Domains and Dimensions in Acculturation:

Implicit Theories of Turkish-Dutch

Judit Arends-Tóth & Fons J. R. van de Vijver

Tilburg University, the Netherlands

Abstract

The present study aims to further our understanding of psychological acculturation by examining which current models of acculturation correspond most with implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch. Current theoretical models of acculturation differ in two aspects: dimensionality (unidimensional adaptation, a bidimensional combination of culture maintenance and adaptation, or a multidimensional fusion of two cultures) and domain specificity (trait or domain-specific models). Domain specificity of acculturation played a more central role in the implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch than typically assumed in current theoretical models. The unidimensional domain-specific model was most frequently employed. Turkish-Dutch emphasized the importance of both Dutch and Turkish culture in their lives (thereby supporting the popular notion of integration), but this importance varied across domains: Adjustment to Dutch culture was more emphasized in the public (functional, utilitarian) domain while maintenance of Turkish culture was more emphasized in the private (social-emotional, identity) domain. This study documents the need to elaborate on domain specificity and on the meaning of integration in acculturation models.

Key Words: Psychological Acculturation, Implicit Theories, Dimensionality Models, Domain-Specific Models, Turkish-Dutch

Domains and Dimensions in Acculturation:

Implicit Theories of Turkish-Dutch

Acculturation refers to the process of cultural change that occurs when individuals from different cultural backgrounds come into prolonged, continuous, first-hand contact with each other (Berry, 1992). In the last decades various models of acculturation have been proposed; yet, little attention has been devoted to a systematic comparison of the validity of these models (e.g., Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001; Kim, Laroche, & Tomiuk, 2001; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). The primary focus of the present study was to investigate which of the current models of acculturation is supported by implicit theories held by migrants.

Theoretical Models of Acculturation

Many studies of how individuals react to intercultural contact focus on acculturation attitudes and ethnic identities (Phinney, 1990; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001). Although there is disagreement about their relationship (Liebkind, 2001), many authors seem to agree that the concepts of acculturation and ethnic identity have different connotations. Acculturation attitudes refer to preferences given to the cultures involved in the process (e.g., Kim et al., 2001; Ward, 1996), while ethnic identity refers to the development of a sense of self in relation to culture. Ethnic identity can be seen as the aspect of acculturation that focuses on the subjective sense of belonging to an ethnic group or culture

(Cuéllar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Keefe & Padilla, 1987; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Phinney, 1990; Tropp, Erkut, Garcia Coll, Alarcon, & Vazquez Garcia, 1999).

Theoretical models of acculturation can be grouped along two lines (see Table 1): dimensionality and domain specificity.

Insert Table 1 about here

Dimensionality. Acculturation refers to the question of how a migrant deals with the culture of origin and the culture of the country of settlement. The former aspect involves the importance of maintaining key aspects of the heritage culture. The latter aspect, according to Berry (1997), refers to the extent to which the immigrant wishes to have contacts with and to participate in the society of settlement. Bourhis and his associates (1997) proposed a refinement by changing the nature of the second aspect, making it cultural instead of social. Their dimension of *cultural adaptation* refers to the importance of adapting to key aspects of the majority culture.

The relationships between these two main aspects of acculturation can be described in three ways. The first, the *unidimensional model* conceptualizes cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation as polar opposites; cultural maintenance refers to retaining elements of the immigrant culture, while adaptation involves the degree of the immigrant's adjustment

to the host culture (e.g., Ward et al., 2001). This model
implies a process of culture change along a single dimension,
a shift from maintenance of the immigrant culture to full
adaptation to the host culture (Gordon, 1964). In this model,
migrants lose their original culture as they acquire a new
culture, which implies a negative relationship between
cultural maintenance and cultural adaptation (e.g., Cuéllar et
al., 1980; Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992).

The second model is called *bidimensional.* Maintenance and
adaptation are treated here as two dimensions. Various authors
view the dimensions as independent; increasing adaptation does
not require decreasing cultural maintenance (e.g., Berry,
1997; Hutnik, 1986; Moghaddam, 1988; Sanchez & Fernandez,
1993). The most popular bidimensional model is that of Berry
(e.g., 1992). In this model, the two main aspects of
acculturation are combined, constituting four acculturation
strategies, namely integration, assimilation, separation, and
marginalization. The integration strategy reflects a desire to
maintain key features of the immigrant's culture while there
is a simultaneous interest in adopting elements of the
majority culture. Assimilation refers to the loss of the
original culture and complete absorption in the majority
culture. The separation strategy reflects a desire to maintain
the minority culture while rejecting the majority culture.
Finally, marginalization amounts to the rejection of both
cultures.

Recent writers have proposed a third kind of dimensionality model. In this model, which could be called a *fusion model*, an acculturating individual mixes both cultures in a new "integrated culture" (Hermans & Kempen, 1998). This integrated culture may either contain a mix of the two cultures (combining "the best of both worlds") or may contain unique aspects that are atypical of either culture (Coleman, 1995; Padilla, 1995; Roosens, 1989). This model has not yet been investigated empirically.

