrants have become more negative in recent years (Arends-Toth & van de Vijver, 2003) and that there is a growing preference for assimilation (van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998).

#### 2.1.3. *Italy*

Over the last two decades Italy has moved from a country of emigration to a country of immigration. It is estimated that there are now 2.8 million immigrants amongst its 58 million population, making Italy (ranked equally with Spain and Great Britain) the third

largest receiving country in the European Union—after Germany and France (Dossier Statistico Immigrazione, 2005, 2005). The largest groups of immigrants originate from Albania and Morocco, with Romania, China and the Ukraine also making substantial contributions to the growing population. Although Italian attitudes toward immigration have been described as hostile and xenophobic (see Kosic & Phalet, this issue), the Eurobarometer 2000 survey found that Italians had greater acceptance of migrants compared to most EU states (Thalhammer, Zucha, Enzenhofer, Salfinger, & Ogris, 2001).

## 2.2. North America

### 2.2.1. Canada

Canada has an ethnically diverse make-up with approximately two-thirds of its 33 million population being of British (40%) or French (27%) ancestry. Nineteen percent of Canada's population are overseas-born, and in recent years almost two-thirds of the annual flow of immigrants have originated from Asian countries. Canada officially adopted a policy of multiculturalism in 1978 and currently targets approximately 300,000 new migrants per annum. National surveys show that Canadians favor integration and have a high level of acceptance of multiculturalism (Berry & Kalin, 1995). An opinion poll revealed that 93% of Canadians agree that it is important to accept a wide variety of cultures in Canada (Hiebert, 2003).

### 2.2.2. The United States

The United States has traditionally been a settlement society and currently has a moderate level of immigration with 11.7% of its total 298 million population being overseas-born (Berry et al., 2006). At present, 68% of its population is of European origins, 14% Hispanic, 13% African American, 4% Asian American, and 1% Native American. The majority of new immigrants to the United States now come from Latin America, Asia and other non-European countries. The United States has traditionally assumed a “melting pot” approach to immigration and diversity, although many have argued that the philosophy is essentially assimilationist in practice. Along these lines, a recent survey indicated that most Americans (58%) believe that immigrants do not learn English quickly enough (Pew Research Centre, 2006).

## 2.3. Oceania

### 2.3.1. Australia

Australia has a high level of immigration with one-quarter of its more than 20 million residents being overseas-born. Ninety-two percent of the population is of European ancestry, about 7% from Asia and 1% Aboriginal and other. Within this mix, however, almost 200 source countries for Australian migration have been identified (Berry et al., 2006). Australia began its move towards multiculturalism in 1975 with policy refinements in 1989 and 1999. Surveys and opinion polls show widespread support for multiculturalism, varying opinions about the level of immigration, which are affected by unemployment trends, and a preference for migrants from Britain and Southern Europe compared to Asia and the Middle East (Dunn, 2003).

### 2.3.2. New Zealand

New Zealand (population 4 million) also has a high level of immigration with one in five residents born overseas. On the basis of its 2001 census, which permits identification with more than one ethnic group, the ethnic origins of the population were: 80% European, 14.7% Maori, 6.5% Pacific, 6.6% Asian, and 6.9% other. Changes in immigration policy in 1986 and 1991 altered the flow from traditional source countries, particularly the United Kingdom, to skills-based criteria and opened the door to massive increases of migrants from Asian countries. New Zealand still has an official policy of biculturalism based on the Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 between Maori and the British Crown; however, it is evolving into a multicultural nation. National surveys show that New Zealanders, including Maori, favor integration over assimilation and separation (Ward, Masgoret, & Leong, 2006).

## 3. Acculturation theory and research

Several theoretical models have been developed over the years to assess the process of acculturation, including changes in attitudes, values, behaviors, language and cultural identity. Although measures of acculturation have sometimes focused on particular processes, models of acculturation can be placed in one of two broad categories: (1) unidimensional models—representing cultural change on a linear bipolar continuum, going from the heritage culture to the host culture, and (2) multidimensional models—where acculturation processes are seen to take place independently in the home and host cultures and may also involve multiple domains. Most recently, acculturation researchers have emphasized the importance of the *receiving society* in the acculturation processes adopted by immigrants. The following section reviews a number of these models and focuses on the convergence of immigrant and host community perspectives within the acculturation process.

