

Mutuality in Acculturation

Toward an Integration

Gabriel Horenczyk,¹ Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti,² David L. Sam,³ and Paul Vedder⁴

¹School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel, ²Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland, ³Department of Psychology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, ⁴Department of Education and Child Studies, University of Leiden, The Netherlands

Abstract. This paper focuses on processes and consequences of intergroup interactions in plural societies, focusing primarily on majority-minority mutuality in acculturation orientations. We examine commonalities and differences among conceptualizations and models addressing issues of mutuality. Our review includes the mutual acculturation model (Berry, 1997), the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM – Bourhis et al., 1997), the Concordance Model of Acculturation (CMA – Piontkowski et al., 2002); the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM – Navas et al., 2005), and the work on acculturation discrepancies conducted by Horenczyk (1996, 2000). We also describe a trend toward convergence of acculturation research and the socio-psychological study of intergroup relations addressing issues of mutuality in attitudes, perceptions, and expectations. Our review has the potential to enrich the conceptual and methodological toolbox needed for understanding and investigating acculturation in complex modern societies, where majorities and minorities, immigrants and nationals, are engaged in continuous mutual contact and interaction, affecting each other's acculturative choices and acculturative expectations.

Keywords: acculturation models, intergroup relations, mutuality, majority-minority interaction

One direct consequence of international migration is the creation of plural societies consisting of people of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. One major avenue in research on plural societies seeks to describe and understand how people of different cultural backgrounds deal with the resulting close and daily interactions these societies offer, and at times impose. In this paper, we will explore some of the models and conceptualizations that have been put forward by acculturation and social psychologists to understand the process and the consequences of intergroup interactions in plural societies. We are particularly interested in exploring the models that have been put forward in the area of mutuality in acculturation. Acculturation as a concept is broadly concerned with the changes that result when groups and individuals of different cultural backgrounds come together (Sam & Berry, 2010). In this context, mutuality – defined by the Free Dictionary as “a reciprocal relationship between two or more people or things” – refers to the intergroup processes resulting from acculturation and shaping acculturation patterns.

Early acculturation models were largely one-dimensional/bipolar and one-directional in nature. A major premise of these one-dimensional bipolar models is that as individuals acquire the cultural identity of the larger and mainstream society, they lose or give up that of their own original cultures. Another central tenet of these early models was the one-directional assumption that acculturation changes occurred primarily among the (ethnic) minority and immigrant group. The models also assumed that the influence for acculturation changes came from the larger mainstream society, where the mainstream society

remained primarily “unchanged” (for a review, see Sam, 2006). These models have gradually given way to bidimensional bidirectional models, where the assumption is that both individuals and groups in contact influence each other and both groups can change, and it is this assumption that underlines the notion of mutuality in acculturation. Not only have one-directional models given way to bidirectional models, the new models have themselves also become more complex as contextual, ecological, and interactional factors are drawn into the models resulting in the proliferation of models dealing with mutuality in acculturation. In this paper, we will first summarize briefly five models or conceptualizations, and research programs that directly address the notion of mutuality. Our analysis looks for commonalities as well as differences among these models where special attention is given to aspects of the conceptualizations and methodologies that can broaden and enrich mutuality research work. We will then examine developments in the socio-psychological study of intergroup relations which further inform our understanding of mutuality in acculturation.

Models of Mutuality in Acculturation

The Mutual Acculturation Model

Although acculturation as defined by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936) fully recognized mutuality of acculturation, the first systematic attempt to understand mutuality

and its ramifications for the two acculturating groups was pointed out by Berry (1974, 1980), when he suggested that there are three aspects to acculturation: the desire for cultural maintenance by members of nondominant groups, the nondominant group's preference for seeking intercultural contact with other groups in the larger society, and the role played by public policies and attitudes of the larger society in constraining or promoting the expression and attainment of these two goals. However much of Berry's ideas resulted in research on how non-dominant groups manage their acculturation, and its consequences for them as individuals (see Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006). The mutual acculturation model of Berry (see Berry, 1997, 2006b) can be summed up in what he refers to as (i) acculturation strategies (on the part of the acculturating individual as an ethnic minority), and (ii) the intercultural strategies (referring to acculturation expectations of the larger societies, i.e., how the majority members expect minority group members to acculturate). Much of recent discussions on the mutuality of acculturation center on *intercultural strategies*, although for fuller comprehension, it is important to understand *acculturation strategies* as well. The underlying factors to these two forms of strategies are (i) the extent to which individuals and groups desire cultural continuity through its maintenance and (ii) the extent to which cultural diversity is desired through interacting (i.e., participation) with individuals and groups of different background. According to Berry (1997), for the individual, this may result in four types of acculturation strategies – integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. For the group, with respect to the expectations of acculturation, four types of intercultural strategies are possible – multiculturalism, melting pot, segregation, and exclusion.

