

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

<http://gpi.sagepub.com/>

Heritage culture maintenance precludes host culture adoption and vice versa: Flemings' perceptions of Turks' acculturation behavior

Kaat Van Acker and Norbert Vanbeselaere

Group Processes Intergroup Relations published online 11 August 2011

DOI: 10.1177/1368430211417263

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://gpi.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/08/10/1368430211417263>

A more recent version of this article was published on - Jan 4, 2012

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://gpi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://gpi.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Version of Record - Jan 4, 2012

>> OnlineFirst Version of Record - Aug 11, 2011

What is This?

Heritage culture maintenance precludes host culture adoption and vice versa: Flemings' perceptions of Turks' acculturation behavior

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

1-13

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission: sagepub.

co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1368430211417263

gpir.sagepub.com



Kaat Van Acker¹ and Norbert Vanbeselaere¹

Abstract

A prevalent concern with the integration of Turkish minorities is that large cultural differences hinder integration. Many majority members doubt that Turkish minority members can combine host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance, although research has shown that most Turkish minority members experience no conflict between these orientations. The present study investigates experimentally whether majority group members *perceive* Turkish minorities' host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance as conflicting orientations. Four hundred and seven Flemish majority members received a vignette that contained information on Turkish minority members' orientation either towards heritage culture maintenance or towards host culture adoption. Results revealed that Flemish majority members perceive host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance as conflicting orientations. Manipulating either maintenance or adoption affected Flemish majority members' perceptions of Turkish minorities' maintenance and adoption but in opposite directions. These results clarify why many majority group members have doubts concerning the integration of Turkish minorities.

Keywords

acculturation, acculturation perceptions, heritage culture, maintenance, host culture adoption, integration

Paper received 16 November 2010; revised version accepted 23 June 2011.

In political debates about the societal inclusion of Muslim minorities in Western European countries it is often stated that large cultural differences between these Muslim minorities and Western European majority groups hinder their integration (Lucassen, 2005). This is clearly illustrated by the

¹University of Leuven, Belgium

Corresponding author:

Kaat Van Acker, Center for Social and Cultural Psychology,
Department of Psychology, University of Leuven,
Tiensestraat 102, bus 3727, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
Email: Kaat.VanAcker@psy.kuleuven.be

following quotation from the election program of a Flemish nationalist party:

The integration of foreigners with an Islamic cultural background is not going very smoothly. Sometimes there is no adaptation at all. Islamic cultures are indeed very different from ours: They are far removed from values such as gender equality, freedom of speech, and secularization which are the central principles of a Western democracy (Vlaams Belang, 2009).

Although the label “Muslim minorities” refers to minority groups with different ethnic backgrounds, people of Turkish descent constitute one of the most prominent ethnic groups within this category in Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and several other countries (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia [EUMC], 2006). In this paper, we focus on the Turkish minority group. Currently, approximately 1.5% of the Flemish population is of Turkish origin (Belgian Census Data 1991–2001 reported in Phaet, Deboosere, & Bastiaenssen, 2007). They are primarily concentrated in the big cities, socially segregated, economically disadvantaged and discriminated (EUMC, 2006; Phaet et al., 2007). Despite their relatively small numbers, Turkish minority members constitute a salient and devalued immigrant group (Meeus, Duriez, Vanbeselaere, Phaet, & Kuppens, 2009). They are considered as Muslims, and attitudes towards Muslims in general are projected on them. Recent findings show that 48% of the Flemish voters agree with the statement that Islamic values threaten Europe, and 37.2% disagree with the statement that most Muslims in Belgium respect European culture and lifestyle (Billiet & Swyngedouw, 2009).

Having just mentioned majorities’ concern with the integration of Muslim minorities it may seem ironic that integration, defined as the combined engagement with the heritage culture and with the host culture, is the preferred acculturation strategy of many Turkish minority members in Belgium (Snauwaert, Soenens, Vanbeselaere, & Boen, 2003), Germany (Rohman, Florack, & Piontkowski, 2006; Zagefka & Brown, 2002) and the Netherlands (van Oudenhoven, Prins, &

Buunk, 1998). This suggests that Turkish minorities experience no conflict between these two engagements, rather they find it possible and desirable to combine them. Indeed, Turkish minority members consider heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption as orthogonal orientations (see Snauwaert et al., 2003, for Belgium; and Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002, for the Netherlands). In the present study we investigate whether Flemish majority members’ perceptions reflect a similar pattern. More specifically, we study whether Flemish majority members perceive Turkish minority members’ orientations towards the host and towards their heritage culture as independent or as conflicting engagements.

