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Abstract

Migration makes questions around how ethno-cultural groups deal with co-existing in shared plural societies increasingly relevant. The changes that occur as a result of such co-existence are known as acculturation. It has been defined as a two-way process with changes among both minority members and majority members. However, little research in the field of acculturation has focused on the nature and implications of these changes from the viewpoint of majority members. The present study attempts to fill this gap by using a mixed method design to explore both how and how much majority members change as a result of the presence of minority cultures in shared society.

The qualitative part of the study investigated which areas of life majority members perceive influence in. The quantitative part measured how important it was for participants to maintain their majority heritage culture and adopt minority cultures. Participants were grouped according to their acculturation preferences.

In the qualitative part of the study, the majority members reported influence across private and public life domains. They reported changes in behaviours and values and they reported positive and negative experiences. The results of the quantitative part of the study showed that those participants who preferred an integration strategy by both maintaining majority culture and adopting minority culture were three times less likely to live in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods with a high proportion of immigrants compared to separated participants. Those who preferred a separation strategy, meaning they only maintained majority culture without adopting minority cultures, reported significantly more identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination, but also higher self-esteem.

It would seem that acculturation is of psychological importance for majority members. Implications for culturally plural societies and future research are discussed.
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Introduction

The goal of this study was to investigate whether acculturation is a two-way process with psychological change on the part of majority members and not just on the part of minority members. Acculturation refers to changes in cultural patterns that result from first-hand contact between different ethno-cultural groups over time (Berry, 1997; Redfeld, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Changes occur both in the cultures as a whole and in individuals (Berry, 1997). Individual changes may be seen in cultural values, practices and identification (Sam & Berry, 2006; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Important to the present research, acculturation is defined as a two-way process where changes occur in members of both groups (Berry, 2006b, 2008). However, the research on majority members has mostly focused on their attitudes towards how they think the minority members should adapt (Berry, 2006b; Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). It is well documented that some majority members are willing to accommodate minority groups (Berry, 2006b; Bourhis, Montreuil, Barrette, & Montaruli, 2009; Montreuil, Bourhis, & Vanbeselaere, 2004; Sapienza, Hichy, Guarnera, & Nuovo, 2010). Still, an investigation into how and how much majority members change is less common in the field of acculturation psychology (Berry, 2006b; Dinh & Bond, 2008; Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). Dinh & Bond (2008) have gone as far as saying that due to lack of research on majority members there exists a common misconception that only minority members go through change. This study therefore aims to investigate the process of acculturation in majority members. Do they adopt aspects of minority cultures? In which areas of life are they influenced? And does acculturation in majority members relate to psychological wellbeing? These are questions that the present research seeks to answer.

1.1 The Norwegian context

The arrival of foreigners in Norway can be traced back to the nation’s origins around the year 900. Still, compared to many other European countries Norway is rather inexperienced as a receiving country for immigrants in the period since World War II (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). Historically, Norway was a nation of mass emigration to North-America more than half-way into the 20th century (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). The country gradually became a destination of interest for migrants, but it was not until 1967
that net immigration surpassed net emigration. Three waves of immigration have occurred in the after-war period (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Nyström, Emanuelsen, & Emanuelsen, 1994). Migrant labourers started arriving in the 1960s from other European countries and areas further away such as Morocco, Turkey and Pakistan. The families of the migrant workers who settled in the country followed in the second wave. Towards the end of the 1970s refugees started arriving from areas of conflict, particularly from Vietnam and Chile. These came to be known as asylum seekers and were the third wave. The waves were overlapping and all three forms of immigration carry on to this day (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Nyström et al., 1994). Entry to the country has been restricted since 1975, following a period of economic recession and heated political debate over strains on the newly implemented welfare system (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Nyström et al., 1994). Restrictions have applied to varying degrees ever since. Figure 1 shows the number of immigrants living in Norway from 1970 until 2016 (Statistics Norway, 2016).

![Figure 1. Immigration to Norway by origin, 1970-2016 (Statistics Norway, 2016).](image)

The numbers include immigrants, defined as persons arriving from abroad with two Non-Norwegian parents, and Norwegian-born persons who have two immigrant parents. At present, the largest group of immigrants arrive from countries in the European Economic Area and the second largest group from Asia including Turkey (Statistics Norway, 2016). People arriving from African countries make up the third largest group. The fourth largest group arrive from European countries outside the European Union.
Today Norway is in the middle range in terms of proportion of immigrants to total population compared to other European countries (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Eurostat, 2015). At the beginning of 2016 the total number of first and second generation immigrants living in Norway was 848,207 people (Statistics Norway, 2016). That was 16.3% of the total population of the country, which was just over five million two hundred thousand. The participants in the present study live in the capital of Oslo. Here the number of immigrants is higher than the national average. At the beginning of the year, 33% of the city’s 658,400 inhabitants were immigrants or children of immigrant parents (Statistics Norway, 2016). In three of the city’s suburbs the number was higher than 50%. It is particularly the areas to the east of the city that are home to immigrants. Neighbourhoods are considered multi-ethnic, rather than enclaves of particular groups of immigrants (Søholt & Lynnebakke, 2015). Figure 2 illustrates how the central area and areas to the east were more densely populated by immigrants and children of immigrants at the beginning of 2015.

Figure 2. First and second generation immigrants living in Oslo (Høydahl, 2015).

The squares illustrate 200 x 250 metres of land. Areas to the east and centre of the city have a higher density of foreign-born immigrants and Norwegian-born children of two immigrant parents.
Due to migration, majority members have become numerical minorities in several cities across the world (Craig & Richeson, 2014). Neighbourhood composition has been related to attitudes towards members of other ethno-cultural groups (Bolt, Özüekren, & Phillips, 2010; Boschman, 2012; Huijts, Kraaykamp, & Scheepers, 2014). It is possible that neighbourhood composition also plays a part in the acculturation experiences of the majority participants. The present study explores this by comparing the experiences of majority members living in the eastern areas to the experiences of those living in other parts of the city.

Current and previous governmental policies use the word integration when they state the goal for settling the new arrivals in society, implying that the expression of all cultures is welcomed (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016). However, according to Westin (2006), the country’s preferred strategy has been assimilation. Immigrants are encouraged to adopt the culture of the Norwegian majority and not maintain their heritage culture (Westin, 2006). He contrasted recent efforts to encourage cultural maintenance among the indigenous Same people with the lack of incentives directed at the maintenance of other minority cultures (Westin, 2006). He also pointed to dispersal policies in housing for refugees and a focus on mastering the Norwegian language in order to succeed in the labour market (Westin, 2006). In addition to abiding by the law, immigrants are required to adhere to the values of Norwegian society (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016). It is stated that within these constraints there are many ways to be Norwegian (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016). Historians note a gradual change from essentially assimilationist policies towards greater recognition of maintenance of minority cultures (Brochmann & Kjelstadl, 2008).

Brochmann & Kjelstadl (2008) currently place Norway in a mid-position somewhere between integration and assimilation. This is supported by the Multiculturalism Policy Index ("Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). The index tracks the endorsement of plural policies in countries across the world and is updated every ten years. The index suggests eight areas for policymaking. Countries are awarded a full point for having a clear policy in an area and half a point for partial policies. This makes eight points the highest achievable score. When the survey was last done in 2010, Norway was awarded a total score of 3.5 ("Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). The average score in Europe was 3.1. Sweden received a score of 7, which was the highest in Europe at the time ("Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). Norway had not affirmed multiculturalism at any level of government.

The attitudes of the majority population are mixed, but increasingly positive towards immigrants (Blom, 2015). In a survey of 1,202 majority members, 73% strongly agreed that
immigrants were an important contribution to the country and 72% agreed that most immigrants enrich the cultural life in Norway (Blom, 2015). Still, 26% of participants agreed that immigrants made society unsafe. Attitudes vary somewhat with the background of minority members. For instance, attitudes towards refugees have historically been more negative than attitudes towards migrant labourers (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). More majority members are sceptical of Muslims than people of other religious faiths (Directorate of Integration and Diversity, 2014). When asked whether immigrants should strive to become as similar to Norwegians as possible the responses were evenly divided, 44% agreed and 40% disagreed (Blom, 2015). More women than men disagreed, and younger people disagreed more often than older people. In another survey of 1,290 participants, six out of ten people agreed that immigrants can fit in with Norwegian society and still keep the traditions of their heritage culture (Directorate of Integration and Diversity, 2014).

1.2 Theoretical framework

The present study investigates acculturation experiences in majority members. Findings are interpreted in light of Berry’s (1997) model of four acculturation strategies. Associations between acculturation and psychological variables such as perceived ethnic discrimination, identity threat, self-esteem, life satisfaction and social conformity are explored. A review of research on majority members is provided, as well as an explanation of the relevant framework and central constructs.

Berry’s (1997) model of acculturation strategies provides a theoretical framework for studying cultural changes in individuals and groups. It has been influential in research on acculturation among minority members (Schwartz et al., 2010; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). The model assumes that individuals vary in how they respond to two issues: 1) Do you wish to maintain your original culture and identity? and 2) Do you want to establish and maintain relationships with the other cultural groups? The answers to the two questions result in the four acculturation strategies that can be seen in Figure 3. If the answer is Yes to both questions, an integration strategy is preferred. This means a desire to both maintain the heritage culture and seek relationships with the other groups in larger society. If the answer is Yes to the first question and No to the second question, a preference for the separation strategy is assumed. The individual prefers maintaining the heritage culture without participating in larger society. If the answer is No to the first question, but Yes to the second
question, an assimilation strategy is preferred. This means only relating to other cultural groups without maintaining heritage culture. If the answer is No to both questions, a marginalization strategy is assumed. The individual wants neither to maintain the heritage culture, nor have relationships with majority society. The strategies are sometimes referred to as attitudes or orientations in the literature. Berry prefers the term strategy to signal that they include both attitudes and behaviours in day-to-day encounters (Berry, 2011).

**Figure 3.** Model of four acculturation strategies (Adapted from Berry, 2001).

Integration is preferred by many minority members (Berry, 1997; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). Despite using phrases such as “preferred strategy,” opting for one acculturation strategy over another is not an entirely voluntary exercise. Societies vary in how they deal with the presence of different cultural groups in terms of policy making, ideology and public opinion (Berry, 1997; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997). As a result, the choice of acculturation strategy is shaped by the surroundings (Berry, 2006a; Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdrzálek, 2000; Schwartz et al., 2010). The validity of the marginalization strategy has been questioned. The word marginalization implies a failure to belong to any culture which is often seen as problematic for the individual (Del Pilar, Udasco, & Wyatt, 2004; Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001). Critics have pointed out that answering no to both issues does not necessarily mean that the person has no sense of belonging or identity (Del Pilar et al., 2004; Kunst & Sam, 2013; Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001). Instead, answering no to both of Berry’s issues might mean that the person has other subcultures that
they value more than their ethnic culture (Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001). Or it may be an expression of individualism (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001). Individualists prefer to see themselves and others as individuals rather than members of cultural groups (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001). Others have found that not all participants who endorsed the marginalized strategy where failing to fit into two cultures, they subscribed instead to a global identity as citizens of the world (Kunst & Sam, 2013).