The Interactive Acculturation Model

An elaboration of Berry's model, suggesting ways in which minority and majority views on acculturation can result in intergroup outcomes, was proposed by Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal (1997). Their Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) seeks to provide an integrative theoretical framework of the interplay between acculturation orientations adopted by the majority community and acculturation orientations adopted by immigrant groups that leads to particular intergroup relational outcomes. The model suggests that the particular norms and ideologies reflected in the political and public rhetoric on the integration of immigrants provide the specific environmental context within which nationals and immigrants develop their representations of each other and these representations are interrelated. For example, assimilationist societies expect immigrants to abandon their own cultural and linguistic distinctiveness for the sake of adopting the culture and values of the dominant group, while ethnist societies often define who can be citizens of the state in exclusive terms (Bourhis et al., 1997). These ideologies shape, in turn, acculturation preferences of both minority and majority group members.

As regards the assessment of acculturation orientations, the IAM suggests five acculturation orientations for immigrants (integration, assimilation, separation, anomia, and individualism) depending on their desire to maintain their heritage culture and their wish to adopt the culture of the host society. The model also defines five acculturation orientations for the members of the majority society (integration, assimilation, segregations, exclusion, and individualism) depending on their attitudes regarding immigrants' preferences related to culture maintenance and culture adoption. The former orientations are assessed using a refined Berry's Immigrant Acculturation Scale, while the latter by a new Host Community Acculturation Scale developed by Bourhis et al. (1997). The model allows both the individual and group-level assessment of host/immigrant acculturation orientations, with the former referring to an individual difference orientation and the latter to an orientation preferred by the majority of members within a particular group.

It is important to acknowledge that as the majority group usually enjoys a strong vitality position and more power than immigrant groups, their acculturation orientations have a stronger impact on immigrant acculturation orientations than the converse (Bourhis et al., 1997). It does not mean, however, that the majority group has a total control over the acculturation preferences of minority group members. Both acculturation orientation toward cultural maintenance and multiculturalism are typically seen as identity threatening for the majority group and identity supporting for minority groups (Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998). Research shows that while integration, separation, and multiculturalism appeal more to ethnic minority groups, majority group members endorse assimilation more strongly (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). Consequently, immigrants often perceive the majority group's expectations of immigrant assimilation as considerably stronger than their own willingness to assimilate (e.g., Horenczyk, 2000). Thus, the profile of orientations toward acculturation emerging in the national community and among the immigrants can match or mismatch each other in varying degrees (Bourhis et al., 1997).

According to the IAM, concordance occurs when the majority community and the ethnic minority group in question share compatible acculturation orientations. Discordance between the majority community and the minority group prevails when the profile of acculturation orientations obtained for the two groups does not match (Bourhis et al., 1997). The outcomes of discordant intergroup relations may take the form of negative intergroup stereotypes, communication problems, and intergroup discrimination, mostly directed toward minority group members, and heightened acculturative stress and lowered psychological well-being of the targeted group members. Consensual intergroup relations are predicted when both majority community members and minority group members share integration, assimilation, or individualist orientations. Problematic intergroup relations emerge when the national community and the minority group experience both partial disagreement and partial agreement as regards their profile of

acculturation attitudes. For example, negative intergroup stereotypes and discriminatory behaviors can be the result of an intergroup pattern where immigrant group members prefer integration but host community members insist that immigrants assimilate to the host society. However, majority members who endorse segregationist or exclusionist orientations toward minority group members are likely to foster the most conflictual intergroup relations with targeted immigrant groups. These host community members are likely to have negative stereotypes concerning immigrants and to discriminate against them in many domains. Nonviolent segregationists may simply think that cultures should not mix, while radical exclusionists are the ones likely to launch violent racist attacks against immigrants. Of the targeted immigrant groups, it is those with separatist attitudes who are most likely to resist and even retaliate against host community persecutions (Bourhis et al., 1997).

As regards empirical support, the model has been subjected to little – and typically only partial – systematic research. In 2001, Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, and Vedder analyzed data from four countries (USA, Finland, Israel, and the Netherlands) collected as part of the 13-nation ICSEY (International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth) project aiming at capturing the interrelationship between identity choices among immigrant adolescents and immigrant policies in these countries. In accordance with the predictions of the IAM, they expected that national policies supporting multiculturalism would allow immigrants the option of being bicultural (i.e., integrated). The findings showed that only in one of the societal contexts (California in the US) did the type of identity adopted by most immigrants parallel the state's official integrative immigrant policy. The mismatch between the immigrant policies adopted in the other three countries and identity choices of immigrant youth in these countries has been explained by within-country variation, group characteristics, and other contextual factors.