Early studies of acculturation adopted a unidimensional approach in which immigrants were seen as relinquishing identification with their culture of origin and gradually moving toward identification with the host culture by adopting the cultural norms, values, attitudes and behaviors of the host society (e.g., Ramirez, 1984). Despite the initial popularity of the unidimensional, bipolar conceptualization of acculturation, these models came under increasing scrutiny. As theory and research on bicultural identity developed throughout the 1980s (e.g., Mendoza, 1984), it became apparent that unidimensional models were too simplistic and that identification with home and host culture had come to be viewed as counterbalancing forces. A balance model of acculturation emerged in which biculturalism was viewed as the middle ground between assimilation and separation. Although the balance model was an improvement on the unidimensional approach, it continued to pose measurement problems because the heritage and host cultures were still viewed as interdependent, rather than orthogonal dimensions. Specifically, this approach failed to distinguish between individuals who identified strongly with both cultures and those who identified weakly with both cultures. To address these difficulties, more comprehensive models of acculturation emerged which began to consider the heritage and host cultures as independent influences.

Researchers who espouse this more comprehensive view argue that acculturation is a multidimensional process. There are two assumptions underlying multidimensional models of acculturation (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). The first one views acculturation

processes as functioning in various separate domains, such as in attitudes, values, behaviors, language and cultural identity. According to this view, immigrants may relate to their heritage and host cultures to different degrees in these various domains. For example, they may be fluent in the new national language, but still totally identify with the values that are predominant in their country of origin.

The second assumption frames orientations towards home and host cultures as independent domains, as in [Berry's \(1980, 1997\)](#) classification of acculturation strategies. According to Berry, immigrants are faced with two fundamental questions, one referring to the maintenance of heritage culture, "Is it of value to maintain my cultural heritage?" and one referring to relations with other ethnocultural groups, "Is it of value to maintain relations with other groups?". On the basis of the answers to these questions four acculturation strategies may be distinguished: (a) integration (it is important to maintain both cultural identity and to have positive relations with the host society); (b) assimilation (only positive relations with the host society are important); (c) separation (only maintaining cultural heritage is of importance); and (d) marginalisation (neither outcome is important).

In a theoretical analysis of the psychological responses to acculturation, [Berry \(1980\)](#) proposed that immigrants undergo a process of change in at least six areas of psychological functioning (language, cognitive styles, personality, identity, attitudes, and acculturative stress). After some initial changes, the individual reaches a state of conflict, at which point an adaptation strategy is reached. As individuals acculturate, a number of behaviors are modified, together with attitudes, beliefs, and values. Berry argued that the four acculturation strategies are not discrete, static strategies; individuals may switch from one strategy to another; and the host culture may consist of several cultures rather than a single majority culture.

Although Berry's model has been extremely influential in the field, it has also received some criticism. Some researchers have argued that the concept of marginalization is not a viable one, since migrants do not choose to be marginalized, but rather may involuntarily be forced to adopt it as an outcome. Or alternatively, it is possible that some immigrants may not directly identify with either their heritage or host cultures because they have opted for a more individualistic acculturation strategy (cf. [Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997](#)). Immigrants who are more individualistic are often characterized by a high level of cosmopolitanism, selectively adopting elements from a number of cultures.

In most multicultural societies, the current discourse centers on the question whether immigrants should assimilate or integrate. [Berry \(1997\)](#) and many other researchers (e.g., [Horenczyk, 1996](#); [Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003](#); [Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998](#); [Zagefka & Brown, 2002](#)) have found that integration is the most preferred and most 'adaptive' strategy for immigrants. Although immigrants may prefer integration, what members of the host society permit necessarily influences the ultimate selection of acculturation strategies.

More recent studies have demonstrated that it is important to look beyond the acculturation attitudes of immigrants to the acculturation expectations of members of the receiving society. For example, separation and marginalization are more likely to be adopted, and assimilation less likely, under conditions of greater perceived discrimination ([Barry & Grilo, 2003](#)). Early discussions by Berry broadly considered the acculturation expectations of members of the receiving society ([Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977](#)), and more

recently these have been described as multiculturalism, melting pot, segregation and exclusion orientations (Berry, 2001).