Domain specificity. Domain-specific models are an elaboration of the trait model (which assumes cross-situational and cross-temporal consistency). Whereas the contexts in which acculturation occurs were often left out of consideration in the trait model, domain-specific models examine domain differences in acculturation. These models are based on the assumption that an individual's preference for adaptation and cultural maintenance may vary across life domains (Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Kim et al., 2001). For example, one may seek economic or work assimilation and linguistic integration, while maintaining separation in family and marriage.

The models of domain specificity that have been proposed in the literature differ in their levels of abstraction (i.e., the breadth of the domain). Based on Rosch's (1978) categorization model, three levels of abstraction of domain specificity can be distinguished. In our own work we find that

the first, superordinate level is constituted by two broad domains: the public (functional, utilitarian) and the private (social-emotional, identity) domain (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003). Turkish-Dutch reported to prefer adaptation to Dutch culture more in the public domain than in the private domain, while cultural maintenance is important in both domains. Similarly, Phalet, Lotringen, and Entzinger (2000) found that Dutch migrant youth preferred cultural maintenance in the private domain (at home) and valued Dutch culture in the public domain (outside of the home). The second, ordinate level of domain specificity is formed by specific life domains (e.g., education and language, which belong to the public domain, and child-rearing and marriage, which belong to the private domain). The subordinate level refers to specific situations; an individual's preference for adaptation and maintenance may vary across specific situations. A number of researchers have shown that the salience of cultural orientation varies as a function of specific situations (e.g., Clement & Noels, 1992; Nagata, 1994; Taylor & Lambert, 1996). Sodowsky and Carey (1988) described certain dual characteristics of first generation Asian Indians in the U.S.A., who preferred Indian food and dress at home and American food and dress elsewhere.

   The meaning of integration. Results obtained using the different acculturation models showed that migrants in general tend to prefer integration, a combination of adaptation and

cultural maintenance (see, e.g., Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989; Lasry & Sayegh, 1992; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998). However, there may be large variations in what is meant by integration in each acculturation model as there are innumerable ways in which cultures can be combined. Integration as a broad term can refer to any (positive) combination of adaptation and cultural maintenance, meaning that migrants have some aspects of both cultures. It can refer to an equal combination of cultural maintenance and adaptation (fifty-fifty distribution). Integration can also indicate that people can have access to both cultural systems and shift from the one to the other depending on the context or life domains (e.g., "dual monocultural" individuals may switch between cultural maintenance at home and adaptation outside). LaFromboise and her colleagues (1993) have proposed an alternation model, which allows for the possibility of having a sense of belonging to two cultures in different situations. Finally, integration can also refer to merging cultures, creating a "new culture" from the old ones (e.g., Coleman, 1995).

The Dutch Context

The Netherlands, like all Western European societies, has become culturally diverse. As a result of the Dutch colonial history in the Caribbean area, the recruitment of cheap labor from the Mediterranean region in the 1960s, and in recent years refugees mainly from Africa, Eastern Europe, and the

Middle East, a heterogeneous group of immigrants have taken up permanent residence in the Netherlands (Meerman, Van IJssel, & Van der Vliest, 2000). At present, 18% of the population in the Netherlands is of foreign origin[1], and by 2010 in the three largest Dutch cities this figure will rise to 50% (SCP, 1998). These numbers are unprecedented in Dutch history. Not surprisingly, the adaptation of these groups to the mainstream society has become a prominent feature of the public discourse on migrants (Vermeulen & Penninx, 2000).

The Present Study

There are various ways to examine the validity of acculturation models. For example, one could measure overt behavior and compare which model is more successful in explaining this behavior. The criterion of validity is then overt behavior. The present study adopts a different approach. We are interested in the question of which of the acculturation models described above (see also Table 1) is most similar to the implicit theories of migrants and can best capture the migrants' experiences, as assessed in a semi-structured interview. It is interesting to compare the agreement between these implicit models and current theoretical models because these two models do not need to be identical, as has been documented in other psychological domains, such as intelligence (Sternberg, 1985).

The Turkish-Dutch group was chosen because it is the largest migrant group in the Netherlands and because Dutch

natives, as has been documented in the study of Pettigrew (1998), experience many relational difficulties with this group[2]. In this article Turkish-Dutch refers to persons who were born in Turkey or who had at least one parent who was born in Turkey.

Research questions. We examined the views of Turkish-Dutch vis-à-vis three topics. The first focused on *cultural preferences and ethnic identity*, the second addressed the question of *how they integrate the cultures*, and the third included the *temporal aspects of acculturation*.

Method

Participants

A group of 147 Turkish-Dutch adults participated in this study. The sample consisted of 77 women and 70 men (71 first generation, 76 second generation). Their age varied from 18 to 55 years, with a mean of 30.44 (*SD* = 8.91). The mean education level, with scores ranging from 1 (*unschooled or primary education not finished*) to 10 (*university degree*), was 5.71 (*SD* = 2.76), which corresponds to attending vocational education at secondary-school level. The employment rate was 53.1%. Our sample was quite similar to the Turkish population in the Netherlands in terms of age, gender, and employment status but had a somewhat higher Dutch education. The participants were obtained through snowball sampling.