In 2003, Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, and Schmitz examined whether the acculturation orientations of repatriates from Former Soviet Russia to Finland, Germany, and Israel and those of the nationals (assessed using Berry, 1997 original acculturation attitudes model) were concordant or discordant, and whether the concordant vs. discordant profiles had any bearing on perceived discrimination and acculturative stress as outlined in the IAM by Bourhis et al. (1997). The researchers acknowledged the highly normative quality of the integration option and the subsequent possible response tendency favoring integration among both hosts and immigrants (see, e.g., Horenczyk, 1996, 2000) and, proposed a new classification of acculturation preferences based on the respondents' second option. The results showed that, when using Berry's original classification model, integration was the most preferred option among the immigrants. Moreover, the acculturation profiles of nationals and immigrants appeared to be concordant in Israel and Germany, and discordant only in Finland, where most of the nationals preferred assimilation. However, when all respondents favoring integration were subclassified according to their second preference, the profiles turned out to be discordant and the intergroup

relations conflictual in all three countries. Supporting the predictions made on the basis of the classification based on these second preferences, those immigrants whose personal acculturation preferences were most in conflict with those of the majority group (separatists in Finland and Israel, assimilationists in Germany) either perceived more discrimination or reported more stress than other immigrants.

A review of acculturation strategy studies indicates that these strategies have been operationalized in three different ways (Liebkind, 2001). Snauwaert, Soenens, Vanbeselaere, and Boen (2003) have referred to the first form of conceptualization – in line with Berry's model – as contact conceptualization. This is based on a combination of the attitude toward cultural maintenance and the attitude toward contact with the majority group (Berry, 1997). The second way is referred to as adoption conceptualization and it is the way Bourhis et al. (1997) have suggested when they replaced the issue of contact and participation with the issue of culture adoption. The third way is called identification conceptualization and it is based on Hutnik's (1986, 1991) bidimensional identification model. As stressed by Liebkind (2001) and Snauwaert et al. (2003), the conceptual differences between these three acculturation models are often overlooked. Moreover, as shown by Snauwaert et al. (2003), these different conceptualizations produce different results in terms of what are the most preferred acculturation orientations. In their study, ethnic minority members were far less inclined to identify with Belgians or to adopt parts of the Belgian culture than to have good and regular relationships with Belgians. The authors concluded that “an adoption integration orientation and an acculturative ethnic identity are psychologically more demanding conceptualizations than the contact integration acculturation orientation, requiring a stronger involvement in the majority group” (p. 237). The concordance model of acculturation (CMA) discussed below has acknowledged this difference by arguing that intergroup negotiations are harder when they touch upon identity and cultural issues than contact and participation issues.

The Concordance Model of Acculturation

In 2002, Piontkowski, Rohmann, and Florack put forward their Concordance Model of Acculturation (CMA). The CMA model addresses not only the consequences of the actual attitudes of both groups, but also the way in which the strategies of the nondominant group are perceived by members of the dominant group and vice versa. As authors argue, “from a psychological perspective, perceived discrepancies seem more important in the prediction of intergroup attitudes” (p. 222). This idea has also been emphasized by Brown and Zagefka (2011), who noted that the best predictor of harmonious or conflictual intergroup relations might not be the acculturation attitudes of one group, but the fit between both groups' preferences. The basic assumptions of the CMA are the same as in the IAM. Particularly, the model suggests that the dominant and the nondominant groups differ in the degree to which

they can control the acculturation process, with the former having more power to determine whether or not the nondominant group is allowed to maintain its own culture and have relationships with the dominant group and to impose on immigrants its own expectations concerning the correct acculturation strategy (Piontkowski et al., 2002). Following the predictions of the IAM, the authors similarly expect that the greater the mismatch in acculturation attitudes, the more problematic and conflictual the intergroup situation will be perceived. In case of discordance on cultural maintenance, immigrants prefer to maintain their culture to a higher degree, as compared to the acceptable level of cultural maintenance they attribute to members of the host community (Rohmann, Florack, & Piontkowski, 2006).