Based on Berry's model of acculturation, the Interactive Acculturation Model by Bourhis et al. (1997) has provided a useful and inclusive framework by focusing on the role of both the acculturation expectations of the receiving community and the acculturation orientations adopted by immigrants. According to this model, host society members may endorse five acculturation orientations towards immigrants: integration, segregation, assimilation, exclusion and individualism. The first three orientations parallel Berry's (1997) notions of integration, separation, assimilation and the last two represent variations on marginalization. According to Bourhis et al. (1997), integration represents an accommodative approach in which host nationals believe that immigrants are entitled to preserve their heritage culture while simultaneously adopting aspects of the national culture. Those who endorse this strategy anticipate the gradual evolution of a multicultural society. Host nationals who espouse segregation believe it is in the best interest of the larger community to separate immigrant cultures from the mainstream society. Those who support assimilation express a desire to see immigrants relinquish their heritage culture in favor of the one from their adopted homeland. Exclusionism reflects the belief that immigration and immigrants are perilous to the national community and that the country would benefit most from a closed, as opposed to an open, immigration policy. Finally, individualism is preferred by those who believe that there is no one right way to manage identity issues as individuals should be empowered to adopt any strategy that they see fit.

Convergence between host and migrant acculturation preferences do not always occur, and Bourhis et al. have argued that dissimilar attitudes result in problematic or conflictual outcomes. Horenczyk's (1996) research revealed that both Russian migrants and Israeli hosts preferred integration, but members of the receiving community had a stronger preference for assimilation than did migrants; they also believed that migrants were more willing to assimilate than was actually the case. Van Oudenhoven et al. (1998) noted that Dutch nationals strongly endorsed assimilation, but that they believed Moroccan and Turkish migrants favored separation, whereas integration was actually preferred by both immigrant groups. The outcomes of host and migrant mismatches, however, have not been widely investigated. One exception to this is research with ethnic repatriates in Finland, Germany and Israel, which linked discordant acculturation preferences to greater perceived discrimination and increased psychological distress (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2003).

In contrast to immigrants who generally prefer integration, host society members have often adopted an assimilation ideology in which immigrants are expected to abandon their cultural and linguistic distinctiveness and adopt the core values of the host society. For instance, in Germany, Zick et al. (2001) reported a preference for assimilation among nationals, while similar results were found in Slovakia (Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdrezálek, 2000), Israel (Horenczyk, 1996) and the Netherlands (Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Admittedly, not all nations prefer assimilation. Exceptions are Canada and New Zealand where residents tend to prefer integration (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Ward & Masgoret, 2004).

It is clear from the research based on the current immigration climate that the process of acculturation can no longer be viewed solely in terms of the experiences of the immigrant, but must consider the mutual change that occurs when two cultural groups come into contact with one another. Furthermore, not only should we consider both the role of



acculturation orientations adopted by immigrants and the acculturation expectations of the receiving community in this process, but we need to consider the interpersonal and intergroup relational outcomes that are the product of combinations of the immigrant and host community acculturation orientations (Bourhis et al., 1997). In many cases, these processes should be considered in a cross-cultural context.

#### 4. Social psychological theory and research

In addition to models of acculturation, social psychological theories of intergroup relations are pertinent to the analysis of relations between immigrant groups and members of the receiving societies. These are briefly summarized in the following section. It should be noted that social psychological theories are often combined with personality or individual differences measures (e.g., social dominance orientation) in intergroup research and that studies have been undertaken in both lab and field settings from a range of perspectives, including developmental and cross-cultural.

The *Contact Hypothesis* suggests that negative attitudes held by one group towards another are caused by a lack of knowledge about that group. When individuals of two groups come into positive, personal, and cooperative contact with each other, they will get to know each other, a consequence of which is that prejudices will be eliminated or reduced. Important is that the interaction takes place between individuals with equal status and that authorities support the contact. Under these conditions mutual attitudes and interaction will become more positive, for instance through a growing recognition of similarities (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1997). An example of the application of the contact hypothesis to the migration context can be found in Voci and Hewstone's (2003) Italian study and Van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud, and Hewstone's (1996) Dutch research, which demonstrated that intercultural contact significantly improved attitudes toward immigrants.

According to the *Similarity-Attraction Hypothesis*, which is more a robust empirical datum than a theory, similarity leads to attraction (Byrne, 1971). The hypothesis states that when one perceives another to be similar to oneself on various characteristics (for instance, attitudes and values), this other will be positively evaluated. In other words, we like people and groups who we think are like us and our own group. Therefore, the similarity-attraction hypothesis (Byrne, 1971) offers an easy explanation for why people do not appreciate cultural differences. Similarity may reduce insecurity in interpersonal and intergroup relations. Cultural similarity, in particular, may be rewarding because it confirms that our beliefs and values are correct. As a consequence, interactions between individuals and groups occur more smoothly. The similarity attraction hypothesis has also been discussed under the rubric of cultural distance in the acculturation literature, accounting for trends where migrants from dissimilar or "distant" cultures are perceived less favorably than those from similar backgrounds (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001).