Minority members are usually not completely free to choose how they acculturate. The dominant society and majority group members promote certain forms of acculturation and thus constrain the options of minority groups (Berry, 2001). For instance, in Belgium, public discourse strongly stresses integration through adaptation (cf. Vlaams Belang quote), signaling to minority members that withdrawal from the host culture is not appreciated. Because minority members’ acculturation preferences can only be realized when majority members and the broader society allow for them (Berry, 2001; Navas, García, Sánchez, Rojas, Pumares, & Fernández, 2005), acculturation researchers have started to explore majority group members’ *expectations* concerning a minority group’s acculturation behavior (Berry, 2001; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Navas et al., 2005; Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdržálek, 2000; Piontkowski, Rohman & Florack, 2002), and majority group members’ *perceptions* of a minority group’s acculturation behavior (Navas et al., 2005; Piontkowski et al., 2002; Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). Majority group members’ expectations reflect what they consider as desirable acculturation strategies for minority groups and majority group members’ perceptions reflect whether minority group members are perceived to live up to these expectations.

However, it is important to note that majority members’ perceptions are psychological

constructions of the social reality based upon previous (indirect) contact, media, etcetera, rather than mere "reflections" of reality. Thus, these perceptions can deviate from minority members' acculturation preferences, and from the behavior they say to have put in practice. Indeed, several authors document discrepancies between immigrants' acculturation preferences and majority group members' perceptions of their adopted strategies (Piontkowski et al., 2002; Roccas, Horenczyk, & Schwartz, 2000; Rohman et al., 2006; van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Zagefka & Brown, 2002).

Thus far, studies comparing acculturation preferences of Turkish minorities with the acculturation perceptions of majorities have found that majority members perceive more separation and less integration from the part of Turkish minorities compared to Turkish minorities' own acculturation preferences (Rohman et al., 2006; Vanbeselaere, Meeus, & Boen, 2007; van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). This pattern of findings may be a consequence of a differential relationship between the two dimensions underlying minority members' acculturation preferences as compared to the two dimensions underlying majority members' acculturation perceptions. Indeed, for Turkish minority members in Belgium (Snauwaert et al., 2003) and in the Netherlands (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002) preferences concerning heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption are independent. Moreover, in a study conducted in the Netherlands it was found that Turkish minority members stress their identification with *both* the heritage and the host culture to a host group audience, presumably because they wish to convince the host audience of their dual affiliations (Barreto, Spears, Ellemers, & Shahinper, 2003).

To date, there is some correlational evidence pointing in the direction of a negative interdependence between Belgian majority members' perceptions of Turkish immigrants' host culture adoption and their perceptions of immigrants' culture maintenance. Additionally, Belgian majority members perceive more heritage culture maintenance than host culture adoption (Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011). Thus, it becomes likely that

majority members perceive more separation and less integration.

This paper aims at providing experimental evidence for a negative interdependence between Belgian majority members' perceptions of Turkish immigrants' host culture adoption and their perceptions of immigrants' heritage culture maintenance. A negative interdependence between the two dimensions underlying acculturation perceptions means that majority members do not believe that Turkish minority members combine engagement with their heritage culture and with the host culture. This has serious consequences for minority members. Majority members who do not believe that heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption are combinable, will not be likely to support Turkish minority members' integration endeavours, putting serious constraints on Turkish minority members' acculturation alternatives. Moreover, minority members may be well aware of majority members' perceptions, resulting in less well-being (cf. Roccas et al., 2000), and in more acculturative stress (cf. Barreto et al., 2003), and eventually causing a self-fulfilling prophecy. When Turkish minority members favoring integration are continuously confronted with majority group members who consider this as impossible, they may sooner or later abandon their efforts (Barreto & Ellemers, 2003).

Current study

The present study focuses on Flemish majority members' perceptions of Turkish minority members' acculturation behavior. To investigate the interdependence of the dimensions underlying acculturation perceptions, majority members received a vignette that contained "information" on Turkish minority members' orientation towards either heritage culture maintenance or towards host culture adoption. The effects of this vignette on majority members' perceptions of Turkish minorities' culture maintenance and culture adoption were measured. This allows us to establish whether manipulating one acculturation dimension affects the perception of only the

manipulated dimension or of both dimensions. Based on recent correlational findings in Flanders (Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011) we expect that giving information about Turkish minority members' position on one dimension will push majority members' perceptions of Turkish minority members' position on the manipulated dimension in the direction of the vignette but it will also push their perceptions of Turkish minority members' position on the other dimension in the opposite direction. More specifically, we expect that when majority members read a vignette stating that Turkish minority members tend to maintain their heritage culture to a high degree, they will not only perceive more heritage culture maintenance among Turkish minority members but also less host culture adoption than when the vignette stated that minority members tend to maintain their culture to a small degree. Similarly, we expect that when majority members read a vignette stating that minority members tend to adopt the host culture to a high degree, they will not only perceive more host culture adoption but they will also perceive less heritage culture maintenance than when the vignette stated that minority members tend to adopt the host culture to a small degree. To assess the direction of the changes in perceptions, the four conditions with a vignette will be compared with a neutral condition in which no information about culture maintenance or adoption is given.