One major difference between the IAM and CMA models is that whereas the IAM uses culture adoption conceptualization of acculturation attitudes, the CMA model uses contact conceptualization with reference to Berry's original acculturation model, which includes two conceptually different dimensions: cultural maintenance (the immigrant's willingness to maintain one's heritage culture) and social contact and participation (the willingness to engage in contact with the majority group) (Berry, 1997). According to the proponents of the CMA model, the concordance and discordance of acculturation attitudes should be separately assessed for these two dimensions. The conceptual reason is that disagreement over the maintenance of culture should have a stronger influence on the intergroup relations (i.e., relations outcomes) than disagreement over the amount of desired contact, as maintenance of culture is strongly associated with group identification (Florack & Piontkowski, 2000). Whereas the CMA model excludes the fifth acculturation orientation suggested in the IAM (i.e., individualism), the model introduces an additional indicator of the problematic and conflictual relations outcomes, namely, perceived threat. Moreover, in contrast to Bourhis et al. (1997), Piontkowski and her colleagues (2002) have argued that the best predictor of intergroup outcomes will not be the fit between the real attitudes of both groups, but the fit between one group's desire and their perception of what the other group wants.

The CMA model was first tested in a survey study comparing the attitudes of Germans with the attitudes they attributed to Polish or Italian immigrants. The results showed that the level of concordance is related to perceived intergroup threat and/or enrichment when controlling for the underlying acculturation attitudes: the greater the concordance between the dominant group's acculturation attitudes and the attitudes imputed to immigrants, the lower the perceived threat and the higher the perceived enrichment (Piontkowski et al., 2002). Further support to the model was provided in a survey among German majority members and Turkish and Italian immigrants in Germany (Rohmann et al., 2006). The researchers found that cultural discordance and contact discordance contributed independently to the prediction of realistic and symbolic threat and intergroup anxiety for both majority and minority group members. Interestingly, in experimental studies (see e.g., Florack, Piontkowski, Rohmann, Balzer, & Perzig,

2003; Rohmann, Piontkowski, & van Raudenborgh, 2008) testing the relationship between threat perceptions and acculturation preferences, these researchers found that on the one hand, perceived threat affected majority members' attitudes toward immigrant acculturation (Florack et al., 2003) while, on the other hand, discordance of acculturation attitudes led to higher perceptions of intergroup threat. Combined with the results of studies testing the CMA models discussed above, this result speaks for the reciprocity in the threat-attitudes relationship; threat can work in two ways: precede and influence intergroup attitudes and be an outcome of difficult intergroup interactions (Piontkowski et al., 2002; Rohmann et al., 2008).

Similar findings have been obtained by Brown and his colleagues, showing that the fit between own desired and perceived other's acculturation orientations are valid indicators of intergroup relations, with lower fit associated with worse intergroup outcomes (Pfafferott & Brown, 2006; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). Thus, as noted by Brown and Zagefka (2011), the reciprocity of acculturation lies in the double role of intergroup relations (i.e., mutuality), which are affected by acculturation attitudes as well as having a causal impact on acculturation preferences.

Acculturation Discrepancies in Complex Social Contexts

Another series of studies focusing on the notion of acculturation discrepancies has been conducted by Horenczyk (1996, 2000). Immigrants and minority members were asked about their "own" acculturation orientations, as well as the acculturation expectations attributed to their national peers. Consistent with most research in the area, the results of his studies found integration to be the most preferred acculturation attitude, and this orientation was also perceived as the primary "acculturation ideology" of their national peers. However, immigrants tend to perceive the majority culture's expectations of immigrant *assimilation* as considerably stronger than their own willingness to assimilate. Further, the resulting internal conflict had detrimental effects on the immigrant's adaptation: "Assimilation discrepancies" were found to be negatively correlated with immigrant's well-being, particularly among respondents high in conformity (Roccas, Horenczyk, & Schwartz, 2000). These complex patterns of results were explained by Horenczyk (1996, 2000) in terms of the "vagueness" of the integration attitude. It was suggested that Integration, or biculturalism, may not always reflect a smooth combination of two strong identities – the ethnic and the national; rather, quite often it involves and requires a delicate balance and negotiation between acculturative forces. Immigrants and hosts may agree on the general preference for integration, while disagreeing on the extent of ethnic cultural maintenance and host culture adoption preferred and expected. Assimilation (or separation) discrepancies can allow us to uncover such acculturative tensions underlying the vague but relatively harmonious rhetoric of biculturalism.

In addition, the impact of the receiving society on the acculturation preferences of immigrants is not limited to that occurring after migration. In a study by Yijälä and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2010) among potential migrants from Russia to Finland, the most important predictors of future migrants' preferences for acculturation options after migration were their perceptions of future nationals' preferences for immigrants' cultural maintenance and contacts with hosts.