A central question in the development of theories of acculturation has been around dimensionality. Berry’s framework has been referred to as bidimensional (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004; Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2010). This is because the two questions he poses represent two separate dimensions of the construct acculturation. The first question, “Do you wish to maintain your original culture and identity?” has been called the maintenance dimension. The second question, “Do you want to establish and maintain relationships with the other cultural groups?” had been called the adoption dimension. A strength of Berry’s model was that it did not assume that maintenance and adoption were mutually exclusive. Instead, the two dimensions were measured separately. Some people turned out to be attached to both cultures, and others to neither culture. Unidimensional models, on the other hand, assumed that adoption of a new culture meant loss of the original culture as these were polar opposites (Schwartz et al., 2010). A comparison across three independent samples concluded that the bidimensional approach was more valid and useful in research with minority members (Ryder, Alden Or, Paulhus, & Insko, 2000; But see also Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004; Celenk & van de Vijver, 2011). Berry’s initial question, “Do you want to maintain relationships with the other cultural groups?” has been operationalized in two different ways in subsequent research (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Snauwaert, Soenens, Vanbeselaere & Boen, 2003; Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011; Ward & Kus, 2012). Some have operationalized the second issue as contact with members of other cultural groups, based on the original wording “relationships sought among groups.” Others have argued that the definition should be adoption of the other culture’s identity, because this corresponds better with the first issue (Bourhis et al., 1997). Several methodological investigations found that the definitions were related, but distinct (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Snauwaert et al., 2003; Van Acker & Vanbeselaere, 2011; Ward & Kus, 2012). However, Matera, Stefanile and Brown (2012) concluded that the two operationalisations had more similarities than differences. People show a greater willingness towards having contact with other cultural groups than towards adopting aspects of the other culture. It has been suggested
that adopting aspect of another culture is a ‘deeper’ psychological phenomena than having contact with members of the other culture (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Ward, 2013).

Another important discussion in acculturation research has been around whether acculturation is a unitary trait or a domain specific process (Celenk & van de Vijver, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2010). Those who argue for a domain-specific approach do so based on observations of minority members using differing acculturation strategies in different life domains. One distinction has been drawn between values and behaviours. Not all minority participants report using the same acculturation strategy in the behavioural domain and the value domain (Miller et al., 2013). Values have been found to be more resistant to change than behaviours, possibly because behavioural changes are more immediately required to survive in new surroundings (B. S. K. Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). Another distinction has been drawn between private and public life domains. Some minority members report using an assimilation strategy in the workplace, but an integration strategy at home with their families (Birman, Simon, Chan, & Tran, 2014; Rojas, Navas, Sayans-Jiménez, & Cuadrado, 2014). Navas et al. (2005) have suggested the Relative Acculturation Extended Model or RAEM. This model proposes that some areas of life, such as family, religion and values, are more central to the hard core of the original culture. These areas were labelled private. Public areas are considered more peripheral and include politics, work and economy. The model predicts a higher frequency of adoption of majority culture in the public domain because it is necessary in order to be able to perform the daily tasks that ensures survival such as earning money, buying goods and visiting the doctor. Adoption is viewed as less essential in the private domain which is primarily reserved for interactions with other members of the same culture (Navas et al., 2005). Some research supports public and private domain specificity in acculturation (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004; Rojas et al., 2014). However, a study with minority participants in Germany and Norway found that engagement with majority culture was highly correlated in the private and public domain (Kunst, Tajamal, Sam, & Ulleberg, 2012).

An important goal of much research on acculturation strategies has been to investigate which strategy is more adaptive for the acculturating minority members. Adaptation has been seen as variations in both sociocultural learning of skills and psychological wellbeing (Berry, 2006c; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). The present study focuses on the latter. One meta-analysis found that adopting the majority culture was related to measures of positive wellbeing and less symptoms of mental distress (Yoon et al., 2013). Maintenance of the
heritage culture was associated with higher self-esteem and more satisfaction with life, but also with increased anxiety (Yoon et al., 2013). Another meta-analysis found that involvement in any culture was positively related to psychological adaptation, but being involved in both cultures was the most adaptive (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013).

Seemingly, there is support for the assumption that integration is the most adaptive acculturation strategy for minority members (Berry, 1997, 2005; C. M. Brown, Gibbons, & Hughes, 2013; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2003; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). For integration to be adaptive it is imperative that the surroundings are supportive of minority groups maintaining their heritage culture (Phalet, Baysu, & Van Acker, 2015).

It is not only factors at a macro level that influence the outcome of acculturation strategies. Inter- and intrapsychic variables may also play a part. Several psychological variables have been investigated in research with minority members. Three of these are perceived ethnic discrimination, perceived intergroup threat and social conformity. Perceived discrimination is the subjective experience of being treated unfairly compared to others in everyday settings (Flores et al., 2008). Perceived discrimination is assumed to have a negative effect on wellbeing. A recent meta-analysis of correlational studies found that perceived discrimination was significantly related to lower self-esteem and life satisfaction and higher levels of anxiety, depression, psychological distress and negative affect (Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, Garcia, & Hinshaw, 2014). However, for the positive measures of wellbeing, self-esteem and life satisfaction, the association was weaker. The Rejection-Identification Model (Branscombe, Schmitt, Harvey, & Diener, 1999) is offered as an explanation. This model suggested that subjective experiences of discrimination led individuals to feel rejected by larger society. This rejection sometimes led to greater identification with the minority in-group. Stronger identification with the in-group was associated with greater wellbeing due to feelings of belonging (Branscombe et al., 1999). Also, attributing unfair treatment to group membership deflected any blame away from the self (Schmitt et al., 2014). The model explains how perceived discrimination has a negative, direct effect on wellbeing. However, it also has an indirect, positive effect mediated by identification with the in-group (Branscombe et al., 1999).

Integrated Threat Theory (Stephan & Stephan, 1996, 2000) suggests that perceptions of threat in intergroup settings affects the relationship between the groups negatively. The theory outlines four types of threat: realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes. Realistic threats are perceptions that another group might challenge a
groups’ existence. This can for example be through access to resources such as jobs, housing or welfare. Symbolic threats are challenges to the worldview of a group. These could be fears that the cultural values will change or erode. Intergroup anxiety are fears that meeting with members of other cultures will be unpleasant. Negative stereotypes are perceptions that members of another cultural group possess negative qualities such as being lazy or dangerous. According to Integrated Threat Theory, all forms of threat can contribute to greater identification with the cultural in-group (For example Poppe, 2008; Vedder, Wenink, & van Geel, 2016). Threat, and especially stereotypes, have been studied extensively in relation to intergroup attitudes (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Shapiro & Neuberg, 2007). Literature tying threat to acculturation is emerging (Florack, Piontkowski, Rohmann, Balzer, & Perzig, 2003; Phalet et al., 2015; Rohmann, Piontkowski, & van Randenborgh, 2008; Tip et al., 2012). In these studies, perceptions of threat are generally associated with less involvement in the group that is seen as the source of the threat.

Social conformity has been found to acts as a moderator for the effects of acculturation strategy on wellbeing. Social conformity is a tendency for people to act the way they believe those around them expect them to and to be more sensitive to feedback from the surroundings. This ability to adjust behaviour in social situations has sometimes been referred to as attention to social comparison information or self-monitoring (Kosic, Mannetti, & Sam, 2006; Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Snyder & Lanzetta, 1974). Social conformity is related to greater maintenance of heritage culture (Güngör, 2007; Kosic et al., 2006). The assimilation strategy is detrimental to the wellbeing of minority members only if they are high in social conformity (Kosic et al., 2006; Roccas, Horenczyk, & Schwartz, 2000). Based on these findings it would seem that it is more harmful for persons who report high levels of social conformity to refrain from maintaining their heritage culture.

### 1.3 Research on the majority experience

Acculturation is frequently defined as a two-way process between cultural groups (Berry, 2008; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001). This implies that majority members should also show signs of change. The acculturation strategy framework has mainly been used to explore cultural maintenance and adoption among minority members. It has also been used to map out the acculturation expectations of majority members. Acculturation expectations are preferences among majority members for how they would like the minority members living in
the shared society to acculturate (Berry, 2006a, 2006b). Many majority members report that they prefer minority groups to integrate, but there is variation between contexts (Bourhis, Montaruli, El-geledi, Harvey, & Barrette, 2010; Piontkowski et al., 2000). Berry’s framework has not yet been used extensively to investigate how majority members themselves relate to minority cultures (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). One reason for this might be that research on minority and majority groups has largely been done in two separate traditions (Berry, 2006b). Whereas acculturation has focused on minority members, majority members has mostly been the focus of a separate tradition studying intergroup relations¹ (Berry, 2006b). This tradition investigates phenomena such as stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination. Berry notes how, for a long time, there was little research into mutuality in either of the traditions: “Rarely were bidirectional studies carried out: that is, of intergroup² attitudes among ‘minorities’ or of the acculturation taking place among members of the ‘mainstream,’ even though these phenomena are present in all these groups” (Berry, 2006b). These two traditions have since been merging and theories of acculturation are becoming increasingly integrated and bidirectional (Horenczyk et al., 2013). One attempt to bridge the gap between the two traditions is the studies on multiculturalism (Berry, 2006b). A Multicultural Ideology Scale has been developed to measure agreement with the view that cultural diversity and contact between cultural groups are good for society and individuals. The scale also measures willingness to accommodate other groups (Berry, 2006b). What these studies do not capture is the extent and nature of accommodation in majority members. Several other lines of research have also documented majority members’ willingness to accommodate minority groups. Montreuil, Bourhis and Vanbeselaere (2004) suggested an additional acculturation expectation. The integrationism transformation expectation described majority members who accepted modification of some features of their own behaviour and institutions in order to accommodate minority culture (Bourhis et al., 2009; Montreuil et al., 2004). It has been studied among at least three majority populations (Montreuil et al., 2004; Sapienza et al., 2010). Leong (2008) has measured multicultural optimism alongside acculturation expectations. Kunst, Thomsen, Sam and Berry (2015) have measured active efforts to help immigrants settle in society. Phelps, Eilertsen, Türken and Ommundsen (2011) have developed a scale measuring majority members’ attitudes towards proactive integration. However, to date only one single publication has explicitly focused on acculturative changes among majority members. Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016) published results of two studies earlier this year where they measured maintenance of heritage culture and adoption of

¹ Berry refers to the second tradition as ethnic relations. I prefer the term intergroup relations, as this is more common in the later literature. The term ‘intergroup relations’ also reflects that cultural identity is not always synonymous with ethnicity.
² The word ethnic has been replaced with the word intergroup.
minority culture in majority members. They found support for a bidimensional model of acculturation strategies among majorities from five countries across three continents (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016).