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 425$) were recruited from two different high schools in the same Flemish city and they participated during regular class time. Within this specific city, 7.6% of the population does not have the Belgian nationality. Turks constitute the third largest group (after the Dutch and the Germans) within this group of foreigners. Eighty percent of the participating students were attending an academic track, preparing them for higher education, while 20% were in a technical education that prepares them for an applied

bachelor or for the job market. Four percent of the participants were not born in Belgium or had at least one parent not born in Belgium. These students were excluded from analyses. Four hundred and seven Flemish high school students (46% male; $M_{\text{age}} = 16.75$, $SD = .72$) were finally retained.

Procedure

Five different types of booklets, pertaining to five different conditions, were randomly distributed among the students in each class. The first page contained the instructions, the second page the manipulation. Participants then read about an ostensibly previously conducted large-scale study in Western Europe investigating Turkish migrants' orientations either towards the host culture or towards their heritage culture. After reading an introductory paragraph, participants read about the "results" of the study. These "results" varied across the different conditions.

In the high-maintenance (HM) condition, it was stated that Turkish immigrants in Belgium have a general tendency to maintain their heritage culture. Then, this maintenance tendency was specified for five different domains (i.e., values and norms, celebrations and customs, language, social contacts, and religion). The vignette ended by stating that Turkish immigrants in Belgium find it more important to maintain their heritage culture than Turkish immigrants in other Western European countries. To this end, fictitious mean scores for heritage culture maintenance of Turkish participants in all participating countries (i.e., 3.5/7) and of Turkish immigrants in Belgium (i.e., 4.9/7) were presented. In the low-maintenance (LM) condition, the content of these "results" was changed so that Turkish immigrants in Belgium were described as not strongly inclined to maintain their heritage culture. Moreover, heritage culture maintenance was presented as lower among Turkish immigrants in Belgium (i.e., 3.5/7) than among Turkish immigrants in other Western European countries (i.e., 4.9/7). Note that in the HM and LM conditions nothing was said about host culture adoption.

In the high-adoption (HA) condition, it was stated that Turkish immigrants in Belgium are very motivated to adopt the host culture. This adoption tendency was then elaborated for the same domains as those mentioned in the HM and LM condition. The vignette ended by stating that Turkish immigrants in Belgium find it more important to adopt the host culture than Turkish immigrants in other European countries. To this end, fictitious mean scores for host culture adoption of Turkish immigrants in all participating countries (i.e., 3.5/7) and of Turkish immigrants in Belgium (i.e., 4.9/7) were presented. In the low-adoption (LA) condition, the content of these "results" was changed so that Turkish immigrants in Belgium were described as not very motivated to adopt the host culture. Moreover, host culture adoption was presented as lower among Turkish immigrants in Belgium (i.e., 3.5/7) than among Turkish immigrants in other Western European countries (i.e., 4.9/7). Note that in the HA and LA conditions nothing was said about heritage culture maintenance.

For participants in the neutral condition (NT) nothing was said about an ostensibly previously conducted study.

Measures

Reproduction of the vignette To assess the effectiveness of our manipulation participants were asked to react to the question "What did previous research reveal?" by indicating how strongly they agreed with each of the following items: "Turkish-Belgians tend to maintain their culture," "Turkish-Belgians tend to maintain Turkish customs," and "Turkish-Belgians tend to keep speaking in Turkish" concerning heritage culture maintenance; and "Turkish-Belgians tend to adopt the Belgian culture," "Turkish-Belgians tend to engage in regular contact with native Belgians," and "Turkish-Belgians tend (to learn) to speak in Dutch" concerning host culture adoption. All items were rated on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*). Participants in the neutral condition did not answer these questions since they did not receive

a vignette. Participants in the other four conditions answered all six items although each vignette only contained information on either culture maintenance or host-culture adoption. None of the participants indicated that they had not received information on a second dimension.

Subjecting the six items to a principal component analysis (PCA) resulted in a two-component solution (criterion eigenvalue > 1) with one component representing heritage culture maintenance (eigenvalue = 2.98) and the other host-culture adoption (eigenvalue = 1.49). The solution explained 74.59% of the variance. The items concerning heritage culture maintenance described in the vignette ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 4.48$, $SE = 1.45$) and the items concerning host-culture adoption described in the vignette ($\alpha = .75$, $M = 3.69$, $SE = 1.21$) formed internally consistent scales.

Acculturation perceptions Then, all participants were asked to indicate their own impressions of Turkish-Belgians' acculturation behavior. For perceived heritage culture maintenance the items were "I have the impression that they maintain their traditional culture," "I have the impression that they maintain their values and customs," and "I have the impression that they have regular contacts with fellow Turks." For perceived host culture adoption the items were "I have the impression that they adopt the Belgian culture," "I have the impression that they adopt the Belgian values and customs," and "I have the impression that they have regular contacts with native Belgians."

