



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The acculturation and adaptation of Turkish adolescents in North-Western Europe

Vedder, P.H.; Sam, D.; Liebkind, K.

Citation

Vedder, P. H., Sam, D., & Liebkind, K. (2007). The acculturation and adaptation of Turkish adolescents in North-Western Europe. *Developmental Science*, 11(3), 126-136. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16608>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16608>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The Acculturation and Adaptation of Turkish Adolescents in North-Western Europe

Paul Vedder

Leiden University, the Netherlands

David L. Sam

Bergen University, Norway

Karmela Liebkind

Helsinki University, Finland

The present study explores the process of cultural and psychological change that follows intercultural contact (i.e., acculturation) and the wellbeing and social adjustment of 736 Turkish immigrant adolescents aged 13–18 living in six countries: Norway, Sweden, Finland, Germany, France, and the Netherlands. Perceived discrimination was the strongest negative predictor of their adaptation outcomes, whereas a combined orientation to the ethnic culture and the national culture was conducive to adaptation. One's country of origin clearly had an impact on the acculturation orientations of the immigrant and on his/her perceived discrimination. The actual cultural diversity characteristic of countries is indicative of a broad context in which the impact of acculturation experiences on adaptation outcomes is invigorated or weakened. Practical implications are discussed.

When some 15 years after the end of the Second World War the economies of most Western European countries started blooming, the further growth required the hiring of extra labor force in less affluent parts of the world. In those days, politicians and the public in general expected these immigrants to return to their home countries as soon as there would be no further need for them. However, the immigrants did not return but, rather, either brought their families to their new countries of settlement or started new families. In doing so, they considerably contributed to the cultural diversity of these countries of settlement. Western societies clearly benefited from immigrants' efforts to contribute to the societies' economy and many immigrants and their offspring succeeded in establishing a better life in their new societies than they had in their societies of origin. Nevertheless, recently conducted surveys in Western European countries have revealed a growing interethnic intolerance, reflected in

relatively high percentages of youth in England, Germany and Denmark holding negative attitudes towards immigrants (Boog, Van Donselaar, Houtzager, Rodriques, & Schriemer, 2006; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). Furthermore, in Western countries the attitudes toward Muslims are predominantly non-supportive (Pew Research Center, 2005). The present study is about Turkish youth in North-Western Europe, a very high percentage of whom indicated to be Muslim.

This study explores the effect of intercultural contact (i.e., acculturation) on the wellbeing and social adjustment of Turkish immigrant adolescents aged 13–18 living in six countries: Norway, Sweden, Finland, Germany, France, and the Netherlands. The Turks form the largest group of immigrants in Western Europe. Therefore, this group, more than any other immigrant group in the region, allows for comparative research focusing on the possible role of countries in immigrant youths' social participation. The main questions of the study were: (A) Do Turkish adolescents' acculturation preferences and experiences and their adaptation differ between countries? (B) In what way and to what extent is Turkish immigrant youth's acculturation related to their adaptation

Correspondence should be addressed to Leiden University, Rommert Casimir Institute for Developmental Psychopathology from a Cultural and Educational Perspective, P.O. Box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden, the Netherlands. E-mail: vedder@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

outcomes? and (C) Does the countries' level/degree of cultural diversity have an impact on the relationship between acculturation and adaptation? Answering these questions is seen as important to the exploration of needs and possibilities for improving immigrant youth's acculturation experiences and their adaptation.

This study is part of a larger international comparative study conducted in 13 countries and involving 26 different ethnocultural groups—the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY; Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006).

Of the four million Turks living outside Turkey (about 5% of the total population), about three million live in Europe (Economic Intelligence Unit, 2001). Most of them (more than two million) live in Germany. Turkey negotiated migration recruitment agreements with several countries in Western Europe, beginning with Germany in 1961, followed by the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, and France, and ending with Sweden in 1967 (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003; Koray, 1997).

About 70% of emigrants from Turkey to Europe were ethnic Turks. The others were mainly Kurds and Assyrians. In this paper the term "Turks" refers to ethnic Turks only. About two-thirds of the Turkish immigrants originated from rural areas and villages in central Turkey and from around the Black Sea. Generally, the Turks who emigrated to Northwestern Europe had a low socioeconomic background and were poorly educated (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). In addition, the majority of them were employed in North-Western Europe on a temporary basis, as "guest workers," filling vacant jobs that were less attractive to the members of their host countries (i.e., nationals).