Materials and Procedure

A three-part, semi-structured interview was developed. Background variables, such as gender, age, educational level, employment, length of stay, and generational status were addressed first. The second part contained 23 open-ended questions, the third 23 Likert rating scale and two rank order questions.

Open-ended questions. In order to assess our first topic, *cultural preferences and ethnic identity*, participants were first asked to indicate which aspects of the Dutch and the Turkish culture and people they evaluated positively and negatively, and how they viewed themselves culturally. The second topic, *how to integrate the two cultures*, was addressed with the question of how they combined the two cultures. The third topic, the *temporal aspects*, was examined on the areas of cultural changes, differences, and difficulties. Cultural changes were addressed with questions asking how Turkish people in general and they personally had changed as a result of living in the Netherlands, how they thought their children and grandchildren would change and deal with the two cultures. Addressing cultural differences participants were asked to describe areas of similarities and differences of the two cultures. Finally, Turkish-Dutch were asked if they had experienced difficulties in dealing with the two cultures.

Rating and ranking questions. In the second part of the interview, the four acculturation strategies of Berry (integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization)

were presented one by one as short statements and the participants had to indicate their level of agreement. As an example, the integration item was: "Turkish people in the Netherlands should adapt to the Dutch culture and they also should maintain their Turkish culture".

Rank order of perceived importance of eight domains (education, language, news, child-rearing, religion, social contacts, celebrations, and food) of each of the two cultures was also assessed. Eight cards (each with one domain name on it) were shown. The participants were asked to rank the cards in such a way that the first card would have the name of the domain that they found most important in the Turkish culture, the second card with the second most important domain, etcetera. After the responses were recorded, the participants were asked to do the same for the Dutch culture.

Acculturation preferences were measured with eight items, each addressing one life domain (language, news, child rearing, social contacts, cultural habits, neighborhood, celebrations, and food). Scores ranged from 1 (*nearly only Turkish*) to 5 (*nearly only Dutch*).

Ethnic identity was measured with one item with scores ranging from 1 (*nearly only Turkish*) to 5 (*nearly only Dutch*), and with the Psychological Acculturation Scale (Tropp et al., 1999). This unidimensional scale has 10 items measuring feelings of belonging and emotional attachment to cultural

groups ranging from 1 (*nearly only Turkish*) to 5 (*nearly only Dutch*).

Procedure. Interview questions were prepared in Dutch and then translated into Turkish by two native speakers, and independently back translated into Dutch. The participants were individually interviewed by one Turkish-Dutch and three Dutch interviewers (all females). They were trained to follow the interview protocol. The interviews were tape-recorded with the consent of the participant.

Construction of categories. Each interview was transcribed. A detailed categorization scheme was first constructed using responses of Turkish-Dutch to each open-ended question, resulting in more than 150 labels. Because this number was still too large for quantitative analysis, a new category system was then constructed after lengthy discussions among the researchers that reduced the 150 labels to 17 categories (see Table 2). During the development of the coding scheme considerable attention was paid to the question whether a category was properly covered. Each category of domains refers to one underlying aspect with a positive or a negative evaluation for the cultures. Some categories refer to relatively broad aspects (e.g., freedom and open-mindedness), while others are more specific in nature (e.g., language and clothes). In order to determine the interrater reliability five arbitrarily chosen interviews were coded. The positive and negative aspects of both cultures were independently

scored for each of the 17 categories by two researchers. The average percentage of agreement (defined as the average of the cells agreement divided by the maximum agreement, which was 68, and multiplied with 100) was 95%.

Results

Results are divided in three sections addressing the research questions: (1) cultural preferences and ethnic identity, (2) integrating the two cultures, and (3) temporal aspects of acculturation.

Cultural Preferences and Ethnic Identity

Cultural preferences. The first research topic in the open-ended questions addressed the preferences for the Turkish and Dutch culture. The positive and negative aspects of both cultures in each category of domains that were mentioned by the participants are presented in Table 2. The association of these aspects (i.e., the extent in which participants like one culture and (dis)like the other in the same category) was measured by means of phi, a correlation measure for a two-by-two table. If phi is positive (negative) for a category, the proportions of liking Turkish and disliking Dutch aspects of this category are higher (lower) than the proportion of liking Dutch and disliking Turkish aspects.