The studies by Horenczyk (1996, 2000) expanded Berry's (1974) conceptual and methodological framework so as to better account for the complexity of social contexts and of intergroup mutuality in acculturation orientations. The first expansion focused on multiple majorities contexts. Quite often, minority groups face the challenge of negotiating their identities vis-à-vis more than one distinct – and at times rival – majority groups. Such is the case, for instance, of Palestinian Arab Christians in Israel. They are, as succinctly put by Rossing (1999), “a double minority: Arabs in the midst of the majority Jewish population of Israel, Christians within Israel's dominantly Muslim Arab society” (p. 28). Horenczyk and Munayer (2007) examined acculturation orientations and perceived acculturation expectations of Israeli Palestinian Arab Christian adolescents vis-à-vis the two majority groups – Israeli Jews and Muslim Arabs. They showed that Palestinian Arab Christians in Israel wish to maintain their ingroup identity; however, they expressed more willingness to adopt elements of the Jewish society, as compared to those of the Muslim Arab society. They also feel stronger assimilation pressures coming from Israeli Jews.

The conceptual and methodological framework addressing issues of mutuality in acculturation can be further expanded. Not only the acculturation expectations attributed to the majority can affect the immigrant's acculturation and adaptation, but also those attributed to co-ethnic members of the immigrant community. Horenczyk and Sankevich (2006) assessed the orientations of Israeli immigrant adolescents from the former Soviet Union, their perceptions regarding the acculturation expectations held by members of the receiving society, and those expectations attributed to members of their migrant ingroup. The picture that emerged from the findings clearly portrays the immigrant adolescents “caught” between the expectations of the two reference groups: Their own assimilation attitudes are stronger than those they attribute to their group of co-migrants, but weaker than the acculturation expectations they perceive from their host peers. A mirror pattern was obtained with regard to the separation attitude. This multi-group conceptualization also contributes to a more refined picture of the relationship between acculturation discrepancies and adaptation. The two types of discrepancies were found to be distinctively correlated with the two facets of adaptation – psychological and socio-cultural (Ward & Kennedy, 1993): Discrepancies between own attitudes and perceived outgroup expectations were negatively related to socio-cultural adaptation (primarily school adjustment), whereas own-ingroup discrepancies negatively predicted psychological adaptation.

The Relative Acculturation Extended Model

The Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM) by Navas et al., 2005 and Navas, Rojas, García, and Pumares (2007) also addresses majority-minority mutuality in acculturation. They propose to measure acculturation orientations of both immigrants and nationals using an elaborated conceptual framework, in order to address the complexity and variability of acculturation and to allow the examination of majority-minority differences in a more refined way. The RAEM distinguishes between two “planes” – real and ideal – of acculturation. The former refers to the actual acculturation options, which immigrants report to have put into practice in their new society, and those that the nationals attribute to the immigrants. The latter refer to the ideal options that immigrants would like to adopt, and those that the nationals would prefer for the immigrants. The RAEM also distinguishes between the different spheres or domains of acculturation – political, work, economic, social, family, religious, and way of life. These can be located on a dimension ranging from more public to more private areas of interaction. Although variations among domains in acculturation strategies have been acknowledged (e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007), the RAEM suggests differentiated prediction of acculturation patterns for the different spheres.

RAEM-based research was conducted primarily in Spain among immigrants from diverse groups as well as among national Spaniards. In one of these studies (Navas et al., 2007), immigrants and nationals largely coincided in their choices for acculturation in the peripheral/public domains: Both parties seem to agree in their preferences for assimilation. However, marked differences between immigrants and hosts emerged with relation to more central/private domains of acculturation: While immigrants tend to prefer separation, members of the host society continue opting for assimilation. In this study, these patterns were considerably similar in both planes – real and ideal. The RAEM prompts us to approach the study of mutuality in a more contextualized way: Concordance or discordance between majority and minority views may depend on the sphere or domain of acculturation. Discrepancies may also be contingent on whether we are measuring ideal or real acculturative orientations.

Social Psychological Contributions

The notion of mutuality within the context of acculturation calls for an integration between acculturation theory and social psychology of intergroup relations. As described above, the question of cultural maintenance – whether the immigrant feels that her/his wish to maintain the heritage culture in the new society is approved by the majority – is crucial for understanding the outcome of acculturation not only in terms of adaptation but also in terms of intergroup relations (see also Brown & Zagefka, 2011). For example, this question is central for understanding the

support for integration and multiculturalism ideology, which essentially encompasses the valuing of cultural diversity (see, e.g., Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011; Van de Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar, 2008). The acculturation models described above are, thus, closely linked to social psychological research on the multiculturalism hypothesis showing that perceived cultural maintenance attitude among the minorities is negatively related to the majority's support for integration and multiculturalism unless it is accompanied with a preference for intergroup contact (e.g., Matera, Stefanile, & Brown, 2011; Tip et al., 2012; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). The findings can be explained in terms of moderating roles played by prejudice and identity threat.