Research amply shows that children of Turkish immigrants are characterized by low educational attainment (Crul & Doornik, 2003; Phalet & Swyngedouw, 2003; Westin, 2003; Worbs, 2003). Additionally, they maintain a strong relationship with their Turkish culture. This maintenance is reflected in an adherence to traditional family values, in having limited social contacts with nationals, in a high proportion of men preferring a marriage partner from Turkey, and in low rates of Turkish language loss between generations (cf. Crul & Doornik, 2003).

For answering the first question it is important to focus on differences between the countries and samples as contexts for acculturation. An exception to the "guest worker" status is found in Sweden, where the guest workers had the same status with the same benefits as Swedes (Hammar, 1999). Turkish immigrants to Finland also were exceptional in that most of them were refugees,

mainly males, who could not find a suitable marriage partner from Turkey. This resulted in high inter-ethnic marriages between Finnish women and Turkish men. Thus, the Turkish ICSEY sample from Finland mainly consists of children from mixed marriages. In line with earlier studies dealing with proximal contextual factors affecting acculturation (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001; Vedder, 2004) we expected a stronger level of assimilation or integration in these youths.

For answering the second question, exploring the link between acculturation and adaptation, we used Berry's classification of acculturation preferences (Berry, 1980): integration, marginalization, assimilation and separation. Integration refers to a combination of a strong link with the ethnic culture and a strong link with the culture of the society of settlement (the national culture). Marginalization refers to a weak link with both the ethnic and the national cultures, separation is a preference of the ethnic culture combined with a depreciation of the national culture, and assimilation is a preference for the national culture combined with a loss of links with the ethnic culture. In regards to adaptation, we differentiated between two types of adaptation—psychological and socio-cultural. Psychological adaptation refers to feelings of wellbeing or satisfaction, whereas socio-cultural adaptation refers to the ability to "fit in" or adjust to new social settings (Ward, 2001). Berry and other scholars (for a review see Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006) collected evidence that integration is more conducive than other combinations to the adaptation of immigrant youth. Other studies found support for the notion that a strong preference for contacts with the own ethnic group is a better predictor of psychological adaptation than a preference for contacts with the national culture, whereas the latter would be a better predictor of adolescents' sociocultural adaptation (cf. Oppedal, Røysamb, & Sam, 2004; Ward, 2001).

In addition to the acculturation preferences, the study also explored the role of perceived discrimination. Perceived discrimination is considered to be basic to immigrants' acculturation experiences. Earlier studies (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Vesala, 2002; Sellers & Shelton, 2003) showed that perceiving oneself as a target or victim of discrimination by members of a dominant group is one of the major acculturative stressors that is negatively related to immigrants' adaptation. In the present study we explored whether these earlier findings with respect to acculturation preferences and experiences can be generalized to Turkish youth living in West European countries.

The third research question, i.e., whether or not the countries' level of cultural diversity moderates the relationship between acculturation and adaptation, is inspired by previous research findings (Bourhis, Moïse, Perrault, & S  necal, 1997; Grosfoguel, 1997) showing that a country's level of immigration and cultural diversity interacts with immigrants' acculturation processes and adaptation. A country supporting cultural diversity would be expected to allow immigrants the option of combining a strong orientation toward their own ethnic culture with a strong orientation toward the national culture. This opportunity is expected to positively affect immigrants' adaptation.

Method

Participants

From the larger ICSEY data set, the data of 736 Turkish adolescents living in North-Western Europe were used for the current analyses. Of these youth, 55 were from Finland, 61 from France, 89 from Germany, 100 from Norway, 273 from Sweden, and 158 from the Netherlands. In no country did we have random samples; sampling took place in cities or regions with high concentrations of immigrant youth.