Insert Table 2 about here

The phi values were positive and significant for social-emotional, private domains (e.g., family and child-rearing practices, amount and ways of social contacts, cultural habits and pride, marriage and sexuality, celebrations and food, leisure activities, and decency), as can be seen in Table 2. The Turkish culture was more positively valued than the Dutch culture in these domains (the mean proportions of participants mentioning the categories were .27 and .06, respectively). In addition, religion was mentioned as a highly important, positively valued domain of the Turkish culture (.54). The values of phi were negative and significant for domains that were related to functional, utilitarian, and public aspects of both cultures (e.g., society and social security, education, open-mindedness and mentality, freedom and independence, communication style, and gender-role differences). The Dutch culture was more positively viewed than the Turkish in these domains (mean proportions of .26 and .01, respectively). In addition, prejudice and discrimination were mentioned as a negatively evaluated domain of the Dutch culture (.52). For two remaining domains, language and clothes, the value of phi was positive but not significant (.36 and .32, respectively).

A multidimensional scaling procedure of the correlation matrix of the proportions of liking/disliking and Turkish/Dutch aspects supported a unidimensional structure (stress value = .02; R^2 = .998). The Turkish liking (-1.12) and Dutch disliking (-.86) constituted the negative pole of the

dimension, and the Dutch liking (1.17) and Turkish disliking (.80) the positive pole. These findings indicate that within a domain the Dutch and Turkish cultures are usually seen as opposites.

In the closed-format part of the interview, eight life domains were evaluated on their preferences by ranking them on the Dutch adaptation and on the Turkish maintenance dimension. The means of the rank orders are given in Table 3. The interrater concordance for the Dutch culture was stronger (Kendall's W = .73, p < .001) than for the Turkish culture (Kendall's W = .31, p < .001). As can be seen in Table 3, language was the most important domain in both cultures but the order of importance of the other domains differed for the two cultures. In the Dutch culture, the more public domains (like education, language, news, and contacts) were perceived as more valuable (M = 2.90, SD = .44) than the more private domains (like celebrations, food, religion, and child rearing), which had a mean score of 6.10 (SD = .44). The difference was significant (Wilcoxon Z = -10.53, p < .001). For the Turkish culture, the participants made no clear distinction between public (M = 4.59, SD = .79) and private domains (M = 4.42, SD = .78; Wilcoxon Z = -1.41, p = .16).

Insert Table 3 about here

Acculturation preferences in eight domains (part of the closed-format part of the questionnaire) were first factor analyzed, using an Oblimin rotation (delta = 0). Two interpretable factors emerged with eigenvalues of 2.73 and 1.21, together explaining 49.24% of the variance (the correlation between the factors was .28). The first factor represents the private domain (including child-rearing, cultural habits, celebrations, and food). The second factor is defined by the more public and utilitarian domains (language, news, contacts, and neighborhood), and is called public domain. Item loadings of the eight domains are presented in Table 5. The mean scale score of the public domain was 3.26 (*SD* = .42), which points to a preference for both cultures (with a slight preference for the Dutch culture) in this domain. The mean scale score of the private domain was 2.20 (*SD* = .59), which means that the Turkish culture was more preferred in these domains. The difference between the public and private domain was highly significant, $t(133) = -21.38$, *p* < .001. These results also support the domain specificity model of acculturation.

Insert Table 4 about here

Ethnic identity. Three measures of ethnic identity were derived from the data. First, in the open-ended part of the interview, participants were asked to describe how they would

define themselves culturally. They mentioned Turkish, Dutch, and Turkish-Dutch aspects. Turkish aspects were most frequently mentioned (.41), followed by Dutch (.34), and Turkish-Dutch aspects (.25). Furthermore, Turkish aspects were mainly mentioned in private domains (such as cultural habits and pride, religion, family and child-rearing practices, and celebrations and food) and Dutch aspects mainly in public domains (such as communication style, open-mindedness and mentality, freedom and independence, and education), which indicate that Turkish-Dutch feel more emotionally attached to the Turkish than to the Dutch culture.

Second, in the closed-format part of the interview, participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*only/very much Turkish*) to 5 (*only/very much Dutch*), how they view themselves. The mean score on this item was 2.36 (*SD* = .96), which refers to an ethnic identity that is slightly more Turkish than Dutch.

Third, we also used the 10 items of the Psychological Acculturation Scale of Tropp et al. (1999), measuring feelings of belonging and emotional attachment to ethnic groups. The mean score of this unidimensional scale was 2.47 (*SD* = .69), which also refers to an ethnic identity that is slightly more Turkish than Dutch. The correlation of this scale with the second measure of ethnic identity was positive and significant (r = .59, p < .001); the correlation with the first measure of ethnic identity, which was computed with the formula

(proportion Dutch aspects mentioned – proportion Turkish aspects mentioned), was .33 (p < .001). The relationship between the first and the second measure was also significant (r = .33, p < .001).

The three measures of ethnic identity showed remarkably consistent findings; our participants see themselves as belonging to two cultures, with a slightly more prominent Turkish identity.

In summary, dealing with the first topic, cultural preferences and ethnic identity, comparable results emerged both in the open-ended and Likert questions. Our data provided strong support for the applicability of Rosch's typology of superordinate and ordinate levels in the area of acculturation. The various life domains studied can be clustered in public and private domains, thereby providing support for the view that public and private domains constitute a meaningful superordinate category in acculturation models. Within a specific life domain the importance of the two cultures tends to be related (either positively in the specific public domains or negatively in the specific private domains). Furthermore, the Turkish culture is valued more in the various private domains and the Dutch culture in the various public domains. So, within a specific domain Turkish-Dutch view acculturation as unidimensional.