1.4 Focus of the present study

What the present study contributes is a bottom-up and top-down investigation into the acculturation of majority members. This was done in a two-part study with a qualitative and a quantitative part. Studying acculturation from the viewpoint of majority members is an entirely new field. At this early stage, it is necessary to establish how majority members themselves define and describe the changes they go through as a result of living alongside minority cultures in larger society. The bottom-up, qualitative part of the investigation provides emic data on behavioural shifts in majority members. Behavioural shifts are changes in, for example, language use, dress, food and identity (Berry, 2006b). The first research question was: In what areas of life do majority members experience behavioural shifts? The qualitative part of the study also explored if acculturation among majority members could be considered domain specific. Distinctions drawn in the literature on minority members was applied to the qualitative material: The distinction between values and behaviours and the distinction between the private and the public life domains. In addition, the qualitative part investigated if influence was perceived as primarily positive or negative. The second research question of the qualitative part was: Can acculturation among majority members be considered domain specific?

In the top-down, quantitative part, I apply Berry’s acculturation strategy framework to the point of view of majority members similar to the work of Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016). The present study measured how important it was for majority members to maintain their heritage culture and how important it was to adopt aspects of minority cultures. In the present study, the participants were grouped together based on their attitudes towards maintaining majority culture and adopting minority culture. The purpose of grouping the majority members together was to see if they showed similar acculturation strategies to those observed among minority members; integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization.

The first aim of the quantitative part of the study was to find out how different acculturation strategies among majority members relate to wellbeing and adaptation. Integration has been linked to better psychological adaptation in minority members, provided
that the surroundings are supportive of multiculturalism (Berry, 1997, 2005; C. M. Brown et al., 2013; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2003; Phalet et al., 2015; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). The question remains whether integration is the most adaptive acculturation strategy for majority members too. The present study focuses on two measures of positive psychological wellbeing: life satisfaction and self-esteem. Two recent studies indicate that acculturation is related to psychological wellbeing in majority members. The study by Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016) found that maintenance of majority culture was associated with greater life satisfaction. Adoption of minority cultures was associated with less acculturative stress (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). Acculturative stress are adverse experiences resulting from the intergroup setting (Berry, 1997). Among measures of acculturative stress was a measure of perceived ethnic discrimination. Another recent study by Inguglia, Musso and Karwowski (2015) comes close to exploring acculturation strategies in majority members. They investigated how majority youth wanted larger society to handle cultural groups living together. They found that endorsement of multiculturalism was associated with higher self-esteem and life satisfaction among majority youth. Segregation was correlated with more psychological problems (Inguglia et al., 2015). However, ethnic identity was correlated with wellbeing, indicating that it was the maintenance of majority culture that most strongly related to life satisfaction and self-esteem. The present study explored how specific acculturation strategies among majority members were related to self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Second, the quantitative part of the study sought to investigate the relationship between perceived ethnic discrimination and acculturation among majority members. In minority acculturation research, perceived ethnic discrimination is robustly related to greater maintenance of heritage culture and less involvement with majority culture (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher, & Haslam, 2016; but see also Berry & Sabatier, 2010; Juang & Cookston, 2009). However, in acculturation research little focus has been directed towards perceptions of ethnic discrimination among majority members, despite reports supporting the existence of such perceptions (Alanya, Swyngedouw, Vandezande, & Phalet, 2015). Reports of perceived discrimination is always a matter of subjective interpretation by the informants. The reports warrant research attention regardless of how well they reflect actual discrimination because of the potential consequences for intergroup relations and individual wellbeing (Alanya et al., 2015). The present study may perhaps shed
light on whether perceived ethnic discrimination plays a role in the acculturation of majority members, the way it does for minority members.

Third, the quantitative part of the study aimed to investigate the relationship between identity threat and acculturation strategies in majority members. Increased realistic and symbolic threat has been found among majority members who perceive that minority members reject majority culture (Matera et al., 2012; Matera, Stefanile, & Brown, 2015). Piontowski, Rohmann and Florack (2002) propose that the maintenance dimension is most strongly related to threat because maintaining cultural values is closely related to cultural identity (Florack & Piontkowski, 2000; Taylor et al., 1996; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Cultural identity is a sense of pride and belonging to a cultural group (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006). The cultural identity of a group is often connected to a geographical region (Finley, 2010). When changes in demographics occur as a result of immigration, the cultural identity of the group that was already living in the region may be challenged by the presence of opposing cultural values (Finley, 2010; Horenczyk et al., 2013). The present study investigates this identity threat. It is measured through questions related to fear that the cultural identity will be lost.

The fourth aim of the quantitative part of the study was to find out if social conformity was related to acculturation strategies among majority members. Social conformity plays a part in the wellbeing of minority members through being related to greater maintenance of heritage culture (Güngör, 2007; Kosic et al., 2006). For minority members who report a high degree of social conformity the assimilation strategy has been found to be detrimental to wellbeing (Kosic et al., 2006; Roccas et al., 2000). This study aimed to see if social conformity was similarly related to maintenance of majority heritage culture. The relationships between social conformity and the two measures of wellbeing were also of interest.
2 Method

2.1 Participants

I collected the data through an internet survey. The participants (N=185) were recruited from the University of Oslo’s student research pool and through social media. The students completed the survey for course credits. All participants were majority members with two ethnic Norwegian parents. Most of the participants were females (n =132, 71.4%) and about a third were males (n =53, 28.6%). The gender difference was most probably due to more female students already present in the research pool the sample was drawn from. The participants were aged 16 to 64 years, with an average age of 32 (SD = 13.27) years. It was a young sample with a median age of 26 years and a mode of 21 years. At the time of the survey 53% were living in the eastern parts of Oslo, in areas where the number of minority members is higher. The remaining 47% were living in the western parts of the city or outside the city limits.

2.2 Procedure

Calls have been made for increased amount of mixed method study designs in acculturation to better capture the process (Ozer, 2013). Therefore, I have conducted a mixed method study with a qualitative part and a quantitative part. The objective of mixing these methods was to be able to answer both how and how much majority members adapt to minority cultures combining bottom-up and top-down approaches. The first part of this study used a qualitative, emic approach. This allowed the participants to freely list all areas of their lives that they thought had been influenced by minority cultures. To find out how much majority members adopt minority cultures, the second part of the study utilized quantitative acculturation scales.

2.2.1 The qualitative part

The qualitative part of the survey asked participants to list which areas of their lives were influenced by the cultures of the immigrants that live in Norway. The response format was open-ended. The first part of this paper is a categorization of the responses into life-domains found in the acculturation literature (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004; Navas et
Of the 185 participants, seventeen left this question unanswered and one person replied that they didn’t know what “immigrants’ culture” meant. The remaining participants listed altogether 550 phrases. The phrases have been coded into categories. The categories were developed from the Acculturation Index (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). The index contains twenty-one categories, has been used to measure acculturation in minority groups across the world and has good psychometric properties (Celenk & van de Vijver, 2011).

**Creation of categories**

To make the Acculturation Index more suitable for a sample of majority members, categories that did not occur in the dataset were dropped and new categories were added. For instance, Identity was dropped since it was only mentioned once. Phrases that occurred frequently in the dataset were given new categories, for instance Contact through Children and Lower Standard of Living. Three initial categories; Public Transport, Shops/Town Centres and Nightlife have been combined into Public Spaces. The phrases in the initial categories all referred to similar experiences of seeing minority members around the city. The phrases appeared to reflect observations and indicated little interaction in these situations. Several phrases were too general to be assigned to a specific life domain, such as “growing up.” As a result, I created the categories Daily Life and Childhood. A distinction was made between phrases clearly describing a change towards a more positive view of other cultures, categorized as Tolerance, and phrases describing a more negative view, categorized as Prejudice. The instances where the valence of value changes was impossible to judge, were categorized as Values – no Valence. In the category Worry the aim of the feelings of frustration was not always stated clearly. It could target immigrants, other Norwegians or the word was by itself. All mentions of feeling of frustration have been included in the Worry category. The category Other accounts for phrases that did not fit into the predefined categories, for instance “pretty much everything” or “envy of skin tone.” The coding instructions opened up for coding a phrase in two categories. A phrase saying “friends from soccer” could be categorized in both friends and hobbies/sports. However, there were no instances of double categorizations. The total number of counts in all categories, 550, therefore reflects the total number of meaningful phrases mentioned by the participants. The final categories with brief descriptions and examples are listed in Table 1. The frequency
given is the number of phrases coded in each category. All phrases were coded by two raters and the frequency listed is the average between the two.

**Interrater reliability**

To judge interrater reliability, Cohens’ Kappa was calculated for each category. Complete agreement was achieved in sixteen of thirty-six categories. The Kappa ranged from .79 to .95 in the remaining categories, with an average value of .94. This indicated a high level of agreement among the raters across all categories. There are, however, challenges to using the Kappa statistic as a measure of agreement. For instance, no agreement exists on cut-off values for acceptable interrater reliability even if some authors have tried to provide guidelines (Flight & Julious, 2015). One often cited attempt at guidelines for judging magnitude comes from Landis & Koch (1977) and states that values between .61 and .80 are substantial, and .81 and 1 are almost perfect agreement. Fleiss (1981) considers values above .75 excellent. Also, the statistic becomes unstable when looking at rare phenomena as it is influenced by prevalence (Bakeman, Quera, McArthur, Robinson, & Appelbaum, 1997). Some of the categories in this study includes only a few instances of a phrase, making the Kappa values fluctuate in the smallest categories. Despite the occasional instances of disagreements, the interrater reliability was satisfactory in the present research.
Table 1. *Categories sorted by frequency and interrater reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description and examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Disagreements</th>
<th>Cohen's Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>All forms of education and courses e.g. primary school and university</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Ingredients or dishes e.g. &quot;kebab,&quot; typically the word &quot;food&quot;</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Workplace and colleagues, most frequently the word &quot;work&quot;</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Spaces</td>
<td>All mentions of contact in public spaces e.g. &quot;on the bus&quot; and &quot;in town&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values - no Valence</td>
<td>Phrases cannot easily be judged to be Tolerance or Prejudice, e.g. &quot;my attitude&quot;</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activity</td>
<td>Films, music, theatre, literature, dance, art, festivals, celebrations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Friends, friendship - distinguished from Social Life</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Areas of the city, neighbours, activities in the community</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>A more positive view of other cultures</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>Fear, worry for the future, frustration, e.g. &quot;second rate citizen in own country&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>Recreational activities, typically &quot;soccer&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Changes in larger society or political views as in &quot;which political party I vote for&quot;</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact through Children</td>
<td>Contact with immigrant parents through the children's hobbies or friends</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Exposure to languages, learning words, expressions, slang</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Life</td>
<td>Non-domain specific mentions of everyday life, routines, habits</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Observations of differences e.g. &quot;colourful communities&quot;</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Increased knowledge about cultures or foreign countries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>News and debates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Family members from abroad or changes in the home</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>Non-domain specific phrases such as &quot;growing up,&quot; &quot;childhood,&quot; &quot;as a teenager&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Life</td>
<td>Acquaintances - distinguished from Friends, e.g. &quot;my social circle&quot; or &quot;socially&quot;</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Standard of Living</td>
<td>Competition for jobs, education and place to live, reduced value on property</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>Ways of behaving and communicating</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>Girlfriend/boyfriend, attraction, dating, e.g. &quot;handsome boys&quot;</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Inspiration for travel destinations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>Either having experienced, witnessed or been accused of racism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Faith, religious expression and practice, typically the word &quot;religion&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>A more negative view of other cultures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Mentions of criminal activity e.g. &quot;stabbings&quot; and &quot;robberies&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Barriers</td>
<td>Problems due to language e.g. &quot;impossible to understand the bus driver&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>Clothes, garments, style of dressing, fashion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe</td>
<td>Feeling safer as a result of exposure/contact with immigrants</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Self-reflection</td>
<td>Criticizing own ethnic group e.g. &quot;ashamed of our closed culture&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>Gangs, gang related activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>When participants state they are not influenced in any area of life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Phrases not fitting into any category or unspecific phrases e.g. &quot;adult life&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total number of phrases | 550 |
| Total number of disagreements | 43 |
| Average Cohen’s Kappa coefficient | .944 |