Subjecting the six items to a PCA resulted again in a clear two-component solution (criterion eigenvalue > 1) with one component representing heritage culture maintenance (eigenvalue = 3.16) and the other host culture adoption (eigenvalue = 1.20). The solution explained 72.58% of the variance. Perceived heritage culture maintenance ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 5.60$, $SE = .98$) and perceived host culture adoption ($\alpha = .79$, $M = 3.38$, $SE = 1.12$) formed internally consistent scales.

We thus measured Flemish majority members' perceptions of Turkish minority members' heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption

in two ways: (a) by asking to reproduce ostensible study results, and (b) by asking to give their personal impressions of 'Turkish' immigrants' acculturation behavior.

Results

Reproduced maintenance and reproduced adoption

We start by discussing the effect of the different vignettes on respondents' reproduction of maintenance and adoption reported in the vignette. To enable direct comparison of the means for reproduced maintenance and reproduced adoption, we performed a repeated measures ANOVA with acculturation dimension (maintenance/adoption) as within-subjects factor and condition as (HM/LM/HA/LA) as between-subjects factor. Our hypothesis that manipulating one acculturation dimension, either maintenance or adoption, affects reproductions of both maintenance and adoption but in opposite directions, implies the prediction of an interaction between acculturation dimension and condition. This interaction was indeed significant, $F(3, 323) = 37.17, p < .001, \eta^2 = .26$. Moreover, the analysis revealed also a main effect of acculturation dimension, $F(1, 323) = 121.71, p < .001, \eta^2 = .27$. The mean score for reproduced maintenance was significantly higher than the mean score for reproduced adoption. However, simple contrasts revealed that this effect was only significant for the HM, $t(81) = 10.63, p < .001$, and the LA conditions, $t(79) = 10.81, p < .001$. In the LM, $t(86) = 1.42, p = .16$, and HA conditions, $t(77) = .82, p = .41$, there was no significant mean difference between maintenance and adoption (see Table 1). In order

to further explore the obtained interaction, we will now discuss the effects of the different vignettes separately for reproduced maintenance and reproduced adoption.

Reproduction of maintenance "reported" in vignette

We start by discussing the effects of the different vignettes on reproduced maintenance. First, a successful manipulation implies that respondents in the HM condition score higher than those in the LM condition on heritage culture maintenance reported in the vignette. Second, we expected that manipulating Turkish immigrants' host culture adoption would also affect respondents' reproduction of maintenance "reported" in the vignette. Thus, we predicted that participants in the LA condition would score higher on reproduction of "reported" maintenance than participant in the HA condition.

Simple contrasts revealed that respondents in the HM condition ($M = 5.50, SD = 1.035$) scored indeed higher than respondents in the LM condition ($M = 4.23, SD = 1.56$), $t(167) = 6.28, p < .001$. Additionally, we expected and found that respondents in the LA condition ($M = 5.38, SD = 1.13$) indicated that the vignette "reported" more maintenance than respondents in the HA condition ($M = 4.25, SD = 1.47$), $t(156) = -5.39, p < .001$ (see Table 1).

Moreover, comparing the maintenance with the adoption conditions revealed that the HM condition did not differ from the LA condition, $t(160) = .58, p = .56$, and the HA did not differ from the LM condition, $t(163) = -.11, p = .91$, in terms of maintenance reproduced from the vignette. The HM did differ from the HA, $t(158) = 5.99, p < .001$, and the LM from the LA, $t(165) = 5.65, p < .001$. Thus, manipulating heritage

Table 1. Means (and *SDs*) for reproduced maintenance and reproduced adoption by the different conditions

	HM ($n = 82$)	LM ($n = 87$)	HA ($n = 78$)	LA ($n = 80$)
Reproduced maintenance	5.50 (1.035) _{b2}	4.23 (1.56) _{a1}	4.25 (1.47) _{a1}	5.38 (1.13) _{b2}
Reproduced adoption	3.29 (.97) _{a1}	3.94 (1.21) _{b1}	4.43 (1.036) _{c1}	3.11 (1.14) _{a1}

Note. Means in the same row that do not share the same letter as subscript differ significantly from each other. Means in the same column that do not share the same number as subscript differ significantly from each other.

culture maintenance as well as manipulating host culture adoption affected respondents' reproduction of maintenance reported in the vignette to a comparable degree.

Reproduction of adoption "reported" in vignette Now, we discuss the effect of the vignettes on respondents' reproduction of adoption reported in the vignette. First, a successful manipulation implies that respondents in the HA condition score higher on adoption described in the vignette than participants in the LA condition. Second, we expected that manipulating maintenance would also affect respondents' reproduction of adoption. Thus, we expected a difference between the HM and LM condition.