Integrating Cultures

Addressing the second topic of integrating the two cultures, in the open-ended part of the interview the question was asked how they combined the two cultures. The answers could be divided into three broad categories. A small group of 14.3% answered that most of the time they do not combine the two cultures, but rather they keep the cultures separate. The largest group (44.8%) indicated that it depends on the situation or domain (e.g., at home, outside home, with Turkish friends, with Dutch colleagues) whether and to what extent they combine the two cultures. For 40.9% of the participants, the combination resulted in a mixture of the two cultures; they found it almost impossible to determine the unique contribution of each of the two cultures in their daily life; for important private domains and decisions (like religion and marriage), only the Turkish culture was considered. Moreover, 8.2% of the participants said that this mixture amounts to creating a new culture. Acculturation is then not a choice between characteristics of two cultures, but amounts to moving between and mixing elements of cultures, an "intercreation", as two of our participants named it. One participant compared it to cooking:

"*You know the ingredients separately and you put them together. What you get is something very new, what you have never had before. It can be very special, but it can also be very nasty. It is a challenge to try to make it very special.*"

The results of the measure of the four acculturation strategies of Berry, which were presented one by one to our participants, showed that integration was the most preferred strategy; 81.6% of our participants agreed with this statement, followed by separation (7.5%) and assimilation (2.7%). Marginalization (1.4%) was the least frequently preferred acculturation strategy.

In summary, the results of the second research topic dealing with the combinations of cultures showed that Turkish-Dutch strongly preferred integration and emphasized the importance of both the Dutch and the Turkish culture in their life. However, integration in the view of the vast majority was not an equal preference for the two cultures as the integration strategy might be taken to assume, but rather a specific combination of cultures, which is mainly guided by situations and life domains. This indicates that domain specificity of acculturation is an important aspect in the implicit theories held by Turkish-Dutch.

Temporal Aspects of Acculturation

The third research topic addressed the temporal aspects of the process of acculturation; more specifically, we examined the relationships among cultural changes, differences, and experienced difficulties.

Cultural change was addressed with the question of whether Turkish migrants have changed as a result of living in the Netherlands. All participants agreed that Turkish people have

changed. A distinction can be made between two broader ways of perceiving cultural changes. A minority of 11.6% saw these changes as diversification of the own group, which means that in their view some people have become more Dutch whereas others have become more Turkish. However, the vast majority of our participants (88.4%) perceived cultural changes as adaptation to the Dutch culture, usually accompanied by a loss of Turkish aspects.

The most changes for Turks as a group were mentioned for cultural habits and pride (proportion of participants who mentioned this aspect = .25), open-mindedness and mentality (.24), family and child-rearing practices (.21), language proficiency (.17), clothes (.17), social contacts (.13), and freedom and independence (.11). The correlation between domains the participants mentioned for Turks as a group and for themselves was high and significant (r = .80, p < .001).

Turkish-Dutch were also asked how they thought their children and grandchildren would change and deal with the two cultures. In Table 5, the frequencies are reported.

Insert Table 5 about here

If we compare their answers with their self-definition in the closed-format part (ignoring the possible impact of the difference in questions from which the information about the self and the next generations was obtained), we can see a

clear pattern of increasing adaptation to the Dutch culture across generations. They view themselves as a "bit more Turkish than Dutch", their children as "a bit more Dutch than Turkish" and their grandchildren as "more Dutch than Turkish". The implicit ideas about the course of the acculturation process over generations support the unidimensional model of acculturation.

The answers of the first (N = 71) and the second (N = 76) generation Turkish-Dutch on how they see themselves, their children, and their grandchildren were also compared. Significant differences were found between their self-definition (t(145) = -4.56, p < .001), and between how they view their children (t(145) = -5.89, p < .001), while the differences in how they view their grandchildren just failed to reach significance (t(123) = -1.88, p =.06). The direction of the differences was consistent in that compared to first generation Turkish-Dutch, members of the second-generation - Dutch view themselves, their children, and their grandchildren as moving more toward the Dutch culture.

The perceived difference between the heritage culture and the culture of the host society is a crucial factor in the acculturation process (Riddle, 1982). Larger differences between cultures tend to be accompanied by larger difficulties and intergroup problems (e.g., Ward et al., 2001). The open-ended answers to the question of whether there are differences between the two cultures, were coded on a 5-point Likert

scale, with scores ranging from 1 (*no/very small differences*) to 5 (*very large differences*). The perceived differences were relatively large (*M* = 4.12, *SD* = .66), indicating that on average the participants found the Turkish and Dutch culture to be very different[3]. The largest differences were mentioned in the areas of family and child-rearing practices, religion, social contacts, marriage and sexuality, freedom and independence, decency, cultural habits and pride, and celebrations and food.