*Note: The frequency represents the average coding between both raters*
2.2.2 The quantitative part

The second part of the survey sought to quantitatively answer the questions: “How important are minority cultures to majority members?” and “Are acculturation attitudes associated with psychological wellbeing?” Six interval scales were used to capture attitudes towards maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures, psychological adaptation in the form of self-esteem and life satisfaction, perceived ethnic discrimination, identity threat and social conformity. Measures of contact with minority members were also included.

Acculturation

Acculturation was defined as how important it was for the participants to 1) maintain their majority culture and 2) adopt aspects of minority cultures. This way the two dimensions correspond with each other, as recommended by Bourhis and colleagues (1997). Additionally, one of the items measured the importance of contact. This way, the scale includes both definitions of the second dimension: relationships sought with other groups and adoption of culture and identity (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Matera et al., 2012). According to Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016) this results in a psychologically consistent profile. The scale was designed as a two-statement measure with seven items that were asked once for the majority culture and once for the minority cultures. The two-statement approach was preferred for its brevity and lack of double-barrelled questions (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007). The scale distinguished between the acculturation domains contact, way of life, importance of culture, values, traditions, belonging and gender roles. Responses were scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important). A principal component analysis confirmed a two-factor structure of majority and minority items. The scale showed satisfactory reliability for the subscales for maintenance of majority culture (α = .86) and adoption of minority cultures (α = .84). Items are listed in Table 2.

Life Satisfaction

A scale developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin (1985) measured how satisfied the participants were with their lives. The scale consisted of five items. The responses were rated on five-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

---

3 Acculturation behaviour was also assessed, but the measure yielded an unclear factor structure and was therefore left out of the analysis.
Table 2. Acculturation scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Paired t-test (bootstrapped)</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to have contact with people with an immigrant background?</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to have contact with ethnic Norwegians?</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to adopt the cultural way of life of immigrants?</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to maintain the Norwegian cultural way of life?</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How big a part of your life is the culture of people with an immigrant background?</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How big a part of your life is Norwegian culture?</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to live according to the values of immigrant cultures?</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to live according to Norwegian values?</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to follow the traditions of immigrant cultures?</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to uphold the traditions of Norwegian culture?</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to feel you belong in immigrant cultures?</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to feel you belong in Norwegian culture?</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to adopt the view on gender roles found in immigrant cultures?</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it for you to uphold the Norwegian view of gender roles?</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All items in the subscale for maintenance of majority culture had significant higher mean scores than their counter parts in the subscale for adoption of minority cultures, p ≤ .002.

*a Contact with minority members was reported as more important than adopting other aspects of minority culture. The mean score for this item on the adoption of minority culture subscale is significantly higher than other minority items in a repeated measures test, Huynh-Feldts F (5.2, 946.98) = 67.86, p < .001. Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated, χ² (7) = 94.28, p < .001, and a Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust the degrees of freedom. The Greenhouse-Geisser value was greater than .75 (ε̂ = .84), so Huynh-Feldt (ε̂ = .88) estimates of sphericity were reported (Field, 2013; Huynh & Feldt, 1976).
A sample item was “In most ways my life is close to my ideal.” A principal component analysis confirmed a uni-factorial structure explaining 66% of the variance and Cronbach’s alpha showed a satisfactory reliability, $\alpha = .87$.

**Self-Esteem**

How the participants evaluate themselves was measured with ten items from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). A sample item was “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.” A principal component analysis of the scores revealed that one factor explained 49% of the variance. Kaiser’s criterion suggested a second factor which was not easily interpreted. There has been some contradictory evidence surrounding the factor structure of this scale. Some authors have suggested it reflects two factors of positive and negative self-esteem due to the wording of the questions (For example Boduszek, Hyland, Dhingra, & Mallett, 2013; Mullen, Gothe, & McAuley, 2013; Supple, Su, Plunkett, Peterson, & Bush, 2013). However, the PCA of the scores from this sample did not provide clear support for the alternative two-factor structures put forth in the literature. The scale was retained as a unidimensional scale because all factor loadings were highest on the first factor. The scale also showed satisfactory reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha value of $\alpha = .88$ and no items were suggested for deletion.

**Perceived Ethnic Discrimination.**

To measure if majority members experienced ethnic discrimination six items were adapted from the Discrimination Stress Scale (Flores et al., 2008). Sample items were “How often are you discriminated against because of your ethnic Norwegian background?” and “How often are you treated rudely or unfairly because of your ethnic Norwegian background?” A principal component analysis confirmed that all items loaded highly on one factor explaining 71% of the variance. The scale showed satisfactory reliability, $\alpha = .92$.

**Identity Threat**

This scale was developed by researchers at the Social and Intergroup Relations Lab (SIRL) at the University of Oslo, where it has been validated with different samples. It has yet to be published. Six items measured perceptions of threat to cultural identity. Sample items were “Sometimes, I am afraid of losing my Norwegian identity” and “At times, it is difficult
for me to maintain my Norwegian identity.” A principal component analysis confirmed one underlying factor explaining 71% of the variance and the scale had satisfactory reliability, $\alpha = .90$.

**Social Conformity**

A measure of the participants tendency to conform in social situations was used called ASCI – Attention to Social Comparison Information (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). This is derived from the early work of Snyder and Lanzetta (1974) on self-monitoring of expressive behaviour. It contained questions about how much participants changed their behaviour according to the feedback they got from other people around them. Sample items were “It’s important to me to fit in to the group I’m with” and “When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behaviour of others for cues.” A principal component analysis with oblique rotation (direct oblimin) revealed that seven items loaded highly on one factor explaining 40.71% of the variance, measuring sensitivity to social clues. The scree plot supported a one-factor solution. However, the Eigenvalues suggested a second factor consisting solely of the item “I think that if everyone in a group is behaving in a certain manner, this is the proper way to behave.” In addition, the item “In social situations, I tend not to follow the crowd, but instead behave in a manner that suits my particular mood at the time” loaded moderately on both factors. The two diverging items were therefore deleted from the scale, raising Cronbach’s alpha from $\alpha = .80$ to $\alpha = .84$.

**Contact with minority members**

Contact with minority members was assessed in several ways. First, the participants reported where in the city they lived. The responses were reduced to two categories: the culturally diverse eastern part and all other parts of the city. Second, they estimated the percentage of immigrants living in their neighbourhoods. Third, they reported how many of their friends, acquaintances and romantic partners had immigrant backgrounds similar to a measure used in previous research on intergroup relations (Navarrete et al., 2009).
3 Results

3.1 Qualitative results

The first part of this study - the qualitative part - sought to answer the question: In which life domains are majority members influenced by the cultures of immigrants? Figure 4 shows the percentage of participants mentioning a phrase in a category. Three areas that clearly stood out as most frequently endorsed are School (mentioned by 32.70% of the participants), Food (mentioned by 30.81%) and Work (mentioned by 23.50%). If the valence of the value categories is ignored, the three categories Tolerance, Prejudice and Values – no Valence were altogether mentioned by 29.64% of the participants. The two categories Friends and Social Life added together amount to 19.19% of the participants.

3.1.1 Analytic strategy for the qualitative data

To ease the interpretation of the results, the thirty-six categories were grouped according to three distinctions. The first distinction was between adopting values versus behaviours (Miller et al., 2013; Schwartz et al., 2010). The second distinction was between adoption of minority cultures in the private and public domains (Navas et al., 2005). In research on minority acculturation, adoption is seen to a greater degree in public domains compared to private domains (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004, 2007; Arends-Tóth, van de Vijver, & Poortinga, 2006; Ozer, 2013; but see also Kunst et al., 2012). The distinctions are applied to the results of this study in order to explore if any meaningful differences may be found between life domains for majority members. The third distinction between positive and negative experiences was born out of the material. In addition to listing areas of life that were influenced by minority cultures, some of the phrases also clearly reflected appraisal of the influence. Some phrases specifically pointed out positive influence whereas others revealed problematic aspects of living in an intergroup setting. These phrases may be seen in light of the acculturative stress and coping framework (Berry, 2006c). Intergroup Threat Theory (Stephan & Stephan, 1996, 2000) may also be helpful in interpreting the results.
Figure 4. Percentage of participants mentioning categories
**Behaviour and value distinction**

According to Miller et al. (2013), acculturation behaviour refers to preferences for language use, adhering to social norms in interactions with others and daily living habits. Examples of daily living habits are preferences for food, entertainment, recreational activities and customs. Values include belief systems, worldviews and political ideologies (Miller et al., 2013). Other researchers have argued for a division into three areas; behaviour, values and identity (Schwartz et al., 2010). Identity is clearly a meaningful variable in the study of acculturation. However, in this dataset only one mention of identity was made. Thus, only the two variables behaviour and values were considered. The phrases that most clearly reflected acculturation behaviour were those that fell into the categories Food (mentioned by 30.81% of the participants), Cultural Activity (15.40%), Language (7.30%), Customs (4.59%), Travel (3.24%) and Clothes (1.62%). The category Hobbies was not considered to be part of acculturation behaviours as this category mainly contained the phrase “soccer.” Soccer is not considered specific to minority culture. It is thought of more as an arena for meeting immigrants. The category contained no phrases referring to more exotic pastimes like capoeira or cricket. Phrases reflecting changes in values were found in the categories Tolerance (mentioned by 12.60% of the participants), Prejudice (1.62%) and Values – no Valence (15.41%). Religion (2.16%) was included, however Politics (7.84%) was excluded. Despite containing some phrases referring to personal political views, the category Politics also contained phrases such as “society.” It was therefore thought to mostly reflect perceived changes at a societal level.