Simple contrasts confirmed that respondents in the HA condition ($M = 4.43, SD = 1.036$) reported more adoption than respondents in the LA condition ($M = 3.11, SD = 1.14$), $t(156) = 7.51, p < .001$. Additionally, respondents in the LM condition ($M = 3.94, SD = 1.21$) reported more adoption than respondents in the HM condition ($M = 3.29, SD = .97$), $t(167) = 3.85, p < .001$ (see Table 1).

Moreover, comparing the maintenance and adoption conditions showed that the HM condition did not differ from the LA condition, $t(160) = 1.05, p = .30$, but the HA condition resulted still in a higher score than the LM condition, $t(163) = 2.84, p = .005$. Moreover, the HM condition did differ from the HA condition, $t(158) = -6.52, p < .001$, and the LM condition from the LA condition, $t(165) = 6.52, p < .001$. Thus, it is shown that manipulating host culture adoption as well as manipulating heritage culture maintenance affects respondents' reproduction of adoption in the vignette.

Perceived maintenance and perceived adoption in Belgian society

We then proceeded to the effect of the vignettes on participants' own impressions of Turkish minority members' acculturation behavior. Again we performed a repeated measures ANOVA with dimension of perceived acculturation (maintenance/adoption) as within-subjects factor and condition (HM/LM/HA/LA) as between-subjects variable. Our hypothesis that manipulating one acculturation dimension, either maintenance or adoption, affects perceived maintenance and perceived adoption but in opposite directions, implies the prediction of an interaction between acculturation dimension and condition. This interaction was indeed significant, $F(4, 403) = 5.22, p < .001, \eta^2 = .049$. Moreover, the analysis revealed again a main effect of acculturation dimension, $F(1, 403) = 663.09, p < .001, \eta^2 = .62$. The mean score for perceived maintenance was significantly higher than the mean score for perceived adoption. This was the case for each of the five conditions (see Table 2). To explore the obtained interaction further, we will now discuss the effects of the different vignettes separately for perceived maintenance and for perceived adoption.

Perceived maintenance in Belgian society

We start by discussing the effect of the vignettes on perceived maintenance in Belgian society. First, we expected that participants in the HM condition would perceive more heritage culture maintenance among Turkish minority members than participants in the LM condition. Second, based upon the hypothesized negative interdependence between perceived maintenance and

Table 2. Means (and SDs) for perceived maintenance and perceived adoption by the different conditions

	HM ($n = 82$)	LM ($n = 87$)	NT ($n = 80$)	HA ($n = 78$)	LA ($n = 80$)
Perceived maintenance	5.79 (.99) _{c2}	5.34 (1.08) _{a2}	5.74 (.94) _{bc2}	5.49 (.88) _{ab2}	5.70 (.93) _{bc2}
Perceived adoption	3.13 (.98) _{a1}	3.69 (1.18) _{b1}	3.23 (1.098) _{a1}	3.60 (1.082) _{b1}	3.23 (1.16) _{a1}

Note. Means in the same row that do not share the same letter as subscript differ significantly from each other. Means in the same column that do not share the same number as subscript differ significantly from each other.

perceived adoption, we expected that perceived maintenance would also be affected by the adoption manipulation. More specifically, respondents in the LA condition were expected to score higher on perceived maintenance than participants in the HA condition. And the four conditions with an experimental vignette were compared with the NT condition where no vignette was provided. Participants in the HM condition ($M = 5.79$, $SD = .99$) perceived indeed more maintenance than participants in the LM condition ($M = 5.34$, $SD = 1.080$), $t(167) = 2.98$, $p = .003$. The NT condition ($M = 5.74$, $SD = .94$) differed from the LM condition, $t(160) = 2.67$, $p = .008$ but not from the HM condition, $t(165) = .28$, $p = .78$. Contrary to our hypothesis, participants in the LA condition ($M = 5.70$, $SD = .93$) did not score significantly higher on perceived maintenance than participants in the HA condition ($M = 5.49$, $SD = .88$), $t(156) = 1.37$, $p = .17$, although the pattern was in the expected direction. Participants in the HA condition scored slightly lower than participants in the NT condition, $t(156) = 1.64$, $p = .10$. All means were significantly above the midpoint of the scale (see Table 2).

Moreover, comparing the adoption and the maintenance conditions revealed that the HM condition did not differ from the LA condition, $t(160) = .56$, $p = .58$, and the HA condition did not differ from the LM condition, $t(163) = .98$, $p = .33$, in terms of perceived maintenance. Moreover, the HM did differ from the HA condition, $t(158) = 1.93$, $p = .054$, and the LM from the LA condition, $t(165) = 2.39$, $p = .017$. Thus, manipulating perceived maintenance affected respondents' perceived maintenance, while manipulating host culture adoption only had a slight effect on perceived maintenance.