During the process of acculturation, migrants might experience difficulties in dealing with the two cultures; a small minority of 5.4% did not experience any difficulties at all, while the majority reported to have at least some difficulties with the Turkish (proportion = .23), Turkish-Dutch (.32), and Dutch aspects (.45) in their life. The domains in which they found it most difficult to deal with the Turkish culture were freedom and independence, marriage and sexuality, and clothes. Most difficulties in dealing with the Dutch culture were reported for language, social contact, and prejudice and discrimination. In the domains of family and child-rearing practices, and cultural habits and pride, difficulties were mentioned both with maintaining the Turkish and adopting the Dutch culture.

The associations between reported changes, difficulties, and cultural differences were addressed next. Two domains which involved one culture only (religion and prejudice; see

Table 2) were not considered in these analyses. The relationship between reported changes and difficulties was relatively high and significant (r = .63, p < .05), which means that more difficulties were mentioned for domains with more reported changes. A positive and significant correlation was also obtained between difficulties and cultural differences (r = .66, p < .01), which means that more difficulties were experienced in domains with more reported cultural differences. The correlation between cultural differences and changes just failed to reach significance (r = .48, p = .07).

In summary, a fairly consistent patterning was found: Domains that show the largest cultural differences are also the domains with most difficulties and most personal changes, and the domains with most reported personal changes are also the domains which more difficulties. Furthermore, when Turkish-Dutch talked about cultural changes over generations, they referred to a unidimensional acculturation model. The cultural change is in the direction of Dutch culture with the simultaneous loss of Turkish aspects.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to investigate the extent to which experiences and implicit theories on psychological acculturation held by Turkish-Dutch are comparable to theoretical models. The latter can be classified along two lines. The first involves the nature (dimensionality) of

acculturation, including unidimensional or bidimensional models, which see adaptation and maintenance as polar opposites or independent (respectively), as well as fusion models which amount to establishing a new type of culture, based on a creative synthesis of the two cultures. The second involves the question to what extent acculturation is domain specific. With regard to the latter question, the participants showed a clear preference; domain specificity is a highly important characteristic of acculturation in their implicit theories. In particular, the distinction between private and public domains is relevant. This implicit theory supports recent studies, carried out among Turkish-Dutch in the Netherlands, which reported the same distinction (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003; Phalet et al., 2000).

Our findings about the different dimensionality models are less easy to summarize. In general, most support was found for the unidimensional model (Turkish aspects on one side and Dutch aspects on the other, meaning that the Turkish and Dutch aspects are negatively related), but the bidimensional model (Turkish and Dutch culture, which are positively related) and the fusion model (creating a new culture) were also present in the implicit theories. However, the popularity of the bidimensional acculturation models in cross-cultural psychology is not matched in the implicit theories. Even when explaining how they combine the cultures, many participants indicated that depending on the life domain and whether they

are in a more public or private context they focus more on one culture. It seems that implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch are more in line with a unidimensional, domain-specific model of acculturation than with a bidimensional model.

Although integration remains a useful term to describe cultural heterogeneity in the attitudes and behaviors of migrants, two potential sources of misunderstanding should be clarified. First, integration is for Turkish-Dutch not an equal preference for two cultures but rather the specific combination of cultures in which different domains are combined in different ways. Turkish-Dutch refer to different aspects of the cultures for the public (functional, utilitarian) and for the private (social-emotional, identity) domains of life. They combine the Turkish and the Dutch cultures in their own way: They focus more on adaptation in the public domain and more on Turkish cultural maintenance in the private domain.

Second, the present study suggests that integration is not always the sum of two independent dimensions, cultural maintenance and adaptation, as the bidimensional models maintain. The relationship of cultural maintenance and adaptation can range from complete independence (as in the bidimensional models) to complete dependence (as in the unidimensional models). Our participants seemed to reason from a dependence model more often than from an independence model.

An important topic in acculturation research involves intergenerational change. The overall picture points to acculturation across generations as a development toward the dominant culture, accompanied by either maintenance or loss of the original culture. Our results indicate that the second generation, although clearly being closer to the Dutch culture than the first generation, is emotionally still strong attached to the Turkish culture.

Two implications emerge from this study. First, the emphasis in the current literature on dimensionality of acculturation may lead to an underestimation of the role of life domains in acculturation. Second, it is important to test the generalizability of the domain-specific model. Before we can generalize from the present findings, comparable research needs to be done on other cultural groups and on a more representative sample of Turkish-Dutch. Longitudinal investigations that follow immigrants over time are also needed to more fully understand what happens to individuals during the process of acculturation. This design would also allow for the identification of a potential order in the modification of cultural orientations across life domains over time. In addition, the effects of cultural context and conditions should be explored in more detail. Domain specificity of acculturation could well be due to the Western European context and acculturation conditions. It may well be that domain specificity is more likely to be seen in countries

in which the dominant group is less open to the culture of migrants. Of particular importance would be a comparison of individuals who are acculturating in different contexts and under different conditions.

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.

Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturation and adaptation in a new

    society. *International Migration, 30,* 69-86.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and

    adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,*

    46, 5-68.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M.