The total number of phrases considered behaviour was 116, and the total number of phrases considered values was 58. Behaviour made up 21.09% and values made up 10.55% of all phrases, as shown in Figure 5. The participants mentioned more influence in terms of their behaviour than their values. But how meaningful was this difference? In order to explore what the different frequencies entailed, a chi-square goodness of fit test was calculated. The hypothesis was that due to chance alone both domains should occur equally often. A significant deviation from the hypothesized value was found ($\chi^2 (1) = 9.878, p \leq .001$), signalling that in the dataset behaviours occurred significantly more often than values. Chi-square results are given in Table 3.
Figure 5. Percentage of behaviours and values mentioned by participants. ** Behaviours occurred significantly more often than values, $p < .001$.

Table 3. Differences between domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Hypothesized occurrence</th>
<th>Chi-square $\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$ -value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private domain</td>
<td>222.50</td>
<td>198.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public domain</td>
<td>174.00</td>
<td>198.25</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td><strong>0.014</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive influence</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative influence</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values in **boldface** are statistically significant using a critical value of $\chi^2 (1) > 3.841$ (2-tailed) as cut of, $p = \leq .05$ (Field, 2013, p. 898, Appendix A.4.).

Private and public domains

A distinction was made between influence in the public and the private life domain. Minority members have sometimes been found to use differing acculturation strategies in these domains (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004, 2007; Arends-Tóth et al., 2006; Ozer,
2013; but see also Kunst et al., 2012). A challenge in applying this distinction in the present study is that previous authors have used different definitions of the public and private domains (For example Arends-Tóth et al., 2006; Rojas et al., 2014; Sapienza et al., 2010). Depending on the conceptualization, the results in the present study would be radically different. For instance, one of the largest categories in the dataset, Food, could be classified as either in the private or public domain. According to Arends-Tóth et al. (2006) food belongs to the private domain, but according to Rojas et al. (2014) food is considered public. Social contact and friendships have also been placed in different domains in different studies (See for example Arends-Tóth et al., 2006; Phalet, van Lotringen, & Entzinger, 2000; Rojas et al., 2014). To solve this issue, a theoretical definition of public and private borrowed from sociology was applied instead (Bojer, Engelstad, Heidar, Hernes, & Stjernø, 1993; Sheller & Urry, 2003). The terms originated in bourgeois liberal ideology where the private areas were those the bourgeois wanted to maintain protected from the interference of the state (Habermas, 1984). This definition of private as something less regulated by the state still contributes to today’s definition (Bojer et al., 1993; Sheller & Urry, 2003). Private life is thus characterized by some degree of choice. For example, as a majority member you cannot choose whether your workplace should employ immigrants because that is regulated by laws against discrimination, but you can choose if you want to socialize with them after work. You can also choose what food to cook and which films to watch. This is also reflected in the previous definitions given by Sapienza et al. (2010) and Rojas et al. (2014). In contemporary use, the word private is also an antonym to professional (Stevenson, 2010). Viewing these strands of reasoning together, the private life domain in the present research was considered to include all areas with a large degree of choice where people acted outside of their professional roles. This included the family and home, but also social relationships and activities in their spare time. The public life domain was defined as something involving larger society or work and school. To ease the division, only arenas for interaction were considered and not categories containing values, emotions and cognitions. According to this definition, the categories School (mentioned by 32.70% of the participants), Work (23.51%), Public Spaces (16.76%), Politics (7.84%), Language (7.30%) and Media (5.95%) fell in the public domain. The categories Food (mentioned by 30.81% of the participants), Cultural Activity (15.14%), Friends (14.05%), Neighbourhood (12.43%), Hobbies (8.65%), Contact through Children (7.30%), Family (5.68%), Childhood (5.41%), Social Life (5.14%), Customs (4.59%), Dating (4.05%), Travel (3.24%), Religion (2.16%) and Clothes (1.62%) were considered part of the private life domain. Daily Life is not specific enough to be classified as either public or
private. Gangs and Racism were also difficult to classify because it is not known whether these phrases indicate first-hand experience or impressions through the media. In total, 222.5 phrases fell within the private domain and 174 phrases fell within the public domain. This left 154 phrases unclassified. In percentages, 40.45% of all phrases were considered influence in the private domain and 31.64% of all phrases were considered influence in the public domain. The results are illustrated in Figure 6. A Chi-square goodness-of-fit test showed that significantly more phrases fell within the private domain ($\chi^2 (1) = 5.94, p = .014$).

![Figure 6](image)

* Figure 6. Percentage of mentions in private and public life domains.

* Influence was reported significantly more often in the private domain, compared to the public domain, $p = .14$.

**Positive and negative influence**

The dataset also reflected that the participants experienced both positive and negative influence from immigration. In terms of influence that could be considered problematic or negative, 9.19% of the participants mentioned phrases in the category Worry. One example of phrases from this category was “I sometimes watch my stuff extra closely on the tram (unfortunately).” Increased competition for work, schooling or lower values on their property - all categorized as Lower Standard of Living, were mentioned by 4.86%. Racism was mentioned by 2.16%. This category included both observed and experienced discrimination,
as well as one report of feeling insulted by accusations of being racist. A few participants mentioned Communication Barriers (1.62%), Crime (1.62%) and Gangs (1.08%). In terms of explicitly positive influence, 12.6% stated that they experienced more Tolerance, 1.35% mentioned that they Feel Safer and 5.95% claimed they had gained new Knowledge. Observation of Diversity was made by 6.22% of the participants, thought to be positive remarks. In total, 47.5 positive phrases were mentioned, making up 8.64% of the total number of phrases, and 41 negative, making up 7.45%. The results can be seen in Figure 7. A chi-square goodness of fit test showed no significant difference between positive and negative influence ($\chi^2 (1) = .551, p = .525$).

![Figure 7. Percentage of phrases mentioning positive and negative influence.](image)

### 3.2 Quantitative results

Generally, participants reported that maintenance of majority culture was more important to them than adoption of minority culture. The difference was significant for all aspects of culture, $p \leq .002$ (See Table 2). The participants found contact with minority members significantly more important than maintaining aspects of minority culture in a pairwise comparison of items in the adoption of minority culture subscale, $p < .001$ (See notes of Table 2 for details of the statistical analysis).
Table 4. *Correlations between variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maintenance of majority culture</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adoption of minority culture</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Perceived ethnic discrimination</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Identity threat</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Self-esteem</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Social conformity</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Bias corrected accelerated bootstrapping was performed because of skewed distributions of scores. The distribution of maintenance of majority culture, life satisfaction and self-esteem were skewed towards higher scores. Adoption of minority culture, perceived ethnic discrimination and identity threat had skewed distributions towards lower scores. ** The correlation was statistically significant at the specified level of $p = \leq .01$ in a two tailed test. * The correlation was significant at the level of $p = \leq .05$. 
A Hierarchical cluster analysis found converging evidence for a three cluster solution based on Schwartz’s Bayesian criterion. Using that method, the same participants selected as outliers automatically by SPSS in the two-step cluster analysis were seen to form separate clusters on their own. This indicated that their combinations of scores were unique and did not easily fit into the larger clusters.

Table 4 displays the correlations between scores for maintenance of majority culture, adoption of minority cultures and the five psychological variables life satisfaction, self-esteem, perceived ethnic discrimination, identity threat and social conformity. Maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority culture had a small, but significant negative correlation of $r = -.24$, $p \leq .01$. Maintenance of majority culture was moderately correlated with perceived ethnic discrimination, $r = .35$, $p \leq .01$ and identity threat, $r = .43$, $p \leq .01$. The two measures of negative experiences: Perceived ethnic discrimination and identity threat were strongly correlated, $r = .76$, $p \leq .01$. Maintenance of majority culture also had small positive correlations with self-esteem, $r = .27$, $p \leq .01$, and life satisfaction, $r = .16$, $p \leq .05$. The two measures of positive wellbeing, self-esteem and life satisfaction, were moderately correlated with each other, $r = .54$, $p \leq .01$. Adoption of minority culture was negatively correlated with identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination and positively correlated with self-esteem. Social conformity had a small positive correlation with adoption of minority culture, $r = .17$, $p \leq .05$. Social conformity was also negatively correlated with self-esteem, $r = -.38$, $p \leq .01$.

3.2.1 Analytic strategy for the quantitative data

Cluster analysis

To see if participants could be grouped in a meaningful way based on maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures, I chose a bottom-up approach and conducted a cluster analysis similar to previous research (Berry et al., 2006; Inguglia et al., 2015; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). A two-step cluster analysis with the log-linear method suggested three clusters based on scores on the subscales for maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority culture. Two participants were excluded automatically by SPSS during the analysis and categorized as outliers. The three clusters formed three different acculturation profiles as displayed in Table 5 and Figure 9. I named the clusters in a similar fashion to studies among minority members (Berry, 2008; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). In the first cluster, named separated ($n = 68$, 37.2%), the participants placed hardly any importance on minority culture and much importance on majority culture. The second cluster ($n = 57$, 31.1%) was named integrated. It was made up of the participants who, in relative terms, valued minority culture higher than the other clusters. Despite being the highest, the cluster mean still only reached 3.01, which was the midpoint of the scale.

---

4 A Hierarchical cluster analysis found converging evidence for a three cluster solution based on Schwartz’s Bayesian criterion. Using that method, the same participants selected as outliers automatically by SPSS in the two-step cluster analysis were seen to form separate clusters on their own. This indicated that their combinations of scores were unique and did not easily fit into the larger clusters.
The participants in this cluster also found majority culture important. The participants in the third cluster ($n = 58, 31.7\%$) had attitudes towards minority cultures close to the total average score for all the participants ($M = 2.22, SD = 0.75$). These participants also placed less importance on majority culture making them seem only moderately attached to any culture. In Berry’s original framework (1997) such an acculturation strategy, where neither culture was strongly valued, was called marginalization. However, there has been some discussion surrounding the validity of the marginalization strategy (Kunst & Sam, 2013; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001; Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001). Since there could be several reasons for the moderate scores of this cluster, I chose the cluster name *undifferentiated* (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). I judged it more appropriate that “diffusion,” which has been used when scores vary between life domains (Berry et al., 2006).

Table 5. *Acculturation clusters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster name</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Majority culture $M$</th>
<th>Minority culture $M$</th>
<th>Minority contact $M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATED</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDIFFERENTIATED</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All cluster means were significantly different from each other, $p = \leq .001$. Minority contact = mean scores on the item ‘How important is it for you to have contact with people with an immigrant background?’