Perceived adoption in Belgian society Last, we discuss whether the different vignettes also affected majority members' own impressions of Turkish minorities' adoption. First, we expected that participants in the HA condition would perceive more host culture adoption among Turkish minority members than participants in the LA condition. Second, based upon the hypothesized

negative interdependence between perceived maintenance and perceived adoption, we also expected that participants in the LM condition would perceive more host culture adoption than participants in the HM condition. The four conditions with an experimental vignette were also compared with the NT condition.

As expected, the HA condition ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.082$) differed significantly from the LA condition ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.16$), $t(156) = 2.11$, $p = .035$. The NT condition ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.098$) differed from the HA condition, $t(156) = 2.091$, $p = .037$, but not from the LA condition, $t(158) = .023$, $p = .98$, (see Table 2). Furthermore, and again as expected, the LM condition ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.18$) resulted in more perceived adoption than the HM ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .98$), $t(167) = 3.32$, $p = .001$. The NT condition ($M = 3.23$, $SE = 1.098$) differed from the LM condition, $t(165) = 2.69$, $p = .007$, but not from the HM condition, $t(160) = .59$, $p = .55$, (see Table 2). All means were significantly below the midpoint of the scale.

Finally, comparing the maintenance and adoption conditions revealed that the HM condition did not differ from the LA condition, $t(160) = .57$, $p = .57$, and the HA condition did not differ from the LM condition, $t(163) = .58$, $p > .10$, in terms of perceived adoption. Moreover, the HM condition did differ from the HA condition, $t(158) = 2.70$, $p = .007$, and the LM from the LA condition, $t(165) = 2.72$, $p = .007$. Thus, manipulating host culture adoption as well as heritage culture maintenance affected respondents' perceived adoption.

Correlation patterns

As an additional test of our hypotheses we calculated for each condition the correlation between reproduced maintenance and reproduced adoption, and between perceived maintenance and perceived adoption. In each of the five conditions correlations between perceived maintenance and perceived adoption were negative and significant (ranging from $-.36$ to $-.48$). The correlation between reproduction of maintenance and reproduction of adoption was not significant

in the low-adoption condition ($r(80) = .088, p = .44$), but this correlation was significantly negative in the other three conditions (ranging from $-.24$ to $-.32$).

Discussion

The present study shows that manipulating either heritage culture maintenance or host culture adoption affected Flemish high school students' perceptions of both Turkish minorities' heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption but in opposite directions. The more Flemish high school students are made to perceive that Turkish immigrants adopt the host culture, the less they perceive that Turkish immigrants maintain their heritage culture and vice versa. This pattern emerged for reproductions of the vignette as well as for Flemish participants' own impressions of Turkish-Belgians' acculturation behavior, and the experimental nature of our design allows us to interpret this pattern in causal terms. Thus, the present study demonstrates that the participating Flemish high school students perceive host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance as conflicting orientations.

Moreover, the vast majority of our respondents seems to be convinced that Turkish immigrants in Belgium are inclined to maintain their heritage culture while not being strongly inclined to adopt the host culture. Indeed, the neutral condition did never differ from the high-maintenance and the low-adoption condition and in all conditions perceived heritage culture maintenance was significantly higher than perceived host culture adoption. Additionally, in all conditions average scores were above the midpoint of the scale for heritage culture maintenance and below the midpoint for host culture adoption. In contrast, studies with Turkish-Belgians demonstrated that Turkish-Belgians score above the midpoint of the scale on the host culture adoption dimension as well as on the culture maintenance dimension (Snauwaert et al., 2003; Vanbeselaere et al., 2007). Majority members thus perceive less culture adoption compared to Turkish-Belgians' preference. Similar discordant patterns have been

documented for Turkish minority members in Germany (Rohman et al., 2006) and in the Netherlands (van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Our data suggest an explanation for this discordant pattern. Since majority members perceive heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption as conflicting engagements, high heritage culture maintenance has to go along with low culture adoption. Since Turkish minority members do not perceive these orientations as conflicting, high culture maintenance can go along with high culture adoption.

The obtained result that host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance are perceived as conflicting orientations also attests that the intergroup relations between Turkish immigrants and the Flemish majority are complex and tense. Our results suggest that majority members may not be likely to support Turkish minority members' attempts to combine engagement with the heritage and the host culture. At the same time, host culture adoption is considered crucial (Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011). This puts serious constraints on Turkish minority members' acculturation alternatives, since it suggests that integration actually means assimilation for the Belgian majority group. Minority members may be well aware of majority members' perceptions, affecting their feelings of well-being (cf. Roccas et al., 2000) and eventually causing reactive acculturation. Turkish minority members who favor integration may come to embrace their ethnic identity more strongly in response to the systematic ethnic categorization and harsh demands by the majority. This may result in segregation (Barreto & Ellemers, 2003).