The gender distribution was almost even (51% females) and did not significantly vary between countries. Adolescents' mean age was 15.2 years ($SD = 1.642$). The Turkish adolescents in Germany were older than their peers in the other countries (16.44, $SD = 1.435$). The youngest group participated in the Netherlands (14.68, $SD = 1.534$). Ninety-one percent of the Turks indicated that they were Muslim, but in Finland only 32%. In this country 45% of the adolescents reported to be non-religious, 16% Protestant and 7% reported another religious affiliation. This is most likely linked to the fact that most of these youth had one Finnish parent, the mother (see below). Eighty two per cent of their fathers indicated to be Muslim. Ninety two percent of the Turkish adolescents was second generation. The first generation youth had a mean length of residence of 11.4 years. Twelve percent of the parents were unemployed and 47% held jobs at the unskilled level, whereas 17% of the parents were working at white collar or professional level. The distribution of parents' occupational status significantly differed by country ($\chi^2(20, N = 627) = 205.54, p < .000$). In Germany, Norway, and the Netherlands a relatively high percentage of parents were unemployed ($>17\%$). In Finland,

a high percentage of parents was employed at white collar or professional level (43%), whereas in Sweden 67% of parents did unskilled work.

Earlier we stated that a high percentage of the adolescents participating in Finland come from interethnic marriages. Our data revealed that 76% of the adolescents in this group had a Turkish father and a Finnish mother. In each of the other countries more than 96% of the adolescents had parents who both came from Turkey.

Instruments and Procedure

Data were collected in all countries by the researchers themselves or by research assistants, usually postgraduate students or teachers who themselves often were members of the ethnocultural group they studied and who were selected and trained by the researchers in each country¹. Data collection involved completion of a structured questionnaire. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary, and that their responses were confidential. Most questionnaires were group-administered in classrooms. In exceptional cases adolescents were approached individually, and the questionnaire was filled out individually. Ethnic language versions of the questionnaire were available, but in all countries the adolescents, irrespective of their ethnic background, preferred using the national language version.

The questionnaire sought information about a variety of demographic variables: the adolescents' age, age of arrival to the country of residence, and parents' occupational status (as defined above). Based on age and age of arrival we defined a new variable "proportion of life spent in country of settlement."

The questionnaire also assessed variables related to acculturation and adaptation. Measures were either developed for the ICSEY project, or taken directly or with some modification from existing scales. For most scales response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). Cronbach alpha for each scale will be presented below. The Cronbach alphas are based on the data provided by the Turkish participants. We present a short description of each of the scales only. A more extensive presentation is given elsewhere (cf. Berry et al., 2006).

Acculturation attitudes: This scale (20 items) assessed four acculturation attitudes: assimilation

¹The researchers in charge were (in alphabetical order of countries) K. Liebkind (Finland); C. Sabatier (France); P. Schmitz (Germany); P. Vedder (the Netherlands); D. L. Sam (Norway) and E. Virta & C. Westin (Sweden).

(Cronbach alpha .61), integration (Cronbach alpha .44), separation (Cronbach alpha .66), and marginalization (Cronbach alpha .61). The scale was adapted from an earlier study (Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). A sample item is: "I prefer social activities which involve both [nationals] and [my ethnic group]" (integration). Response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Cultural identity: Cultural identity was measured with a scale originally developed by Phinney (1992). The scale assesses ethnic identity with 8 items by inquiring about ethnic affirmation (e.g., one's sense of belonging, positive feelings about being group member) (Cronbach alpha .83). A sample item is "I feel that I am part of [ethnic] culture." The other scale (4 items) measured national affirmation and the importance of one's national identity (Cronbach alpha .85). A sample item is "I am happy that I am [national]." Response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Ethnic language proficiency: The scale for ethnic language proficiency (4 items) inquired about the respondent's ability to understand, speak, read and write the ethnic language, for example: "How well do you speak [ethnic language]?" (Cronbach alphas .87). Response options ranged from "not at all" (1) to "very well" (5). The scale was developed by Kwak (1991).

Ethnic peer contact: The scale (4 items) assessed the frequency of interaction with peers from ones own ethnic group and from the national group, respectively. A sample question is: "How often do you spend free time with peers from your own ethnocultural group?" Cronbach alpha was .77. Response options ranged from "never" (1) to "weekly" (5). It was specifically developed for the ICSEY-study.