*Social Identity Theory* (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) offers an even more pertinent perspective on the intergroup processes between immigrants and host societies. Social categorization and comparison are key features of the theory, which posits that (1) group membership forms an important component of social identity; and (2) people strive to attain or maintain a positive self-image by engaging in favorable comparisons between their ingroups and various outgroups. Consequently, ethnocentrism is assumed to be an inevitable consequence of social identification. Ethnocentrism may manifest itself through

ingroup favoritism or outgroup derogation, particularly in domains such as stereotyping and attributions. Social Identity Theory has been widely used to interpret intergroup relations from both host and migrant perspectives (e.g., Kosmitzki, 1996).

A theory particularly focused on intergroup relations in plural societies is *Integrated Threat Theory* (ITT) (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Drawing on a range of theories that emphasize cognition, comparison, and conflict, ITT identifies four types of threat that play a significant role in precipitating prejudice: realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping. Realistic threats include perceived threats to the welfare of a group or its members. Symbolic threats are associated with values, beliefs and attitudes and are perceived to undermine or jeopardize the worldview of a group. Intergroup anxiety constitutes threat as it arises in response to fears of diminished self-concept and negative evaluations by others. Finally, negative stereotypes contain elements of threat in that they lead to the anticipation of negative events and interactions. ITT has been used widely in studies of attitudes toward migrants, including Stephan, Ybarra, Martínez, Schwarzwald, and Tur-Kaspa (1998) research in Spain and Israel.

A more recent model which also highlights the role of threat in the relations between hosts and immigrants is the *Instrumental Model of Group Conflict* (Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, & Armstrong, 2001). Inspired by realistic group conflict theory (LeVine & Campbell, 1972), the model identifies two conditions leading to intergroup antagonism. The first is resource stress which may arise from limited resources, unequal access to resources, and desire or acceptance of unequal access based on a social hierarchy. The last of these three factors is regarded as an individual difference variable and is often discussed under the rubric of Social Dominance Orientation. The second determinant of conflict is the presence of a relevant outgroup. The outgroup should be salient, distinctive and a viable competitor for valued resources. Salience and distinctiveness can be accentuated by such things as the increasing numbers of outgroup members or by their distinguishable appearance. The combination of resource stress and a relevant outgroup results in intergroup competition and is accompanied by the cognitive and affective perception of threat. The cognitive component revolves around a zero-sum belief system, where there is a perception that any opportunities and benefits given to one group are regarded as directly reducing the concomitant opportunities and benefits available to the others. The affective component encompasses the perceptions of fear and anxiety as a result of the challenges posed by outgroup competitors. Esses et al.'s (2001) work on attitudes toward migrants in the United States and Canada has given strong support for the Instrumental Model of Group Conflict as has Masgoret's (2004) work in New Zealand.

A model that is oriented towards inclusion is the *Common Ingroup Identity Model* (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). The central idea of the model is that once a set of people is defined as part of the ingroup, they will be treated in a similar way to other ingroup members. Gaertner and Dovidio argue that by shifting cognitive representations of membership in ingroups and outgroups to an inclusive social identity within a single group, more favorable attitudes toward former outgroup members may be produced through processes involving pro-ingroup bias. When members of a former outgroup come to be considered part of the ingroup, the cognitive and motivational forces that contribute to ingroup favoritism become redirected to improve attitudes toward the newly defined members of the ingroup. Common ingroup identity can be achieved by increasing the salience of existing common superordinate memberships (e.g., a school, a company, a nation) or by introducing factors (e.g., common goals or shared fate) that are perceived to



be shared between the original groups. The model does not necessarily require each group to forsake its less inclusive group identity completely. Individuals belong simultaneously to several groups and possess multiple identities (Brewer, 2000). Research demonstrating that national identity is linked to positive attitudes toward immigrants, such as Billiet, Maddens, and Beerten's (2003) work in Belgium can be interpreted in terms of the theory of Common Ingroup Identity.