We see several possibilities for explaining why majority members perceive Turkish minority members' host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance as conflicting. A first possibility is that this perceived negative interdependency reflects strategic concerns. Majority members could present the engagements with host and heritage cultures as irreconcilable in order to justify restrictive integration policies (e.g., assimilation, compulsory host culture learning courses) (Chrysoschoou & Lyons, 2010; Van Acker,

Mesquita, Vanbeselaere, & Phalet, 2011). The quote at the beginning of this paper is an example of how political parties may construct cultural incompatibility to justify restrictive integration policies. Minority members on the other hand may also be strategically motivated to stress their engagement with both the heritage and the host culture because they are aware that majority members value host culture adoption and at the same time they do not wish to abandon their heritage culture. Thus, they are motivated to demonstrate that the combination is indeed possible (cf. Barreto et al., 2003).

Another explanation for the obtained negative interdependency between Flemish majority members' perceived maintenance and perceived adoption holds that, despite a claimed preference for integration among many Turkish minority members, their actual behavior would be more indicative of separation, and that it is the latter which informs majority members' perceptions (Navas et al., 2005). However, as stated in the first part of this article, majority members' perceptions are psychological constructions of reality informed by (indirect) contact, media, etcetera. For majority members in Belgium, actual interethnic contact is mostly rather limited and perceptions may be largely based on indirect contact and media influences. In this specific sample, participants reported on 7-point scales (ranging from 1 (none or never) to 7 (very many or very often)) that they have few Turkish-Belgian friends ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 1.19$) and few ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.30$) contacts overall. In this case, information transmitted by media and peers may have a considerable impact on the formation and perpetuation of majority members' perceptions about minority members (cf. Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007, 2009; Vergeer, Lubbers, & Scheepers, 2000). Currently, Flemish politicians and media tend to highlight conflict and tension between Islamic culture and Western culture (cf. Vlaams Belang quote; De Ridder, 2010; Van Acker et al., 2011). This may be conducive to the perception that combining engagements with both cultures is not possible. If politicians, media, and other public sources focused more on how Muslims combine

affiliations with their heritage and with the Belgian culture, majority members' belief in integration might grow. The possible efficiency of such a strategy is suggested by the fact that our data show that even one relatively short vignette already significantly affected majority members' perceptions. Therefore, it could be fruitful that further research would explore the impact of variables that relate this perceived conflict between host culture adoption and heritage culture maintenance either to strategic concerns or to the representations of minority integration and of national identity as propagated by media, by politicians, and by individual citizens.

The present finding that the two dimensions underlying majority members' acculturation perceptions are negatively interdependent also has important repercussions for the conceptualization and measurement of majority members' acculturation perceptions. An important question is whether it is still valid to present majority members' acculturation perceptions as composite acculturation categories by combining two dimensions that are not independent (Zagefka & Brown, 2002). We think that our data strengthen Rudmin's (2003) suggestion that it would be better to work with both acculturation dimensions separately.

There are a number of comments that could be made about the validity of our findings. First, one might wonder whether the obtained pattern of results is not partly caused by the specific method used. Since participants were only told either about heritage culture maintenance or about host culture adoption they might have interpreted this message as implying that that one dimension precluded the other. This interpretation would also result in a negative relation between the two dimensions although the respondents themselves would not have to experience the dimensions as conflicting. However, this interpretation is not in line with the fact that the neutral condition revealed an equally strong negative correlation between perceived heritage culture maintenance and perceived host culture adoption. Thus, even without any message given, the two dimensions are perceived as conflicting.

Another possible critique on our methodology could be that the pattern for reproduction of heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption resembles the pattern for perceived heritage culture adoption and host culture adoption because these reproductions and perceptions of acculturation behavior were measured in a very similar way. However, we want to point out that especially the LM and the HA conditions reveal large differences between the mean scores for reproduced and perceived maintenance and adoption, indicating that these answers are not just copied from one another. Moreover, the correlations between reproduced and perceived maintenance ($r(326) = .38, p < .001$) and reproduced and perceived adoption ($r(326) = .54, p < .001$) are not extremely high in our sample. Finally, a principal component analysis on all 12 items including reproductions and perceptions points in the direction of a comprehensive 4-factor solution explaining 75% of the variance. Thus, we considered it justifiable to present reproductions of the vignette and own impressions of Turks' acculturation behavior as separate sets of dependent variables.

A further limitation of the present study is that it was conducted in only one immigration context and concerning one specific immigrant group. Future research should explore whether the negative relationship that we observed between the dimensions underlying acculturation perceptions also holds in different societal contexts and for different immigrant groups. We think that the observed pattern is likely to hold especially for devalued immigrant groups that are perceived as culturally different from the host group. Since this is true for Muslim immigrant groups in several Western European countries (e.g., Foner & Alba, 2008), the obtained findings are probably not an exception. Another limitation is that our sample consisted only of high school students. We opted for this population because high school students in Belgium are a relatively more heterogeneous group in terms of their socioeconomic background and their immigration attitudes than college students and highly educated workers. But high school students' attitudes

may differ from those of adults in that they may be less politicized. However, a recent study conducted in the Netherlands found no major differences between high school students' (between 14 and 15 years old) and adults' perceptions of minority members' acculturation behavior and in their affective reactions to this behavior (Hofstra, 2009).