Family obligations: Ten items assessed attitudes towards *parental authority* (henceforth *family obligations*; e.g., "Children should obey their parents."). The scale was developed by Georgas, Berry, Chisakopoulou, and Mylonas (1996). Cronbach alpha was .69. Response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Perceived discrimination: This scale was developed for the ICSEY-study and assessed the perceived frequency of being treated unfairly or negatively, being teased, being threatened, or feeling unaccepted because of one's ethnicity (e.g., "I have been teased or insulted because of my ethnic background") (9 items, Cronbach alpha .84). Response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Psychological adaptation was measured with scales for life satisfaction, self-esteem, and psychological

problems. *Life satisfaction* was measured with a five-item scale assessing the overall degree of adolescents' satisfaction with their lives. The scale was originally developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985). Cronbach alpha was .80. A sample item is: "I am satisfied with my life." *Self-esteem* was measured using Rosenberg's (1965) 10-items self-esteem inventory. Cronbach alpha was .79. A sample item is "On the whole I am satisfied with myself." The scale for *psychological problems* (15 items) measured depression, anxiety, and psychosomatic symptoms. Cronbach alpha was .90. A sample item is: "My thoughts are confused." Response options for all three scales ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). Items were adapted from a variety of sources (Beiser & Flemming, 1986; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985; Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991).

Sociocultural adaptation was assessed using two scales, one for school adjustment (7 items; adapted from Anderson, 1982; Moos, 1989; Samdal, 1998; Wold, 1995) and one for behavior problems (10 items; adapted from Bendixen and Olweus, 1999). Cronbach alphas were .71 and .82 respectively. A sample item of the scale for *school adjustment* is: "I feel uneasy about going to school in the morning." Response options ranged from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). A sample item of the scale for *behavior problems* is: "Cursed at a teacher." Response options ranged from "never" (1) to "many times during the past 12 months."

Cultural Diversity

We characterize the societies of settlement included in this study with respect to the actual degree of cultural diversity found in those societies. This degree of diversity, in turn, is based on three indicators. The percentage of immigrants now residing in a society is one indicator of its cultural diversity. The second indicator refers to cultural homogeneity which is defined as the percentage of the population in a country characterized as a single group that is homogeneous in terms of ethnic, religious and linguistic background (Kurian, 2001). The third indicator refers to as the ethnic diversity index (Sterling, 1974), with low scores for nations with a nearly homogeneous ethnic composition and high scores for nations with many small ethnic groups.

The three indicators were standardized across the thirteen countries that participated in the original ICSEY study. A Principal Component Analysis (varimax rotation) showed that all three indicators positively load on a single factor

(eigenvalue 2.02, 67.2% explained variance). The resulting factor scores ranged between -1.11 (Portugal) and 1.42 (Canada). For the six countries included in the study presented here, the resulting scores were generally low ($-.55$ for Sweden, $-.68$ for France, $-.74$ for Finland, $-.83$ for the Netherlands, $-.84$ for Germany and -1.01 for Norway). As clarified earlier, it is expected that countries with higher cultural diversity scores (more immigrants and more cultural variation) are better places for intercultural relationships, for acculturation and for adaptation; hence, they represent better places to be for children of Turkish immigrants.

Results

The Cronbach alphas reported in the preceding section indicate that the subscales for acculturation attitudes, especially the one for integration, had problematic reliabilities. Given the relevance of these subscales in the conceptual framework used, we decided to combine the scores on these subscales in our analyses with other variables aiming at staying as close as possible to the original notion of the different acculturation preferences. This means that Berry's conceptualization of acculturation informed this study but that we measured acculturation by combining different scales designed to measure not only acculturation attitudes, but also aspects of Turkish youths' identity development and self reports on intercultural relationships and competencies that are assumed to be important for their acculturation.

We conducted *six* different principal component analyses (with varimax rotation). The first four each included an a priori selection of the intercultural variables (i.e., the acculturation attitudes scales, the cultural identity scales, ethnic peer contact and language proficiency). The final two were with combinations of the adaptation measures as presented in the method section. Our aim was to construct six scores. And as hoped and expected all six PCA's resulted in one factor solution: the *national orientation*, which refers to a combination of national identity and the acculturation attitude of assimilation (eigenvalue 1.26, 63% explained variance); *bicultural orientation*, which includes the two acculturation attitudes of integration (loading positively) and marginalization (loading negatively) (eigenvalue 1.25, 62% explained variance); the *ethnic orientation*, which includes ethnic identity, the acculturation attitude of separation, and family obligations (eigenvalue 1.59, 53% explained variance); and *ethnic behaviors*, a factor that combines ethnic language