## **5. Acculturation research and social psychological theories**

As we saw in the previous section, social psychologists have dealt with important topics that are all very relevant for acculturation research: contact, social identity (cultural), similarity, intergroup threat, inclusion and exclusion. Remarkably, however, until recently, the two lines of research have evolved independently from one another in the study of host-immigrant relations. Social psychologists have too often developed and tested theoretical paradigms referring to isolated parts of intergroup relations (e.g., the minimal group paradigm or the similarity-attraction hypothesis), whereas acculturation research has been very broad and in many cases largely descriptive (e.g., the great number of studies describing what adaptation strategies groups of immigrants prefer). Fortunately, however, acculturation researchers have inspired social psychologists to adopt a broader scope and to extend their research to the context of immigration, and social psychologists have encouraged acculturation researchers to formulate more precise theoretical explanations. All papers in this issue illustrate—to various degrees—social psychological contributions to the study of immigration. In many cases, they also demonstrate the merger of acculturation theory with intergroup research, sometimes from a cross-cultural perspective.

A good example is the contribution of Esses, Wagner, Preiser and Wilbur on the effects of promoting an inclusive national ingroup on attitudes toward immigrants. The authors combine Social Identity Theory, the concept of Social Dominance Orientation and the Common Ingroup Identity Model to predict reactions towards immigrants in Canada and Germany. In Canada the induction of a common national ingroup helped to reduce unfavorable attitudes of higher social dominance oriented individuals whereas the inclusion of immigrants in the national group induced a more negative reaction among the higher social dominance oriented in the German sample. The research clearly underlined the significance of cultural context in intergroup perceptions and relations.

Two papers highlighted the role of threat and attitudes. Ward and Masgoret tested an integrative model of attitudes towards immigrants among a random sample of 500 New Zealanders which was primarily based on the ITT and the Instrumental Model of Group Conflict. Their study employing structural equation modelling showed that more frequent intercultural contact led to decreased intergroup anxiety, which, in turn, predicted lower perceptions of threat and more positive attitudes towards immigrants. A second path from multicultural ideology led to decreased perception of threat and, in turn, to more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Rohmann, Florack and Piontowski examined acculturation preferences and desired intergroup contact in connection with ITT. They found that the same threats, culture discordance and contact discordance, predicted negative attitudes towards the minority and majority groups among both German hosts and immigrants (Italians and Turks), respectively. Moreover, the effects were stronger among and toward Turks than among and towards Italians.

The issue of cultural concordance was also featured in the study of attitudes toward acculturation and intergroup relations by Pfafferott and Brown. Majority group members and adolescent immigrants in Germany were asked about their own attitudes towards acculturation and intergroup relations, what they thought their parents would think, and what the other group (the immigrants and the majority group, respectively) would think. Integration was preferred by both groups. Discrepancies between own and perceived preferences of the outgroup were negatively related to life satisfaction for minority members and to perceived quality of intergroup relations for both groups. For the immigrants, discrepancies between own preferences and perceived preference of their parents were also predictive of less satisfaction with life and poorer intergroup relations.

Four papers deal with the classic topics of ethnocentrism, stereotypes and prejudice. Berry shows a hierarchy in the attitudes (“comfort levels”) of 12 different groups of Canadians towards 14 ethno-cultural groups in Canada. He also highlights the importance of multiple perspectives on multiple groups in evolving multicultural societies. A similar theme emerged in Griffiths and Nesdale’s research on attitudes of children (Anglo-Australian and Pacific Islanders) towards ingroup and outgroup. Results showed that majority children rated both outgroups (Pacific Islanders and Aborigines) less favorably than the ingroup, whereas the Pacific Islanders rated their own group as favorably as the majority children, but were less favorable towards the Aborigines. Lee and Fiske’s study also reflected a hierarchy in the attitudes towards different groups of immigrants in the United States. Based on their Stereotype Content Model, the research demonstrated how stereotypes can be further differentiated by two dimensions relating to perceived status and competition within society, i.e., warmth and competence. Kosic and Phalet reported an ‘over-inclusion effect’ with respect to the two most numerous groups of immigrants (Albanians and Moroccans) in Italy. Their study demonstrated that the tendency to categorize immigrants as belonging to the dominant immigrant groups was most pronounced among respondents who expressed higher levels of prejudice and perceived the immigrants as maintaining their culture of origin.