All acculturation scores varied significantly between clusters in a post-hoc ANOVA with a Bonferroni correction. This underlined the validity of the cluster solution. Checking only the item ‘How important is it for you to have contact with people with an immigrant background?’ the mean scores also varied significantly between clusters, Welch’s $F (2, 117.64) = 37.91, p = \leq .001$. The scores were higher on this item than the mean scores for the entire subscale.

**ANOVA between clusters**

Next, I set out to test for differences between the clusters on the remaining variables including demographics. A post-hoc ANOVA with a Bonferroni correction, to account for small sample sizes and multiple comparisons, explored possible differences between the three
clusters. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances was significant for the variables age, identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination. Welch’s adjusted $F$-values and degrees of freedom are therefore reported for these variables. Descriptions of the clusters are given in Table 6 in terms of demography, measures for contact with minority members and psychological measures.

![Cluster profiles based on acculturation scores](image)

**Figure 8.** Cluster profiles based on acculturation scores. +/- 1 Standard Error is displayed.

Participants with similar combinations of scores on attitude towards majority and minority culture were grouped together using cluster analysis. The participants in the separated cluster strongly value maintenance of majority culture, but not adoption of minority culture. The participants in the integrated cluster value maintaining both cultures, whereas the participants in the undifferentiated cluster only moderately value maintaining either culture. All mean scores along both dimensions are significantly different between all clusters, $p = \leq .001$.

**Demography**

All clusters consisted of more women than men, probably due to the demography of the student population the sample was partially drawn from. The proportion of women to men did not differ significantly between clusters.

The participants in the separated cluster were the oldest with mean age of 35.70 years ($SD = 13.47$). The participants in the undifferentiated cluster had a mean age of 30.55 years
The participants in the integrated cluster were the youngest with a mean age of 28.63 years ($SD = 11.79$). This age difference was significant between the separated and the integrated cluster in a post-hoc comparison (see notes of Table 6).

The eastern parts of Oslo are areas with a larger portion of minority members compared to other part of the city. Within the integrated cluster most participants do not live in areas with a high density of immigration compared to the separated and undifferentiated clusters. This difference is statistically significant (see the notes of Table 6 for details of the statistical analysis). Participants in the separated cluster were almost three times more likely to live in the more culturally diverse eastern parts of Oslo than those in the integrated cluster, odds ratio = 2.79. And the participants on the undifferentiated cluster were twice as likely to live there compared to the integrated cluster, odds ratio = 2.28. There were no significant differences between clusters in terms of the share of participants that had grown up in the eastern parts of Oslo. To get a better picture of the participants’ neighbourhoods, they were also asked to estimate the percentage of immigrants living there. They did this both for their current neighbourhood and the area where they had lived most of their lives. No significant differences were found between clusters in these estimates.

**Contact measures**

In addition to looking at neighbourhoods, three measures of contact with members of immigrant cultures were investigated: number of immigrant partners, friends and acquaintances. A difference score was calculated subtracting the standardized values for measures of contact with other majority members from measures of contact with minority members. This was done for all three measures of social contact. There were no significant variation between clusters in these difference scores for friends or acquaintances. The undifferentiated cluster reported more minority than majority romantic partners, whereas the pattern was reversed in the separated cluster. The difference between the two clusters was significant, $F (2,178) = 3.65, p = .023$. Scores were also summarized into a total contact score and the total difference in social contact with majority members and minority members was calculated. There was a significant main effect of the cluster solution on the total score difference score, but the post-hoc comparison found only marginally significant differences between the separated cluster and the other two clusters, $F (2, 180) = 3.60, p = .068$ (undifferentiated) and $p = .071$ (integrated).
### Table 6. Descriptive statistics for the clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster names</th>
<th>SEPARATED (37.2%)</th>
<th>UNDIFFERENTIATED (31.7%)</th>
<th>INTEGRATED (31.1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75.0% (n=51)</td>
<td>62.1% (n=36)</td>
<td>78.9% (n=45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.0% (n=17)</td>
<td>37.9% (n=22)</td>
<td>21.1% (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>35.71 years(^a)</td>
<td>30.55 years</td>
<td>28.63 years(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in East Oslo</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>36.8%(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grown up in East Oslo</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants in neighbourhood now</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants in neighbourhood past</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in contact (mean z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority - majority partners</td>
<td>-0.31(^c)</td>
<td>0.33(^e)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – majority friends</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority – majority acquaintances</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total minority – majority contact</td>
<td>-0.22(^d)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological measures (mean scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity threat</td>
<td>2.18(^a)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic discrimination</td>
<td>1.75(^f)</td>
<td>1.41(^f)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>3.96(^g)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social conformity</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Bold** values indicate a significant main effect of the cluster solution.

\(^a\) The age difference was significant between the separated and the integrated cluster in a post-hoc ANOVA, Welch’s $F (2,188) = 5.11, p = .007$. \(^b\) A Chi-square test showed a significant association between cluster membership and location, $\chi^2 (2) = 8.459, p = .015$. Due to small sample sizes the Likelihood ratio was reported. The z-test showed that the difference was between the integrated cluster vs the other two. Cramer’s V was .21 which indicated a moderate effect size. \(^c\) The difference in minority vs majority romantic partners was significantly different in the undifferentiated cluster and the separated cluster, $F (2,180) = 3.65, p = .023$. \(^d\) The separated cluster reported a marginally significant difference in contact with minority members from the other two clusters, $F (2,180) = 3.60, p = .068$ (undifferentiated) and $p = .071$ (integrated). \(^e\) Participants in the separated cluster experienced significantly more minority contact than the other two clusters, Welch’s $F (2,118.98) = 6.381, p = .002$. \(^f\) Mean discrimination score for the separated cluster was significantly different from the undifferentiated cluster, Welch’s $F (2,118.93) = 4.055, p = .011$ and marginally significant for the integrated cluster, $p = .064$. \(^g\) The separated cluster reported significantly higher self-esteem, $F (2, 151) = 4.892$, than the integrated, $p = .026$, and undifferentiated clusters, $p = .027$
**Psychological well-being**

Figure 10 shows the mean cluster scores for the psychological variables. The separated cluster reported the greatest identity threat. The average identity threat score for the separated cluster is significantly different from both the other clusters in a post-hoc comparison, Welch’s $F(2, 118.98) = 6.381, p = .002$. The separated cluster also reported higher perceived ethnic discrimination. The mean discrimination score for the separated cluster was significantly higher than the undifferentiated cluster, Welch’s $F(2, 118.93) = 4.055, p = .011$ and marginally significant for the integrated cluster, $p = .064$. In terms of psychological wellbeing, there was little difference among the three clusters in life satisfaction. However, the separated cluster had significantly higher self-esteem than the other two clusters, $F = (2, 151) = 4.892, p = .026$ (integrated) and $p = .027$ (undifferentiated). There were no significant differences in social conformity.

*Figure 9. Psychological measures.*

+/- 1 Standard Error is displayed. **The participants in the separated cluster reported more identity threat than the other clusters, $p = .002$. *Perceived ethnic discrimination in the separated cluster was significantly higher than in the undifferentiated cluster, $p = .01$, and marginally significant for the integrated cluster, $p = .06$. They also reported higher self-esteem, $p = .03$.**
4 Discussion

Dinh & Bond (2008) claimed that it is a common misconception that majority members are hardly influenced at all by the cultures of immigrants. If such a misconception is prevalent, the results of this study goes some way in showing it is mistaken. The qualitative study showed that majority members were influenced by minority cultures across several life domains. They reported changes in their behaviours and values. They described influence in the private as well as the public domain, and they reported both positive and negative experiences. Indeed, less than 4% of the participants reported no influence at all from minority cultures. The quantitative study showed that majority members value minority cultures to varying degrees. Their patterns of maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures were seen to form distinct acculturation profiles. The profiles differentially related to several psychological variables. The findings of the qualitative and the quantitative parts of the study are discussed in turn.

4.1 The qualitative findings

The qualitative part of the study showed that majority members experienced influence from minority cultures in many areas of their lives, but some areas were mentioned much more frequently than others. School, food and work were among the most frequent phrases. Work and school are two arenas where many of the participants presumably spend much of their time. They are also likely to come into contact with minority members in these two arenas regardless of how little or how much they seek them out elsewhere. This might provide opportunities to learn about other cultures. But work and school are also public arenas where minority members are more likely to adopt majority culture (Navas, Rojas, García, & Pumares, 2007; Rojas et al., 2014). Hence, although influence in the public sphere was reported more often, the degree of change on the part of majority members may still be small. The high frequency of the phrase food can have two explanations. In the local context of Oslo, immigrant entrepreneurs seized a great share of the market for restaurants and grocery shops in the 1980s, making exotic foods readily available to the city’s population at affordable prices (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). They also provided a local and personal service that was otherwise lost in the growing trend of building supermarkets. The majority participants are also subject to a trend of globalization, meaning that the world is becoming
more interconnected (Audretsch, Lehmann, Richardson, & Vismara, 2015). Norwegians are exposed to food from other cultures through travel. Imported goods are increasingly available in supermarkets. It is therefore difficult to distinguish the influence of minority cultures from the general trend of globalization on the eating habits of majority members (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). It is without doubt that majority members show signs of behavioural shifts since most report influence. But behavioural shifts are not necessarily thought to be psychologically demanding for the individual (Berry, 2006b). The most frequent categories, school, work and food, reflect influence felt by many people. Categories implying change of a more personal character such as religion and dating are mentioned by much fewer participants. Therefore, the qualitative study maybe reflects mostly superficial changes for the many and more pervasive change for the few, but this needs to be established empirically by future research. If it is the case that some majority participants adopt minority culture to a greater degree than others, it can be thought of as individual differences in adoption of minority culture. Converging evidence for such an individual differences perspective on acculturation comes from the quantitative findings, which are discussed later on.

The qualitative results show some support for domain specificity of majority acculturation. There were significant differences between occurrences of behaviours and values. There were also significant differences between the occurrences of phrases that are part of the private and public domain. Together these findings indicate that the acculturation of majority members varies in different areas of life. Participants reported significantly more mentions of behaviours than values. In research with minority members values have been assumed to be more resistant to change (B. S. K. Kim et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2013; Szapocznik et al., 1978). It might be because it is often necessary to change behaviour to be able to perform the tasks of daily life and to function in surroundings that are culturally plural (Navas et al., 2005). It might also be that values have a more central position as core components of culture (Navas et al., 2005). They are also more closely linked to cultural identity (Horenczyk et al., 2013). For instance, a majority member can probably eat exotic foods without having to change how they think about the world or who they are.