    (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies.

    Applied Psychology: An International Review, 38, 185-206.

Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S.

    (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A

    social psychological approach. *International Journal of*

    Psychology, 32, 369-386.

Clement, R., & Noels, K. A. (1992). Towards a situated

    approach to ethnolinguistic identity: The effects of

    status on individuals and groups. *Journal of Language and*

    Social Psychology, 11, 203-232.

Coleman, H. L. K. (1995). Strategies for coping with cultural

    diversity. *The Counseling Psychologist, 23,* 722-740.

Cuéllar, I., Harris, L. C., & Jasso R. (1980). An

    acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and

clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 2,* 199-217.

Flannery, W. P., Reise, S. P., & Yu, J. (2001). An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1035-1045.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hermans, H. J. M., & Kempen, H. J. G. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist, 53*, 1111-1120.

Hutnik, N. (1986). Patterns of ethnic minority identification and models of social adaptation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 9,* 150-167.

Keefe, S. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1987). *Chicano ethnicity.* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Kim, C., Laroche, M., & Tomiuk, M. A. (2001). A measure of acculturation for Italian Canadians: Scale development and construct validation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25,* 607-637.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 395-412.

Lasry, J. C., & Sayegh, L. (1992). Developing an acculturation scale: A bidimensional model. In N. Grizenko, L. Sayegh & P. Migneault (Eds.), *Transcultural issues in child psychiatry* (pp. 67-86). Montreal: Editions Dougals.

Liebkind, K. (2001). Acculturation. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner

(Eds.), *Intergroup processes. Blackwell handbook of social

psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 386-406). Oxford: Blackwell.

Meerman, M., Van Ijssel, M., & Van der Vlist, R. (2000).

Ethnicity at work: Report on a quasi-experiment. *The

Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences, 36,* 211-229.

Moghaddam, F. M. (1988). Individualistic and collective

integration strategies among immigrants: Toward a mobility

of model of cultural integration. In J. W. Berry & R. C.

Annis (Eds.), *Ethnic psychology: Research and practice

with immigrants, refugees, native people, ethnic groups

and sojourners* (pp. 69-79). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Nagata, D. K. (1994). Assessing Asian American acculturation

and ethnic identity: The need for a multidimensional

framework. *Asian American and Pacific Islander Journal of

Health, 2,* 109-121.

Padilla, A. M. (Ed.). (1995). *Hispanic psychology: Critical

issues in theory and research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Reactions toward the new minorities

of Western Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24,* 77-103.

Phalet, K., Lotringen, C., & Entzinger, H. (2000). *Islam in de

multiculturele samenleving* [Islam in the multicultural

society]. Utrecht: ERCOMER.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and

adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,*

499-514.

Riddle, D. I. (1982). Multiculturalism: Moving beyond cultural

    definition. In R. Rath, H. S. Asthana, D. Sinha, & J. B.

    P. Sinha (Eds.), *Diversity and unity in cross-cultural*

    psychology: Selected papers from the Fifth International

    Conference of the International Association for Cross-

    Cultural Psychology (pp. 121-127). Lisse, the Netherlands:

    Swets & Zeitlinger.

Roosens, E. E. (1989). *Creating ethnicity: The process of*

    ethnogenesis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch &

    B. L. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27-

    48). Hillsdale, NJ : Erlbaum.

Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is

    acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-

    head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-

    identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and*

    Social Psychology, 79, 49-65.

Sanchez, J. I., & Fernandez, D. M. (1993). Acculturative

    stress among Hispanics: A bidimensional model of ethnic

    identification. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23,*

    654-668.

Schalk-Soekar, R. G. S., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003).

    Migrants' and majority members' orientation toward

    multiculturalism in the Netherlands. Manuscript submitted

    for publication.

SCP (Social Cultural Planning Bureau) (1998). *Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 1998: 25 jaar sociale verandering* [Social and Cultural Rapport 1998: Social change in 25 years]. Rijswijk, the Netherlands: Social Cultural Planning Bureau.

Sodowsky, G. R., & Carey, J. C. (1988). Relationships between acculturation-related demographics and cultural attitudes of an Asian-Indian immigrant group. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 16,* 117-136.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (1992). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: Concurrent and factorial validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52,* 1041-1046.

Taylor, D. M., & Lambert, W. E. (1996). The meaning of multiculturalism in a culturally diverse urban American area. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136,* 727-740.

Tropp, L. R., Erkut, S., Garcia Coll C., Alarcon, O., & Vazquez Garcia, H. A. (1999). Psychological acculturation: Development of a new measure for Puerto Ricans on the US Mainland. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59,* 351-367.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members toward

adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 995-1013.

Vermeulen, H., Penninx, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Immigrant integration: The Dutch case.* Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Ward, C. (1996). Acculturation. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (pp. 124-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock.* London: Routledge.

Endnotes

[1]This last figure includes those who are foreign born and those born in the Netherlands with at least one non-native parent.