In several papers individual differences, in particular Social Dominance Orientation, are included in the analyses of acculturation and intergroup relations. Van Oudenhoven and Hofstra introduce a new individual difference variable to the field-attachment styles—and examine its relationship to acculturation preferences. The concept is pertinent to research on host-immigrant relations because attachment styles underpin contact and predict the tendency to approach other people in novel situations. Interestingly, in their study in the Netherlands a secure attachment style was related to a preference for integration in both immigrants and hosts.

The last paper illustrates a cross-cultural approach to acculturation and intergroup relations. Leong and Ward examine the influence of cultural values (of 14 European nations) on attitudes towards immigrants and multiculturalism. The results showed that Mastery, Masculinity, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Collectivism were negatively related to support for policies that promote harmonious co-existence. Masculinity and Mastery were also linked to more pessimism towards multiculturalism. Interestingly, cultural values, and Hofstede’s value dimensions in particular, were better predictors of attitudes towards immigrants than socio-economic factors.

Altogether, the ten papers offer novel integrative and comparative perspectives on the relationships between immigrants and hosts. Integration comes in the form of merging theories and frameworks from acculturation research and social psychology and

incorporating the perspectives of both hosts and immigrants. The comparative dimension is reflected in the inclusion of different groups of immigrants, cultures, nations, and age ranges. Despite these advances, there are at least two important issues that merit further attention in future research: (1) the refinement of core constructs, culture and identity, in particular; and (2) influence of globalization on host–immigrant relationships. These are elaborated in the final section.

## **6. Future directions for research**

The imprecise and sometimes interchangeable use of ‘culture’ and ‘identity’ in the acculturation literature is problematic and should be remedied in future theory building and research. Culture is a complex construct and may be seen as encompassing artefacts, social institutions, language, customs, traditions and shared meanings. Cultural identity, however, refers to a sense of pride and belongingness to one’s cultural group. Immigrants may easily adopt the language, the dress code and the working habits of the new country and even love the new food—all the external trappings of ‘culture’—but they may still identify strongly with their nation of origin. This means that immigrants may give up parts of their cultural heritage without giving up their cultural identity. Therefore, future research should investigate which aspects of culture are essential for immigrants to retain their cultural identity, which may differ from group to group, and which may vary across contexts. In the global arena, religion is likely to be one area that deserves particular attention.

The refinement of the definitions of culture and identity also has implications for social inclusion. Social inclusion is a normative concept in the sense that it is found to be desirable to promote conditions that favor the inclusion of individuals and groups into society (see, for instance, [Abrams, Hogg, & Marques, 2005](#)). The concept is, however, not normative as to whether individuals and groups should maintain their culture or their identity. As such, social inclusion offers a valuable perspective on intergroup relations in culturally diverse societies.

Beyond issues pertaining to culture, identity and inclusion, attention should be paid to the influences of globalization on acculturation and intergroup relations. There are currently two related factors that are evoking changes in the life and options of immigrants and their receiving societies: the ever growing number of immigrants on a worldwide basis and the unprecedented opportunities for transnational contact. The consequences of these two factors have barely been investigated and should be incorporated into future research.

Transnationalism broadly refers to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states ([Vertovec, 1999](#)). Although transnationalism may reflect international linkages across multiple countries, in many instances the term is used to refer to the process by which immigrants forge and sustain multistranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement ([Basch, Glick Schiller, & Szanton Blanc, 1994](#)). An essential element of transnationalism is the great number and variety of involvements that immigrants sustain in both home and host societies. Examples are: money remittances, commercial ties between the country of origin and the new country, intensive links with relatives and friends in the country of origin, branches of religious organizations that are set up in the new country, second homes in the country of origin, and mutual visits. Transnationalism is facilitated by geographical proximity and good telecommunication services; some also argue that is more likely to

arise in conditions where immigrants form a considerable proportion of the nation, e.g., North Africans in Western Europe and Hispanics in the United States.

The emergence of these patterns suggests that we can add a new dimension—‘wish to be engaged in transnational contact’—to the dimensions ‘wish to maintain contact with the host society’ and ‘wish to maintain culture and identity’ in Berry’s model of acculturation. This extends the within-society mechanisms referred to in the model to the international domain, reflecting current worldwide trends in globalization. The desire for transnational contact may combine with the four core acculturation strategies in different ways. For example, integrated migrants, who value both cultural maintenance and contact with the host society, may extend their means of cultural maintenance through association with their country of origin. On the other hand, immigrants who combine separation with transnational links may retreat from society and stay within ‘ethnic enclaves’ where they can keep living as they were accustomed in their country of origin. Such ethnic enclaves (e.g., Klein-Ankara in Berlin and Chinatowns in San Francisco and London) have multiple connections with the country of origin, such as trading companies, travel agencies, exchange of artists or students, and sustained, frequent mutual visits. Indeed, withdrawal into ethnic enclaves may become an attractive option for immigrants, when they experience discrimination or if the host society puts too much pressure on them to assimilate.