proficiency and contacts with ethnic peers (eigenvalue 1.34, 67% explained variance). *Psychological adaptation* combined the scale scores for self esteem, life satisfaction and psychological problems (eigen value 1.85, 62% explained variance) and *sociocultural adaptation* was based on scores for school adjustment and behavioral problems (eigen value 1.36, 68% explained variance). Combining the separate scales in factor scores means that in the remainder of this section we refer to these factor scores. These are all standardized scores. The scale for perceived discrimination was the only scale that was not included in a PCA. We decided to standardize the scores on this variable as well within the Turkish group. Standardization does away with confounding effects of possible country-related sampling artifacts and response sets.

Do Turkish Adolescents' Acculturation Preferences and Experiences and Their Adaptation Differ Between Countries?

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations and the scoring ranges (minimum–maximum score) for the six acculturation and adaptation variables.

In order to answer the first question we conducted two 6 (country) * 5 (parents' level of occupational status) MANCOVAs in which age and proportion of life spent in the country of settlement were included as covariates. In the first MANCOVA all five acculturation variables and in the second the two adaptation variables were included as dependent variables.

The first analysis yielded a statistically significant main effect of country of settlement (Wilks' $F [25,2765] = 7.464$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$) and an interaction effect of country of settlement * the highest level of occupational status of either parent (Wilks' $F [95,2676] = 1.403$, $p < .008$, $\eta^2 = .05$). Univariate analyses showed that the main effect was due to national orientation ($F [5,553] = 6.815$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$; Bonferroni: Finland > other countries), bi-cultural orientation ($F [5,553] = 4.328$, $p < .002$, $\eta^2 = .04$; Bonferroni: Germany < Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands), ethnic orientation ($F [5,553] = 8.689$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; Bonferroni: Finland < other countries; Germany < the Netherlands), and ethnic behaviors ($F [5,553] = 26.714$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .20$; Bonferroni: Finland < other countries; the Netherlands > France, Germany). Interaction effects were found for the national and ethnic orientation ($F [19,553] = 2.039$, $p < .007$, $\eta^2 = .07$ and $F [19,553] = 2.717$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .09$), meaning that these scores varied between countries depending on

Table 1. Means Standard Deviations and Score Ranges of the Acculturation and Adaptation Variables

		Finland	France	Germany	Norway	Sweden	Netherlands
	<i>N</i>	55	61	89	100	273	158
Perceived discrimination	<i>M</i>	-0.14	-0.22	0.15	0.60	-0.17	-0.06
	<i>SD</i>	0.962	0.965	0.893	1.082	0.926	0.994
	Range	-1.34-2.95	-1.34-2.21	-1.34-2.35	-1.34-3.98	-1.34-3.24	-1.34-3.39
National orientation	<i>M</i>	0.84	0.21	-0.23	0.10	-0.06	-0.22
	<i>SD</i>	0.920	1.026	1.012	0.870	0.983	0.886
	Range	-1.43-2.99	-1.75-3.33	-1.75-3.60	-1.61-2.56	-1.75-2.81	-1.75-3.44
Bicultural orientation	<i>M</i>	0.24	0.09	-0.29	-0.33	0.10	0.14
	<i>SD</i>	1.001	0.728	0.873	1.189	0.977	1.024
	Range	-2.26-1.64	-1.85-1.45	-2.50-1.83	-3.88-1.83	-3.04-1.83	-3.00-1.83
Ethnic orientation	<i>M</i>	-1.03	0.08	-0.35	-0.10	0.22	0.31
	<i>SD</i>	1.124	1.071	0.999	0.870	0.958	0.765
	Range	-3.55-1.11	-3.48-1.57	-2.79-1.42	-2.94-1.61	-2.72-2.31	-2.93-1.77
Ethnic behaviors	<i>M</i>	-1.44	-0.29	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.51
	<i>SD</i>	1.310	1.062	0.847	0.889	0.901	0.585
	Range	-3.46-1.20	-2.65-1.48	-2.08-1.48	-2.24-1.48	-2.20-1.48	-1.21-1.48
Psychological adaptation	<i>M</i>	-0.01	0.02	-0.33	-0.39	0.18	0.14
	<i>SD</i>	1.133	1.070	0.947	0.988	0.924	0.993
	Range	-3.02-1.69	-3.11-2.10	-2.77-1.84	-2.65-2.10	-2.76-2.10	-2.99-2.14
Sociocultural adaptation	<i>M</i>	0.02	-0.01	-0.21	-0.29	0.11	0.09
	<i>SD</i>	1.024	1.062	0.863	1.135	1.002	0.954
	Range	-3.54-1.39	-3.09-1.52	-2.63-1.39	-3.95-1.52	-3.75-1.52	-3.66-1.52