[2]In the Dutch public discourse Turkish and Moroccan migrants are often seen as the prototypical migrant groups. Currently, the Dutch experience the largest cultural distance and hold the strongest prejudices against the Moroccan group (Schalk-Soekar & Van de Vijver, 2003).

[3]The finding that the participants rated the two cultures as very different can also be confirmed on the basis of Table 2. Differences between the positive and negative valued aspects of the two cultures were computed using the formula *([positive valued Turkish aspects – positive valued Dutch aspects] – [negative valued Turkish aspects – negative valued Dutch aspects])*. The correlation between the proportions spontaneous mentioned and computed differences was used as an index for construct validation. This correlation was relatively high and significant, $r = .60$, $p < .05$, which gives support to construct validity of cultural differences.

Table 1

A Classification of Acculturation Models (Domain Specificity and Dimensionality)

Domain specificity	Dimensionality		
	Unidimensional models	Bidimensional models	Fusion models
Trait models (domain-aspecific models)	Migrant adapts to the main culture	Migrant has two attitudes: maintenance of original culture and adaptation to the host culture	A new culture emerges

Domain-specific models
- Superordinate level
  (public and private domain)
- Ordinate level
  (more specific life domains,
  e.g., child-rearing, news)
- Subordinate level
  (specific situations)
	Speed of adaptation varies across domains/situations	Same as above, but now applied for life domains/situations	A new culture emerges in a domain/situation

Table 2

Proportion of Participants Mentioning Each of the 17 Categories, Their Positive and Negative

Evaluation, and the Relationship between Culture and Evaluation

Categories	Turkish		Dutch		Phi[a]
	Valued positively	Valued negatively	Valued positively	Valued negatively	
Family, child rearing	.68	.19	.15	.36	.48***
Religion	.54	.00	.00	.00	----
Amount/way of social contacts	.46	.04	.08	.37	.74***
Language	.11	.00	.03	.01	.36
Cultural habits, pride	.32	.05	.01	.05	.57***
Marriage, sexuality	.17	.10	.03	.18	.52***
Celebrations, food	.16	.01	.03	.01	.39*
Leisure activities	.05	.00	.03	.03	.58*
Clothes	.03	.05	.01	.08	.32
Decency	.04	.01	.06	.25	.50***

Society, social security	.00	.08	.41	.01	-.91***
Education	.01	.05	.09	.00	-.82***
Open-mindedness, mentality	.02	.18	.18	.03	-.77***
Freedom, independence	.00	.32	.29	.14	-.69***
Communication style	.03	.14	.50	.07	-.65***
Gender-role differences	.00	.20	.09	.01	-.95***
Prejudice, discrimination	.00	.00	.00	.52	----

[a]Phi is the correlation between culture (Turkish—Dutch) and evaluation (liking—disliking).

Proportions do not add up to a fixed sum per row or column, because scores are derived from free responses and participants were not forced to mention each category or to choose any of the four cells of a row.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3

Ranking of Importance of Domains in the Turkish and Dutch Cultures[a]

Turkish cultural domains		Dutch cultural domains	
	Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)
Language	2.71 (1.45)	Language	1.47 (.81)
Religion/Islam	2.84 (2.50)	Education	2.20 (1.02)
Child-rearing	3.61 (1.73)	Social contacts	3.58 (1.23)
Social contacts	4.37 (1.76)	Child-rearing	4.30 (1.55)
Education	4.91 (1.98)	News	4.35 (1.38)
Food/eating	5.59 (2.11)	Celebrations	6.08 (1.16)
Celebrations	5.63 (1.73)	Food/eating	6.78 (.95)
News	6.38 (1.86)	Religion	7.23 (1.37)
Public domain[b]	4.59 (.79)	Public domain[b]	2.90 (.44)
Private domain[c]	4.42 (.78)	Private domain[c]	6.10 (.44)

[a]Lower score points to more importance. [b]Public domain involves education, language, social contacts, and news. [c]Private domain involves child-rearing, food, celebrations, and religion.

Table 4

Results of Factor Analysis of Acculturation Attitude Ratings

(Pattern Matrix; Highest Loading of Variable in Italics)

Life-domains	Private domain	Public domain
Cultural habits	*.71*	.16
Celebrations	*.63*	.18
Eating/food	*.69*	-.23
Child-rearing	*.75*	.09
News	.22	*.42*
Language	-.00	*.70*
Social contacts	-.12	*.73*
Neighborhood	.08	*.70*
Variance explained	34.07%	15.17%

Table 5

Frequencies of Perceived and Expected Cultural Changes in

Three Generations

Turkish and Dutch cultures	Self	Child	Grandchild
1. (Nearly) only Turkish	18	1	---
2. More Turkish than Dutch	56	13	5
3. Equally Turkish and Dutch	50	84	23
4. More Dutch than Turkish	17	49	43
5. (Nearly) only Dutch	4	---	54
Do not know	2	---	22
Mean (*SD*)	2.54 (.95)	3.23 (.63)	4.17 (.87)