Another line of research bridging social psychological and acculturation theorizations relates to the concept of identity undermining introduced by Sindic and Reicher (2009) in their article on the separatist attitudes of Scots toward Britain. Identity undermining is assumed to arise from the perceptions of incompatibility between subgroup and superordinate identities and from perceptions of the ingroup's powerlessness within the common superordinate group. Sindic and Reicher (2009) argue that in order to predict attitudes toward or membership in a superordinate group, one must examine how subgroup members see superordinate membership as impacting on their ability to live by their cultural identity. For example, according to Sindic and Reicher (2009), the majority has the power to impose its priorities and way of life upon the minority, making it difficult for minority groups within a superordinate body such as a national group to express their identities. Demand for assimilation poses one of the biggest threats to ethnic minority groups (see, e.g., Wolsko, Park, & Judd, 2006) as it demands changes from both the content and/or the value dimensions of identity. In intergroup contexts, threats to the content of identity would be, for example, situations when changes in the content of minority identity are used as prerequisites for membership in a valued superordinate group, while threats to the value of identity, in turn, relate to denigration of minority group membership (Breakwell, 1986).

In their study of Russian-speaking minority youth living in Finland, Mähönen, Jasinskaja-Lahti, and Liebkind (2011) have empirically tested the effect of identity undermining operationalized as perceived cultural discordance on the relationship between ethnic identification and national identification. Their results indicated that ethnic and national identities were negatively associated and appeared as oppositional only when there was a perceived discordance between an individual's wish to maintain the heritage culture and the majority group's attitude toward immigrants' maintenance of their ethnic heritage.

When cultural discordance was not experienced, ethnic and national identification were independent of each other. Thus, contexts characterized by an exclusive attitude climate and public disregard (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007), undermining of the minority group's identity (Sindic & Reicher, 2009), and cultural discordance expressed as dis-

agreement between majority members and immigrants regarding the latter's degree of adherence to their heritage culture (Mähönen et al., 2011; Rohmann et al., 2006) can all be seen to represent indirect threats to the value of minority group members' identity influencing the attitudes and identification patterns of minority group members. The findings reported by Sindic and Reicher (2009) indicated that if the ability to live by the heritage identity is compromised, there is a negative relationship between subgroup and superordinate group identification among minority members. At the other end of the continuum, minority group members are suggested to experience identity enhancement if they perceive that their culture is preserved and supported through superordinate group membership (Sindic & Reicher, 2009). Similar ideas have been presented by Huo and Molina (2006), who suggest that subgroup respect, defined as feelings that one's subgroup is recognized, accepted, and valued by members of the superordinate group, is linked to more positive evaluations of the superordinate group among minority group members. The results of a recent study by Mähönen et al. (2011) obtained support for the model by Sindic and Reicher (2009) and highlighted the importance for the identification patterns of minority members of their perceptions of the intergroup context. In their study, a negative relationship between ethnic and national identification emerged only when the respondents felt that their ability to maintain their heritage (Russian) culture was compromised because of the Finnish majority.

Finally, recent research on the impact of perceived discrimination on national identification among immigrants may also be seen as addressing issues of mutuality. The starting point of this line of work may be found in a study by Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey (1999) in which they report that African-Americans' hostility toward White Americans increases the more they face group-based discrimination. In the Rejection-Disidentification Model (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Solheim, 2009; see also Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007), rejection by the host society is seen as an important predictor of the extent to which immigrants seek to identify with the society, and this is further reflected in their attitudes toward the national majority group. When the motivation or possibilities for the development of positive national identity are blocked, immigrants' willingness to engage in intergroup contact with, and their attitudes toward, the national majority group, are negatively affected. The model has received empirical support in different intergroup contexts. In longitudinal studies among Russian-speaking immigrants in Finland, perceived discrimination experienced by immigrants diminished their identification with and worsened their attitudes toward the Finnish majority group (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Mähönen, & Liebkind, 2012). In France, perceived rejection by host French society directly and negatively affected French identification among Romanian and Moroccan immigrants, which, in turn, reduced the extent to which they adhered to the assimilation acculturation strategy expectation (Badea, Jetten, Iyer, & Er-Rafiy, 2011).