The majority members were more affected by minority cultures in the private domain than the public domain. This is a somewhat surprising finding because it is the reverse of minority members (Navas et al., 2007; Rojas et al., 2014). These results should be interpreted with caution due the varying definitions of the private and public domains. But one explanation may be that majority members have less need to adapt in the public domain in
order to succeed and survive (Deaux, 2006). Majority members live in a society where their own heritage culture often has the most vitality (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). In the Norwegian context, the majority group is strong in numbers nationwide (Eurostat, 2015). The policies of the Norwegian government state that the general population is responsible for including immigrants in society, but there are few mentions of maintaining minority cultures (Ministry of Justice and Public Security, 2016; "Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). There are seemingly few signals to majority members that they could or should adopt other cultures. When majority members go beyond what is required of them by adopting aspects of minority culture in the private domain it perhaps reflects choice more than necessity. Hence, while minority members seem to experience acculturation more in the public domain, this study suggests that the opposite holds true for majority members.

The phrases also captured both negative and positive views on, and experiences with, immigration. On the one hand, participants reported increased knowledge of and tolerance for other cultures. On the other hand, they also reported crime, worries and lower standards of living. Reports of negative experiences might indicate that majority members also experience acculturative stress. Acculturative stress is defined as challenges arising out of the meeting between cultural groups (Berry, 2006c). It can manifest as language difficulties, incongruent cultural values or other barriers to succeeding in the relevant context (Gil, Vega, & Dimas, 1994; E. Kim, Hogge, & Salvisberg, 2014; Lantrip et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2014). Some of the phrases fit this definition, such as mentions of difficulties communicating with bus drivers because of language barriers. Also references to racism, discrimination, crime and gangs could count as stressful experiences. Worries and negative emotions are not defined as acculturative stress in themselves, but they reflect the presence of challenges in the intergroup setting. Other phrases reflected increased competition for work and education and reduced value of property. These phrases can be interpreted as experiences of realistic threat (Stephan & Stephan, 1996, 2000). A few participants mentioned that they had reflected around gender roles as a result of influence from minority cultures. These phrases might indicate some level of symbolic threat. Gender roles could be an area where the majority members believe cultural values are clashing. This appears to be reflected in debates in national newspapers (For example Aure, 2016; NTB, 2016).

In sum, the qualitative findings reflect that most majority members experienced behavioural shifts. There were some indications of acculturative stress and experiences of
threat. The role of threat in the acculturation of majority members is further explored in the discussion of the quantitative findings.

4.2 The quantitative findings

The findings from the quantitative study showed that majority members were concerned with adopting aspects of minority cultures, but far less than with maintaining their heritage culture. This was similar to the results of two studies done earlier this year which also applied Berry’s framework to the point of view of majority members (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). The participants were more open to having contact with minority members than adopting aspects of minority culture. Similar results have been found among minority members (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Snauwaert et al., 2003). It has been suggested that adopting aspect of another culture is a ‘deeper’ psychological phenomena than having contact with members of the other culture (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Ward, 2013). The two acculturation subscales had a modest negative correlation of $r = -.24$, lending support to the notion that they represent separate, albeit related, dimensions. Maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures varied between individuals. The participants could be divided into groups based on clusters of their acculturation scores. Two of the clusters resembled two of the acculturation strategies in Berry’s (1997) bidimensional acculturation framework: integration and separation. The integrated cluster was made up of participants that found both maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures important. The separated cluster consisted of participants that only found maintenance of majority culture important and not adoption of minority cultures. The third cluster found both maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority cultures moderately important. The cluster name undifferentiated was preferred to marginalized because their mean scores indicated moderate attachment, rather than no attachment (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). There could be multiple reasons for why someone does not especially value the maintenance of any culture. Perhaps they see all people as individuals, rather than members of cultural groups (Bourhis et al., 1997). Following such a definition, one could call the third cluster individualization. Another explanation is that they subscribe to a global identity rather than an ethno-cultural identity (Kunst & Sam, 2013). Further research is needed to explore the nature of acculturation among majority members with acculturation profiles like the one found in the undifferentiated cluster. The fourth strategy in Berry’s model, assimilation, was not found.
This was expected, since there is presumably less need for majority members to adopt minority culture in order to survive and succeed (Deaux, 2006). In Norway, majority members make up a large part of the population nationwide (Statistics Norway, 2016). The country also has a history of more assimilationist than plural governmental policies (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; "Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). There is perhaps normative pressure to include minority members in larger society. There is perhaps even growing norms of multiculturalism. But it would be surprising if a substantial proportion of majority members decided to fully adopt minority culture without maintaining majority culture. The fact that the cluster means varied significantly in maintenance of majority culture and adoption of minority culture supported the validity of the three-cluster solution. The clusters clearly consisted of participants that had differing approaches towards minority cultures. The cluster solution indicated an even distribution of the three acculturation strategies among majority members. There were differences between the clusters in terms of age, current neighbourhoods, self-esteem, identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination that warrant discussion.

**Age, neighbourhood and contact measures**

The younger the participants in a cluster were, the more likely they were to choose integration and hence to adopt minority cultures. The reason is not known since not much literature exists on acculturation strategies among the majority. One possible explanation could be that younger people have had more experience with minority cultures at an earlier age. In minority research a younger age at arrival predicts greater adoption of the new culture (Chudek, Cheung, & Heine, 2015; Schwartz et al., 2010). Norway has received immigrants later and in smaller numbers compared to other European countries (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008; Westin, 2006). This might mean that the younger participants have grown up in a time where they were more exposed to other cultures. The neighbourhood data, however, contradicts this explanation. The participants of the integrated cluster, who were also the youngest, were less likely to live in areas with more immigrants. This finding is somewhat counter-intuitive. One would perhaps expect that living in a multi-ethnic neighbourhood would be related to greater cultural adoption through more social contact. However, diverse neighbourhoods are in some cases related to less social contact between members of different ethno-cultural groups (Bolt et al., 2010; Huijts et al., 2014; Longshore, 1982). Other times neighbourhood composition is not related to social contact (Boschman,
In an earlier study done in Norway, living in a diverse neighbourhood did not predict having a greater number of friends from another ethno-cultural group (Kouvo & Lockmer, 2013). In the present study, the separated cluster reported marginally less total social contact with minority members when measures of friends, acquaintances and romantic partners were summed together. But the effects were not robust. There was no difference in terms of how many participants from each cluster had grown-up in diverse neighbourhoods. All three clusters reported similar levels of immigrants living in their surroundings. It would seem that the reason why younger participants were more likely to fall into the integrated cluster was not necessarily more direct exposure to minority cultures. A competing explanation may be that they have grown up in a time where multiculturalism has been put forth as an ideology. Historians have observed a move from assimilationist towards more multiculturalist policies both nationally and internationally (Brochmann & Kjeldstadli, 2008). There has been increasing observations of multiculturalism in the Norwegian school curriculum, but this is only in the last decade and is therefore not applicable to the participants in this study ("Multiculturalism Policy Index," 2016). Still, it might reflect a growing recognition of multiculturalism as an ideology. Multiculturalism has been established as normative in some samples of majority members elsewhere (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Mahonen, & Liebkind, 2011; Tip et al., 2015; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Social conformity failed to distinguish between the clusters, however age was correlated with social conformity and adoption of minority cultures. The role of social conformity in adoption of minority cultures cannot be ruled out. Furthermore, the other psychological variables such as identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination might interact with neighbourhood composition. It is possible that living in neighbourhoods with a greater number of immigrants made the participants less inclined to adopt minority cultures. I will return to the discussion of neighbourhoods when discussing identity threat.

**Acculturation and psychological wellbeing**

With increasing globalization and migration, majority members face changes in their surroundings. How they cope with living in a plural society may affect them psychologically. Evidence from this study indicates that adoption of minority cultures are related to fewer negative experiences. This converges with the findings in the study by Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016). They found that adoption of minority culture was associated with less acculturative stress (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). Stress was measured as for instance
discrimination, prejudice, intercultural relations, challenges at work and cultural isolation. In a similar vein, the study by Inguglia et al. (2015) found the participants who preferred a segregated society experienced more psychological problems. In the present study, the separation strategy appeared to be the most problematic for majority members. It was associated with greater identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination, yet it was also associated with higher self-esteem. As this was a correlational study the causal directions could not be determined. Still, I put forward a possible explanation of the relationship between the acculturation strategies and the psychological variables. I suggest that negative experiences of identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination increases maintenance of majority culture and decreases adoption of minority culture as predicted by the Rejection-Identification Model (Branscombe et al., 1999). The increased self-esteem is interpreted mainly as a compensatory response to identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination through stronger maintenance of majority culture. The age difference between the clusters might also contribute somewhat to the differences in self-esteem. The participants in the separated cluster were older than the participants in other two clusters. Self-esteem has been seen to increase with age (Orth, Robins, Widaman, & King, 2012; Twenge & Campbell, 2001).

Perceived ethnic discrimination and identity threat were strongly correlated in this study, \( r = .76 \). It would seem that they are closely related, both representing negative experiences among the majority members caused by the intergroup setting. Faced with challenges to social identity, humans are motivated to preserve a positive sense of self (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Shelton, Richeson, & Vorauer, 2006). This can be achieved either by highlighting the positive traits of the threatened identity or by distancing oneself from it. Both perceived ethnic discrimination and any form of threat to the identity or status of the cultural group provokes members to highlight their cultural identity (Branscombe et al., 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 1996, 2000). It also makes them opt for acculturation expectations that limit the cultural maintenance of other cultures (Florack et al., 2003). The high level of identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination might have contributed to the acculturation profile of the separated cluster. The higher maintenance of majority culture might explain the increased self-esteem relative to the other clusters. Increased identification with heritage culture should lead to increased wellbeing in general, but life satisfaction did not distinguish between clusters. Perhaps, self-esteem is particularly susceptible to the effects of perceived ethnic discrimination because attributing negative experiences to discrimination
means deflecting any blame away from the self (Schmitt et al., 2014). Additional support for this interpretation comes from observations of higher self-esteem in some minority groups (Gray-Little, Hafdahl, & Eisenberg, 2000; Major, Sciacchitano, & Crocker, 1993; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2004; Yuh, 2005; but see also E. Kim et al., 2014; Twenge, Crocker, & Eisenberg, 2002).