Transnationalism has provided immigrants with a wider range of alternatives for life in their new country. It also affords greater opportunities for immigrants to distance themselves from the host society when their identity is being threatened. Paradoxically, the availability of several options to deal with the new society may make immigrants also feel more at ease and more ‘at home’ in the new society.

The second factor that should influence developments in future research is changing demographics. Immigrants are evolving into members of established communities and now form a large proportion of many national populations. As a consequence, host societies are becoming increasingly culturally heterogeneous. These multicultural environments are likely to lead to new acculturation strategies and outcomes. Two of these are creolization and pluralism.

When a variety of cultural groups co-exist and there is no clearly dominant group, a process of creolization may take place. The concept of creolization refers to the mixing of two or more formerly discrete traditions or cultures. creolization occurs in many parts of the world, but there are large differences in the degree of mixing (Hannerz, 1992). Examples of creolization include: spontaneous forms of youth language (ethno-language) or music (for instance hip hop) in which elements from different ethnic groups are adopted, or food preferences (for instance cajun food) that have become fashionable among a larger public. Such hybrid cultural phenomena are specially to be found among transnational youth whose primary socialization has taken place with the cross-currents of differing cultural fields (Vertovec, 1999). In the end, the implications of creolization are that immigrants shape the transformation of the host culture by adding elements from their own culture and, that in doing so, find it easier and more appealing to identify with the evolving national culture.

Another plausible outcome in a multicultural society is pluralism. This approach encourages both cultural maintenance and intergroup contact; however, the cultural mixing, which is seen in creolization, does not occur. Pluralism arises from the relationships amongst a number of different groups that together form a new nation

(or community). Although there may be status differences among the groups, each represents an important component of societies where no clear majority group is apparent. Pluralism is distinct from the common understanding of integration, which tends to refer to a dyadic relation between a subgroup of immigrants and the host society largely defined by its culturally dominant group. Furthermore, we may assume that marginalisation and separation (including withdrawal into ethno-cultural enclaves) may occur in plural societies, but will do so relatively infrequently because these societies embrace cultural diversity.

Finally, the issue of national identity in multicultural societies is important and should receive greater attention in future research. Nations that support maintenance of cultural heritage while at the same time promoting a superordinate national identity show high levels of ethnic tolerance. Canada is a good example of this.

Most residents identify as Canadians, as opposed to by ethnic group, and support for multiculturalism and outgroup tolerance are moderately high (Berry, 2000). Indeed, the tendency for migrants to identify by national label is higher in Canada than in the United States or Australia (Van Oudenhoven, 2006). Similar trends have been observed in Singapore's multicultural society. There, research has shown that ethnic and national identity are strong and positively correlated in the four major ethnic groups, that Singaporeans typically refer to themselves in terms of a hyphenated identity (e.g., Singaporean–Chinese) and that stronger national identity is associated with more positive outgroup attitudes (DeRoza & Ward, 2005). These developments are in line with the Common Ingroup Identity model of Gaertner and colleagues who argue that intergroup conflict can be diminished by interventions that shift cognitive representations of membership in ingroups and outgroups to an inclusive social identity within a single group (Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996). It is the acceptance of multiculturalism and the evolution of a multifaceted, inclusive national identity that holds the promise for our future in an era of increasing globalization.

## References

- Abrams, D., Hogg, M. A., & Marques, J. M. (2005). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arends-Toth, J. V., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 249–266.
- Barry, D. T., & Grilo, C. M. (2003). Cultural, self-esteem and demographic correlates of perception of personal and group discrimination among East Asian immigrants. *American Journal of Ortho-psychiatry*, 73, 223–229.
- Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation-states*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–34.
- Berry, J. W. (2000). Sociopsychological costs and benefits of multiculturalism. In J. Dacyl & C. Westin (Eds.), *Governance of cultural diversity* (pp. 297–354). Stockholm: UNESCO.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615–631.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 27, 301–320.