To conclude, this study suggests that many adolescents do not believe that Turkish minority members can combine their heritage culture and the host culture. This may explain the current skepticism concerning the integration of Turkish minorities. To alter these perceptions it is important to attend more to Turkish minority members' efforts to adopt the host culture and to combine heritage culture maintenance and host culture adoption.

Acknowledgments

The contribution of the first author was supported by a PhD fellowship of the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). We thank Joris Vanlommel for his assistance with data collection.

References

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2003). The effects of being categorised: The interplay between internal and external social identities. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 14, 139–170). East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Barreto, M., Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Shahinper, M. (2003). Who wants to know? The effect of audience on identity expression among minority group members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*, 299–318.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(3), 615–631.
- Billiet, J., & Swyngedouw, M. (2009). Etnische minderheden en de Vlaamse kiezers: Een analyse op basis van de post-electorale verkiezingsonderzoeken 1991–1995–1999–2003–2007 (D/2009/1191/1) [Ethno-cultural minorities and the Flemish voters. An analysis on the basis of post-electoral surveys 1991–1995–1999–2003–2007 (D/2009/1191/1)]. Leuven, Belgium: University of Leuven, Centre of Sociological Research.
- Boomgaarden, H. G., & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant parties: The

- role of news media content. *Electoral Studies*, 26(2), 404–417.
- Boomgaarden, H. G., & Vliegthart, R. (2009). How news content influences anti-immigration attitudes: Germany, 1993–2005. *European Journal of Political Research*, 48(4), 516–542.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Sénécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 369–386.
- Chrysochoou, X., & Lyons, E. (2010). Perceptions of (in)compatibility between identities and participation in the national polity of people belonging to ethnic minorities. In A. E. Azzi, X. Chrysochoou, B. Klandermans & B. Simon (Eds.), *Identity and participation in culturally diverse societies: A multidisciplinary perspective* (pp. 69–88). West-Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- De Ridder, K. (2010). *De witte media. Of waarom "allochtonen" altijd slecht nieuws zijn* [The white media. Or why allochtones always mean bad news]. Leuven, Belgium: Lannoo.
- European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. (2006). *Muslims in the European Union: Discrimination and Islamophobia*. Retrieved from http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/Manifestations_EN.pdf
- Foner, N., & Alba, R. (2008). Immigrant religion in the U.S. and Western Europe: Bridge or barrier to inclusion? *International Migration Review*, 42, 360–392.
- Hofstra, J. (2009). *Attaching cultures: The role of attachment styles in explaining majority members' acculturation attitudes* (Doctoral thesis, University of Groningen, the Netherlands). Retrieved from <http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/318936372>
- Lucassen, L. (2005). *The immigrant threat: The integration of old and new migrants in Western Europe since 1850*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., Phalet, K., & Kuppens, P. (2009). Examining dispositional and situational effects on outgroup attitudes. *European Journal of Personality*, 23, 307–328.
- Navas, M., García, M., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernandez, 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.
- Phalet, K., Deboosere, P., & Bastiaenssen, V. (2007). Old and new inequalities in educational attainment: Ethnic minorities in the Belgian Census 1991–2001. *Ethnicities*, 7, 390–415.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P., & Obdrzález, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 1–26.
- Piontkowski, U., Rohman, A., & Florack, A. (2002). Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 5(3), 221–232.
- Roccas, S., Horenczyk, G., & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Acculturation discrepancies and well-being: The moderating role of conformity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 323–334.
- Rohman, 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.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 3–37.
- 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.
- Van Acker, K., Mesquita, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Phalet, K. (2011). *Europe's real and present threat: An analyses of the models of diversity in Flemish-Belgium*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Van Acker, K., & Vanbeselaere, N. (2011). Bringing together acculturation theory and intergroup contact theory: Predictors of Flemings' expectations of Turks' acculturation behavior. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 334–345.
- Vanbeselaere, N., Meeus, J., & Boen, F. (2007). "Integratie" van minderheden: Een pleidooi voor conceptuele zuiverheid ["Integration" of minorities: A plea for conceptual clarity]. In B. Raymaekers, G. van Riel & B. Pattyn (Eds.), *Ruimte voor kennis: Lessen voor de XXI^e Eeuw [Room for knowledge: Lessons for the XXIst century]* (Vol. 13, pp. 195–224). Leuven, Belgium: Universitaire Pers Leuven
- 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.

- Vergeer, M., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. (2000). Exposure to newspapers and attitudes toward ethnic minorities: A longitudinal analysis. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 11*, 127–143.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Multiculturalism among minority and majority adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 91–108.
- Vlaams Belang. (2009). *Election program*. Retrieved from www.vlaamsbelang.org/21/2/
- 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.