Toward an Integration

The last decades have witnessed a growing trend in acculturation theory and research which lays emphasis on the context of acculturation (Berry, 2006a). Contextual (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005), interactional (e.g., Phinney et al., 2001), and ecological (e.g., Birman, Trickett, & Vinokurov, 2002) approaches see the acculturating individual reacting to forces from the immediate and larger societal and ideological contexts, in a continuous – not always constructive – negotiation, shaping identities, and affecting adaptation.

Thus, mutuality in acculturation theory and research is here to stay. Common to the models underlying most studies in this area are two major features: bidimensionality and bidirectionality. In this paper we presented and discussed selected models and research programs sharing these components, focusing primarily on majority-minority mutuality in acculturation orientations. We also delineated a trend toward convergence of acculturation research and the socio-psychological study of intergroup relations addressing issues of mutuality in attitudes, perceptions, and expectations. The picture emerging is one of great variety, richness, and complexity.

A growing number of studies focus on the consequences of mutuality patterns – examining the general thesis predicting better outcomes following fit between attitudes, attributions, and expectations. Negative outcomes of discordance in acculturation orientations can be intergroup in nature (such as stereotypes and discrimination) or psychological (e.g., reduced sociocultural adaptation, lower levels of well-being).

Our review provides us with a rich mapping of the field, with its continuously expanding borders. We showed the multiple ways in which the acculturation orientations are conceptualized and measured. Studies differ on whether the four orientations are assessed (e.g., the RAEM and IAM, Horenczyk, 1996) or whether the two underlying dimensions are measured separately (e.g., Brown & Zagefka, 2011). Our mapping also pointed at substantive differences when models and studies focus on contact (Snauwaert et al., 2003), adoption (Berry and IAM), or identification (Hutnik, 1991). As to host acculturation orientations, in some studies these are measured separately (e.g., Berry et al., 2006, the RAEM) whereas other studies conceptualized mutuality in terms of perceived – or attributed – orientations (e.g., CMA).

Additional variations emerge when different domains of participation and contact (from public to private) are taken into account, and a distinction is made between the “real” and “ideal” planes of acculturation orientations (as proposed by the RAEM approach) – allowing for complex patterns of mutuality to be explored. Lastly, complex intra- and intergroup contexts can be included in models dealing with mutuality in acculturation orientations: As suggested by Horenczyk, studies can address intergroup configurations in which minority groups develop acculturation orientations vis-à-vis more than one majority group, and intragroup situations in which the acculturating individual

faces acculturation expectations and pressures from both the majority out-group as well as the minority in-group.

This paper was aimed at enriching the conceptual and methodological toolbox needed for understanding and investigating acculturation in complex modern societies, where majorities and minorities, immigrants and nationals, are engaged in continuous contact and interaction, affecting each other’s acculturative choices and acculturative expectations. We sought to bring out the commonalities and nuances in the different conceptualizations, with the hope of advancing contextualized acculturation research. Although the various models have much in common, at times even overlap, they have been largely used as separate and discrete models. However, there are many aspects of mutuality research – such as those listed earlier – in which the different models can inform and contribute to each other. Our comparative analysis of the various models and research programs can serve as a first step toward the development of a comprehensive and unified model, a “supermodel,” akin to the work by Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, & Eidelson (2008) on group identification. This “supermodel” will integrate conceptualizations from acculturation research and social psychology of intergroup relations. Our analysis might also pave the way to meta-analytical studies examining basic hypotheses derived from research on mutuality in acculturation.

References

- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 249–266.
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Acculturation attitudes: A comparison of measurement methods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*, 1462–1488.
- Badea, C., Jetten, J., Iyer, A., & Er-Rafiy, A. (2011). Negotiating dual identities: The impact of group-based rejection on identification and acculturation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 586–595.
- Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism: Unity and identity reconsidered. *Topics in Culture Learning, 2*, 17–22.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*, 5–68.
- Berry, J. W. (2006a). Contexts of acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 27–41). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, J. W. (2006b). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 719–734.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Birman, D., Trickett, E. J., & Vinokurov, A. (2002). Acculturation and adaptation of Soviet Jewish refugee adolescents: Predictors of adjustment across life domains. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*, 585–607.

- Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Toward an Interactive Acculturation Model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369–386.
- Branscombe, N., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135–149.
- Breakwell, G. M. (1986). *Coping with threatened identities*. London, UK: Methuen.
- Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2011). The dynamics of acculturation: An intergroup perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 130–176.
- Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2000). Acculturation attitudes of the Dutch and the Germans towards the European Union: The importance of national and European identification. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21, 1–13.
- Florack, A., Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, U., Balzer, T., & Perzig, S. (2003). Perceived intergroup threat and attitudes of host community members toward immigrant acculturation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, 633–648.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities* (pp. 241–250). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Horenczyk, G. (2000). Conflicted identities: Acculturation attitudes and the immigrants' construction of their social worlds. In E. Olshtain & G. Horenczyk (Eds.), *Language, identity, and immigration* (pp. 13–30). Jerusalem, Israel: Magnes.
- Horenczyk, G., & Munayer, S. (2007). Acculturation orientations toward two majority groups: The case of Palestinian Arab Christian adolescents in Israel. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 38, 76–86.
- Horenczyk, G., & Sankevich, V. I. (2006, July). *Acculturation attitudes, perceived ingroup and outgroup expectations, and adaptation among immigrant adolescents*. Paper presented at the 18th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Spetses, Greece.
- Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Is pluralism a viable model of diversity? The benefits and limits of subgroup respect. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9, 359–376.
- Hutnik, N. (1986). Patterns of ethnic minority identification and modes of social adaptation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 9, 150–167.
- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- 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, 79–97.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Solheim, E. (2009). To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination. *Applied Psychology*, 58, 105–128.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Mähönen, T. A., & Liebkind, K. (2012). Identity and attitudinal reactions to perceptions of intergroup interactions among ethnic migrants: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51, 312–329.
- Liebkind, K. (2001). Acculturation. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: An Intergroup processes* (pp. 386–406). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Matera, C., Stefanile, C., & Brown, R. (2011). The role of immigrant acculturation preferences and generational status in determining majority intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 776–785.
- Mähönen, T. A., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Liebkind, K. (2011). Cultural discordance and the polarization of identities. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*, 14, 505–515.
- Navas, M., García, M. C., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernández, J. S. (2005). Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 21–37.
- Navas, M., Rojas, A. J., García, M., & Pumares, P. (2007). Acculturation strategies and attitudes according to the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): The perspectives of natives versus immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 67–86.
- Pfafferott, I., & Brown, R. (2006). Acculturation preferences of majority and minority adolescents in Germany in the context of society and family. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 703–717.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493–510.
- Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., & Florack, A. (2002). Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat. *Groups Processes and Intergroup relations*, 5, 221–232.
- Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What About Me?” Perceptions of exclusion and whites' reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 337.
- Roccas, S., Horenczyk, G., & Schwartz, S. (2000). Acculturation-discrepancies and well-being: The moderating role of conformity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 323–334.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Toward a unifying model of identification with groups: Integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 280–306.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149–152.
- Rohmann, A., Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2006). The role of discordant acculturation attitudes in perceived threat: An analysis of host and immigrant attitudes in Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 683–702.
- Rohmann, A., Piontkowski, U., & van Raudenborgh, A. (2008). When attitudes do not fit: Discordance of acculturation attitudes as an antecedent of intergroup threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 337–352.
- Rossing, D. (1999). Microcosm and multiple minorities: The Christian communities in Israel. In N. Greenwood (Ed.), *Israel yearbook and almanac* (pp. 28–42). Jerusalem, Israel: IBRT Translation/Documentation.
- Sam, D. L. (2006). Acculturation: Conceptual background and core concepts. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 11–26). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 472–481.
- Sindic, D., & Reicher, S. D. (2009). “Our way of life is worth defending”: Testing a model of attitudes towards superordinate group membership through a study of Scots' attitudes towards Britain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 114–129.
- Snauwaert, B., Soenens, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2003). When integration does not necessarily imply integration different conceptualizations of acculturation orientations lead to different classifications. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 231–239.

- Tip, L. K., Zagefka, H., González, R., Brown, R., Cinnirella, M., & Na, X. (2012). Is support for multiculturalism threatened by ... threat itself? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 22–30.
- 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.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 93–104.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26, 91–108.
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2007). National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1448–1462.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions: A comparison of secondary students overseas and at home. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 129–147.
- Wolsko, C., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2006). Considering the Tower of Babel: Correlates of assimilation and multiculturalism among ethnic minority and majority groups in the United States. *Social Justice Research*, 19, 277–306.
- Yijälä, A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2010). Pre-migration acculturation attitudes among potential ethnic migrants from Russia to Finland. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34, 326–339.
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies, relative fit and intergroup relations: Immigrant-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 171–188.

Gabriel Horenczyk

School of Education
 Hebrew University of Jerusalem
 Mt. Scopus
 Jerusalem 91905
 Israel
 Tel. +972 2 588-2031
 Fax +972 2 532-2211
 E-mail gabriel@vms.huji.ac.il