- Berry, J. W., Westin, C., Virta, E., Vedder, P., Rooney, R., & Sang, D. (2006). Design of the study: Selecting societies of settlements and immigrant groups. In J. W. Berry, J. Phinney, D. L. Sam, & P. Vedder (Eds.), *Immigrant youth in cultural transition* (pp. 15–45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Billiet, J., Maddens, B., & Beerten, R. (2003). National identity and attitude toward foreigners in a multinational state: A replication. *Political Psychology*, 24, 241–257.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369–386.
- Brewer, M. B. (2000). Reducing prejudice through cross-categorization: Effects of multiple social identities. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 165–183). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24, 531–548.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- DeRoza, C., & Ward, C. (2005). *National identity, ethnic identity and intergroup perceptions in Singapore*. Submitted for publication.
- Dossier Statistico Immigrazione 2005. (2005). *Statistic Dossier on immigration 2005*. Roma: Idos.
- Dunn, K. (2003). *Attitudes toward immigration and immigrants in Australia*. Paper presented at New Directions, New Settlers, New Challenges-Building and Enhancing Communities End-users Seminar, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). Public attitudes toward immigration in the United States and Canada in response to the September 11, 2001 “Attack on America”. In V. M. Esses, J. F. Dovidio, K. L. Dion (Eds.), *Immigrants and immigration, Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 57 (pp. 389–412).
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Gaertner, S., Dovidio, J., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 271–290.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the cultural organization of meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hiebert, D. (2003). *Are immigrants welcome? Introducing the Vancouver Community Studies Survey*. Vancouver Centre of Excellence: Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper, No. 03-06.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell, & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 241–250). Oxford: Butterworth.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., Horenczyk, G., & Schmitz, P. (2003). The interactive nature of acculturation: Perceived discrimination, acculturation attitudes and stress among young ethnic repatriates in Finland, Israel and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 79–90.
- Kosic, A., & Phalet, K. Ethnic categorization of immigrants: the role of prejudice, perceived numerosity and their acculturation strategies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, this issue.
- Kosmitzki, C. (1996). The reaffirmation of cultural identity in cross-cultural encounters. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 57–74.
- Levine, R. A., & Campbell, D. W. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Masgoret, A. M. (2004). *Examining the bases of intergroup competition and its role in determining immigration attitudes in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the XXVI International Conference of Psychology, Beijing, China.
- Mendoza, R. H. (1984). Acculturation and sociocultural variability. In J. L. Martinez, & R. H. Mendoza (Eds.), *Chicano psychology* (pp. 61–75). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173–185.
- Pew Research Centre. (2006). *America's immigration quandry*. <<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?PageID=1045>>. Retrieved September 9, 2006.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P., & Obdrezálek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 1–26.
- Ramirez, M. (1984). Assessing and understanding biculturalism-monoculturalism in Mexican–American adults. In J. L. Martinez, & R. H. Mendoza (Eds.), *Chicano psychology* (pp. 77–94). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Ryder, A., Alden, L., & Paulhus, D. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 49–65.



- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Claremont symposium on applied psychology* (pp. 23–46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, P., Martínez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 29, 559–576.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differences between social groups: Studies in the psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 23–48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Coole.
- Thalhammer, E., Zucha, V., Enzenhofer, E., Salfinger, B., & Ogris, G. (2001). *Attitudes toward minority groups in the European Union: A special analysis of the Eurobarometer 2000 survey*. Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.
- United Nations. (2005). *Trends in total migrant stock: The 2005 revision*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2006). Immigrants. In D. L. Sam, & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook on acculturation psychology* (pp. 163–180). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Groenewoud, J. T., & Hewstone, M. (1996). Co-operation, ethnic salience and generalization of inter-ethnic attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 649–661.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995–1013.
- Vertovec, S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22, 447–462.
- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of salience. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 37–54.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. London: Routledge.
- Ward, C., & Masgoret, A. -M. (2004). *New Zealanders' attitudes toward immigrants and immigration*. Paper presented at New Directions, New Settlers, New Challenges: Foundation for Science, Research and Technology End-users Seminar on Migration. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Ward, C., Masgoret, A. M., & Leong, C.-H. (2006). *Immigration, acculturation and intergroup relations in New Zealand*. Paper presented at the 18th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece.
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies and relative fit and intergroup relations: Immigrants-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 171–188.
- Zick, A., Wagner, U., Van Dick, R., & Petzel, T. (2001). Acculturation and prejudice in Germany: Majority and minority perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 541–557.