the parents' occupational status. This is particularly clear when comparing scores in Sweden and the Netherlands. Mean national orientation scores in the Netherlands were lowest for youth whose parents held skilled jobs (-.40), whereas in Sweden these scores were highest for this same group (.48). The opposite was the case with the scores for ethnic orientation in the skilled group in the Netherlands (.44) and Sweden (-.60). We lack information to further explain these differences.

Overall, the findings warrant the conclusion that country of settlement has a considerable impact on adolescents' acculturation, and mainly in the expected direction. Turkish youth living in Finland had a stronger national orientation, a weaker ethnic orientation and showed less ethnic behaviors than the Turkish youth in other

countries. Also remarkable was the finding that scores for bicultural orientation were lowest in Germany.

No statistically significant differences between countries were found in regard to youth's adaptation to their host culture.

In What Way and to What Extent Are Turkish Immigrant Youth's Acculturation Orientations and Perceived Discrimination Related to Their Adaptation Outcomes?

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, we conducted hierarchical multiple regression analyses entering age, proportion of life spent in the country of settlement, and parents' occupational status in the first step, because we wanted to explore the

Table 2. Adolescent's Acculturation Experiences as Predictors of their Psychological Adaptation (*N* = 575)

	Step 1			Step 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>
Age	0.050	0.026	-0.081	-0.036	0.024	-0.059
Proportion of life in host country	0.490	0.219	0.094*	0.086	0.202	0.016
Parents' occupational status	0.043	0.040	0.045	0.020	0.038	0.021
National orientation				0.050	0.040	0.049
Bicultural orientation				0.162	0.039	0.165***
Ethnic orientation				0.107	0.045	0.108*
Ethnic behaviors				0.064	0.044	0.064
Perceived discrimination				-0.354	0.040	-0.351***
<i>R</i> ²			0.02			0.21
<i>R</i> ² -change			0.02			0.19
Sig. <i>F</i> -change			0.011			.000

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

Table 3. *Adolescents' Acculturation Experiences as Predictors of their Sociocultural Adaptation (N = 575)*

	Step 1			Step 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>
Age	−0.088	0.026	−0.141**	−0.067	0.025	−0.108**
Proportion of life in host country	0.203	0.222	0.038	−0.166	0.209	−0.031
Parents' occupational status	−0.030	0.040	−0.030	−0.050	0.039	−0.051
National orientation				0.079	0.042	0.076
Bicultural orientation				0.123	0.040	0.124**
Ethnic orientation				0.129	0.046	0.128**
Ethnic behaviors				0.053	0.046	0.052
Perceived discrimination				−0.323	0.041	−0.317***
<i>R</i> ²			0.02			0.17
<i>R</i> ² -change			0.02			0.15
Sig. <i>F</i> -change			0.003			.000

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

relationship between acculturation and adaptation taking a possible relationship between adolescents' demographic characteristics and both acculturation and adaptation variables into account. Both the acculturation orientations and acculturation experiences (i.e., perceived discrimination) were entered on the second step. These variables were centered.

The findings with respect to psychological adaptation and sociocultural adaptation were comparable. With both dependent variables the background variables explained a negligible proportion of 2% of variance of the adaptation scores. Acculturation variables contributed an additional 19% (psychological adaptation) or 15% (sociocultural adaptation). Higher bicultural and higher ethnic orientation were conducive to adaptation, whereas higher levels of perceived discrimination predicted worse adaptation.

Does the Country of Settlement, Particularly Its Cultural Diversity, Have an Impact on the Relationship Between Acculturation and Adaptation?