But it is equally possible that it was the separated participants’ strong cultural maintenance that made them sensitive to identity threat in the first place. A stronger identification with your ethno-cultural group is associated with a stronger perception of threat (Baysu, Phalet, & Brown, 2011; Branscombe et al., 1999; Heim, Hunter, & Jones, 2011). Experimental evidence has shown that only individuals who identify strongly with the group at the outset respond to threat by increasing identification (Ellemers, Spears, Doosje, & Insko, 1997). This might explain why identity threat is higher only in the separated cluster and not the undifferentiated cluster. Furthermore, both the participants in the separated cluster and the undifferentiated cluster were more likely to live in neighbourhoods high in immigration. But the separated cluster experienced significantly more identity threat than the undifferentiated cluster. Neighbourhood composition may increase the saliency of ethnic identity, but more so for those who have the strongest ethnic identities to begin with (Giles & Evans, 1986; Shelton et al., 2006). For those who identify less with majority culture at the outset, the presence of a salient outgroup might lead to further withdrawal from majority culture in order to reduce threat (Ellemers et al., 1997). Based on research with minorities, one might expect that the undifferentiated cluster should score lower on measures of psychological wellbeing because they lack the protection of a strong connection with any culture (Koydemir, 2013; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). However, in this sample there was little indication of this. In fact, their lack of attachment to majority culture might serve as a buffer against identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination. This depends on what lies behind the acculturation profile of the undifferentiated cluster. If they have ties to other social groups not based on ethnicity, this might explain why their low identification might not represent a risk-factor. Alternatively, they might have a global identity rather than a cultural identity (Kunst & Sam, 2013).

One might ask why the integrated cluster does not appear to experience identity threat. They were significantly less concerned with maintaining majority culture than the separated cluster, but their attachment was still strong. Part of the answer might be that the integrated participants do not live in neighbourhoods with a high proportion of immigrants. This might mean less threat to identity since outgroups are less salient (Esses, Dovidio, & Hodson, 2002).
Realistic and symbolic threat has been found to be highest among majority members when they live in neighbourhoods where they make up approximately half the population (Giles & Evans, 1986; Kouvo & Lockmer, 2013). In a series of experiments, Craig and Richeson (2014) showed that when diminishing group size of the majority in-group nationally was made salient to majority members, they preferred to spend time with members of the ethnocultural in-group. The participants also exhibited greater in-group favouritism (Craig & Richeson, 2014). Majority members have also been seen to be less supportive of integration when the number of members from other ethno-cultural groups is higher in their local neighbourhoods (Bolt et al., 2010; Giles & Evans, 1986; Longshore, 1982). Most people, regardless of ethnicity, prefer some diversity in their neighbourhoods, but not too much (Søholt & Lynnebakke, 2015). The acculturation strategies of majority members might also be influenced by neighbourhood proportionality in a similar manner to attitudes towards out-groups and desire for contact. It is possible that the participants of the integration cluster experience less identity threat because their neighbourhood compositions are more homogenous. Also, the participants in the integration cluster do not report the same level of perceived ethnic discrimination. Past discrimination experiences have sometimes been found to be a source of threat (Branscombe et al., 1999; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008).

4.3 Strengths and limitations

Methodical issues

The present study had strengths and limitations that require mentioning. To start with, one limitation it that the present study was a correlational study, so no causal relations between variables can be established. The present study could also have benefitted from a larger, randomized sample with a more equal gender distribution. Age, gender and neighbourhood composition have all be suggested as possible influences on acculturation in minority members (Berry et al., 2006). Age was found to be associated with acculturation in this sample, but it was a young sample overall. If I had used a stratified sample this finding would have more certainty to it. A behavioural measure unfortunately had to be dropped from the analysis because it yielded an unclear factor structure. Such a measure of acculturation behaviour would have been important to establish if reported attitudes reflect behaviour in day-to-day encounters (Ward & Kus, 2012).
Methodical strengths of the study are the use of a mixed-method study design, cluster analysis and the two-statement measure of acculturation attitudes. Some claim that measurements of acculturation using scales are too simplifying (Chirkov, 2009b). The criticism comes mainly from proponents of cultural relativism. As Ozer (2013) points out, the gap between cultural relativism as an epistemological standpoint on the one hand and universalism on the other, cannot be bridged as they are mutually exclusive. However, emic research including qualitative measures can go some way in meeting the criticism. Including qualitative data allowed for a bottom-up exploration of the majority members’ experiences. The participants were invited to bring attention to the areas of life where they noticed cultural influence, making it an emic approach. The quantitative data was well suited for capturing the degree of maintenance and adoption. The measurements were previously used in acculturation research making it possible to build on, and add to, the work of others. One advantage of cluster analysis is that it avoids problems inherent with categorization based on scalar means, medians and midpoints. Using cut-off points can result in the categorization of scores that are close together in opposing categories. Also, there is always the question of which category the centre point should be assigned to is (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007; Inguglia et al., 2015). Cluster analysis perhaps avoids some of these caveats because it groups participants based on patterns of scores rather then divide them into four a priori categories (Rudmin & Candland, 2003; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). The two-statement measure of acculturation attitudes is recommended compared to scales using one or four statements (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007). One statement measures assume acculturation as one-dimensional process and does not allow for capturing the dynamic nature of the construct. One-statement items are also often double-barrelled. The four statement measure is more susceptible to method effects and it is also more demanding for participants (Arend-tóth & van de Vijver, 2007). Most crucially, given the limited pre-existing knowledge about acculturation among majority members, an a priori four-fold taxonomy would have been problematic.

Can the results from this study be generalized to other majority populations? Norway cannot be said to be as culturally diverse as many other countries, yet the location where the present study was conducted is increasingly diverse (Statistics Norway, 2016). Currently the total amount of first and second generation immigrants is small to moderate in Norway compared to other European countries, and only a small portion of immigrants have origins outside the European Union (Eurostat, 2015). In some of the neighbourhoods in Oslo, however, immigrants make up over half the population (Statistics Norway, 2016). The results
of the present study are similar to those found by Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016). In their studies and in the present study, maintenance of heritage culture was generally stronger than the adoption of minority cultures. The Norwegian scores were a little lower for adoption of minority cultures, but otherwise followed the same pattern. This supports the generalizability of the results from the present study.

**Theoretical issues**

A challenge in acculturation research is that the acculturation process is complex and there are different strands of research (Ward, 2001, 2013). Some acculturation research confounds cultural identity and maintenance of heritage culture (Liebkind, 2006; Ozer, 2013; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2006). These concepts have been shown to be related, but distinct (Schwartz et al., 2010; Snauwaert et al., 2003). Culture includes artefacts, social institutions, language, customs, traditions and shared meanings. Cultural identity is more specifically a sense of pride and belonging (Van Oudenhoven et al., 2006). Acculturation is a wider construct than changes to cultural identity (Liebkind, 2006; Ward, 2013). It is possible to adopt aspects of a culture and want to maintain relationships with that cultural group while still not identifying as part of that culture (Snauwaert et al., 2003; Van Oudenhoven et al., 2006). Identity is considered more robust than the other components of acculturation (Liebkind, 2006). The present study did not measure ethnic identity directly, yet I use literature on ethnic identity in interpreting the results. I am assuming an overlap between strong attitudes towards maintaining your culture and strongly identifying as a member of that culture. There is some support for that assumption (Mana, Orr, & Mana, 2009). Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016) found moderate correlations between national identity and maintenance of majority culture in five samples of majority participants. Liebkind (2006) suggested that for ethnic identity to be threatened it must be internalized and strong. Still, including an explicit measure of ethnic identity, such as a revised version of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, would have strengthened the assumptions about identification in the interpretation of the results (Example of MEIM can be found in S. D. Brown et al., 2014).

Some criticism of Berry’s acculturation framework, which was applied here, has been directed at the assumption of four a priori categories of acculturation strategies (Schwartz et al., 2010). Support for the validity of the four-fold model is emerging, but some studies also find other acculturation profiles (Schwartz et al., 2010; Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). The present study chose to group participants by strategy. Such a categorical approach loses some
of the nuances in acculturation (Schwartz et al., 2010). It does, however, allow for comparison with previous research (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). It is also useful in describing the pattern of acculturation in a sample of majority participants. The vocabulary of Berry’s model is probably well-known also outside academic circles, making the results easier to communicate to policy makers and the general public. Some criticism of Berry’s four-fold model comes from a standpoint of cultural relativism (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Chirkov, 2009a; Ozer, 2013).

These critics state that the acculturation process is too complex and contextually dependent to be captured by quantitative scales like the ones used in the present study (Chirkov, 2009a). Even so, it does not mean that this type of quantitative psychological research cannot shed some light on the experiences of the majority in addition to other contributions from other disciplines (Berry, 2009). If we keep in mind that it is only one way of studying a phenomenon among many others, the threat of reductionism seems less daunting.

4.4 Societal implications and future directions

The present research has important implications for societies and future research. Conflictual relationships between different ethno-cultural groups are presently a central political challenge in many societies (Audretsch et al., 2015; Koven & Goetzke, 2010; Lowenstein & Phillipson, 2002). Understanding and describing the mechanisms of acculturation may serve a purpose in informing policies on how to reduce intergroup conflict. The changes majority members go through as a result of migration has not received much research attention (Berry, 2006b; Dinh & Bond, 2008; Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). A fuller understanding of acculturation should include changes on the part of majority members, not just minority members. The results of the qualitative investigation provide useful information for creating emic acculturation scales for majority members, rather than adopting scales made for minority members. Future research may also want to consider threats to cultural identity alongside other types of threat.

By establishing that majority members also have acculturation strategies, the present research opens up questions of how these strategies are related to other findings in the field. For instance, how do minority members perceive the acculturation strategies of the majority? How are majority acculturation strategies related to their acculturation expectations? How are
they related to endorsement of multiculturalism? Perhaps most important: Do acculturation strategies of the majority shape intergroup relationships? Policies aimed at improving relations between majority and minority members should consider the role of identity threat and perceived ethnic discrimination in both groups. Finlay (2010) argues that identity threat is the major driving force in intergroup conflict. If that is the case, one solution to intergroup tension is promoting a supraordinate national identity, that includes all member of society whilst allowing the retention of cultural and ethnic identities of subgroups (Finley, 2010; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1996). Future research could also explore which aspects of culture and identity the various groups need to retain in order to achieve optimal outcomes for both groups (Van Oudenhoven et al., 2006). Furthermore, the consequences of acculturation strategies for individual majority members warrant attention. Living in the midst of cultures that clash can have serious consequences for the individual. An increased understanding of acculturation can perhaps point to potential ways of preventing maladaptive outcomes for acculturating individuals. The present study and that of Lefringhausen and Marshall (2016) is the first budding evidence that acculturation is differentially related to adaption in both minority and majority groups. Policies for plural societies need to consider the wellbeing of all members of larger society (Lefringhausen & Marshall, 2016). Future research has the potential to test the direction of relationships between psychological variables related to acculturation using experimental designs.
5 Conclusions

The present study aimed at investigating whether acculturation is truly a two-way process by showing changes in majority members as a result of adoption of minority cultures. The qualitative results showed that majority members indeed are influenced by minority cultures across several life domains. The influence varied with domains, lending support to a domain specific understanding of acculturation also for majority members. The quantitative results showed that some majority members supported acculturation strategies similar to those found among minority members. This finding suggested that acculturation taxonomies such as that of Berry, may to some degree be valid for majority members. Converging evidence from the two parts of this study demonstrated that acculturation is indeed a two-way process with change also happening on the part of the majority group.
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