We conducted additional analyses in order to find out whether and to what extent the earlier reported differences between countries could be attributed to the countries' cultural diversity and whether the countries' cultural diversity scores moderated the relationship between the acculturation variables and adaptation outcomes.

Hierarchical regression analyses were used in which we entered age, which was the only background variable that had a clear impact in the former analyses, in the first step. In the second step we entered the five acculturation variables. In the third step we added the countries' cultural diversity scores only, and in the fourth and final step we inserted the interaction terms combining the

cultural diversity scores with the acculturation variables. The latter clarify whether or not cultural diversity is a moderator of the relationship between the acculturation variables and the adaptation outcomes. Tables 4 and 5 present the outcomes with respect to psychological and sociocultural adaptation, respectively.

With respect to psychological adaptation the inclusion of cultural diversity and the interaction terms do away with the predictive role of bicultural orientation. Instead, national orientation became important. Both higher scores for national orientation and higher scores for perceived discrimination corresponded to lower scores for psychological adaptation. On the other hand, a stronger ethnic orientation coincides with better psychological adaptation. Moreover, the findings show that cultural diversity moderates the relationship between ethnic and national orientation on the one hand and psychological adaptation on the other hand, meaning that in countries with higher cultural diversity scores, higher scores for ethnic orientation are more conducive for healthy psychological adaptation than in countries with lower cultural diversity scores. The moderating effect of cultural diversity with respect to the relationship between national orientation and psychological adaptation indicates that in countries with lower cultural diversity scores, higher national orientation scores are more detrimental for youths' adaptation than in countries with higher cultural diversity scores. The contribution to the explanation of variance of the two interaction terms, however, is weak.

With respect to sociocultural adaptation the outcomes were largely comparable, except that with this dependent variable cultural diversity moderated the relationship of ethnic orientation and sociocultural adaptation only. Higher ethnic orientation scores had a more positive impact on

Table 4. *Adolescents' Acculturation Experiences and Cultural Diversity as Predictors of Adolescents' Psychological Adaptation (N = 733)*

	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3			Step 4		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>
Age	−0.041	0.022	−0.068	−0.024	0.021	−0.039	−0.021	0.021	−0.035	−0.019	0.021	−0.031
Bicultural orientation				0.195	0.034	0.194***	0.186	0.035	0.186***	0.229	0.167	0.229
Ethnic orientation				0.125	0.039	0.125**	0.117	0.039	0.117**	0.451	0.179	0.453*
National orientation				0.057	0.036	0.056	0.048	0.036	0.047	−0.375	0.174	−0.368*
Ethnic behaviors				0.051	0.038	0.051	0.070	0.039	0.070	−0.076	0.162	−0.076
Perceived discrimination				−0.331	0.034	−0.329***	−0.321	0.035	−0.319***	−0.427	0.165	−0.424*
Cultural diversity							0.373	0.206	0.064	0.545	0.212	0.094*
CD * Bicultural orient.										0.059	0.196	0.050
CD * Ethnic orientation										0.446	0.218	0.357*
CD * National orientation										−0.535	0.209	−0.425*
CD * Ethnic behaviors										−0.180	0.207	−0.136
CD * Perceived discr.										−0.130	0.195	−0.110
<i>R</i> ²			.01			.20			.20			.22
<i>R</i> ² -change			.01			.19			.00			.02
Sig. <i>F</i> -change			.065			.000			.071			.010

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

sociocultural acculturation in countries with higher cultural diversity scores.

Discussion

In the introduction we formulated three research questions: (A) Do Turkish adolescents' acculturation preferences and experiences and their adaptation differ between countries? (B) In what way and to what extent are Turkish immigrant youth's acculturation orientations and perceived discrimination related to their adaptation outcomes? and (C) Does the country of settlement, particularly the cultural diversity characteristic of

the countries, have an impact on the relationship between acculturation and adaptation?

Regarding the first research question, the country of settlement appeared to have a considerable impact on Turkish youths' acculturation but not on their adaptation. As expected, Turkish youth in Finland had a stronger national orientation, a weaker ethnic orientation, and showed less ethnic behaviors (as defined by youth's use of their ethnic language and contacts with ethnic peers) than did Turkish youth in the other five countries.

This study showed that youths' proximal acculturation context, such as their parents' ethnic background, also may have a strong impact on their acculturation. Whereas the Turkish

Table 5. *Adolescents' Acculturation Experiences and Cultural Diversity as Predictors of Adolescents' Sociocultural Adaptation (N = 734)*

	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3			Step 4		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>St. β</i>
Age	−0.097	0.022	−0.159***	−0.072	0.022	−0.117**	−0.070	0.022	−0.115**	−0.070	0.022	−0.114**
Bicultural orientation				0.125	0.035	0.124***	0.119	0.036	0.119**	−0.038	0.172	−0.038
Ethnic orientation				0.131	0.040	0.131**	0.125	0.040	0.126**	0.580	0.185	0.581**
National orientation				0.073	0.036	0.072*	0.067	0.037	0.066	0.375	0.177	0.368*
Ethnic behaviors				0.059	0.039	0.059	0.072	0.040	0.072	−0.010	0.168	−0.010
Perceived discrimination				−0.283	0.035	−0.282***	−0.276	0.036	−0.275***	−0.592	0.171	−0.590**
Cultural diversity							0.248	0.211	0.043	0.323	0.218	0.056
CD * Bicultural orient.										−0.181	0.201	−0.155
CD * Ethnic orientation										0.556	0.224	0.444*
CD * National orientation										0.364	0.213	0.289
CD * Ethnic behaviors										−0.106	0.213	−0.080
CD * Perceived discr.										−0.381	0.200	−0.324
<i>R</i> ²			.01			.20			.20			.22
<i>R</i> ² -change			.01			.19			.00			.02
Sig. <i>F</i> -change			.065			.000			.071			.010

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

adolescents in general were found to have a strong ethnic orientation and were characterized by maintenance of ethnic behaviors, the Turkish adolescents in Finland had a weaker ethnic orientation, were less involved with peers from their own group and made less use of their own language. A similar contrast between Finland and the other countries was found with respect to the adolescents' national orientation. Generally, the national orientation of Turkish adolescents was low, but it was considerably higher for youth living in Finland. The important point to be made here is that particular situations yield results contrary to the overall picture. Our Turkish respondents in Finland may experience more support from the national population given that their mother is often Finnish and that their parents' have a higher occupational status than the parents of Turkish adolescent in the other countries. Most likely, they find in their mother and in other Finnish relatives support for their struggle to identify their position within the Finnish social and cultural environment.

Regarding the second research question, acculturation and adaptation were found to be related in several ways; the more experiences of discrimination the adolescents reported, the lower was their psychological and sociocultural adaptation. In addition, a strong bicultural orientation and a strong feeling of belonging with co-ethnics contributed to the adolescents' psychological adaptation.

We postulated that the level of discrimination Turkish immigrant youth in North-Western Europe perceive represents a vital aspect of their acculturation experience, which reflects the attitude in the larger society toward the immigrants and, likely, has a decisive impact on the immigrants' acculturation and adaptation. Therefore, like other researchers (e.g., Sellers & Shelton, 2003), we treated perceived discrimination as an independent variable that contributes to the explanation of immigrants' adaptation outcomes. We found strong support for this assumption showing that perceiving oneself as a target or victim of discrimination by members of a dominant group is one of the major acculturative stressors that is clearly associated with psychological symptoms among immigrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Vesala, 2002; Sellers & Shelton, 2003).

In the introduction we referred to the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth, of which the present study is a small part. The findings in the Turkish group are largely comparable to the findings in the whole ICSEY study: A combined orientation toward the ethnic and the national culture is conducive to adolescents' positive adaptation. If, for some reason, this bicultural

orientation option is unattainable, then a strong orientation towards the ethnic culture seems to be a good alternative. The present study, focusing only on Turkish immigrant youth in Western Europe, underlines that these are broadly applicable regularities which seem to be independent of ethnic group (see Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006). Nevertheless, as we did in the present study, we should continuously look for local or contextual varieties in order to know how robust the generalizations are.

In regard to the final research question, the results of this study show that countries do differ in terms of immigrants' acculturation orientations and experiences. We found no direct evidence for a relation of the countries' actual cultural diversity with immigrant adolescents' psychological and sociocultural adaptation, in addition to the influence of the personal acculturation orientations and experiences of immigrant youth. However, the actual diversity of the country of settlement moderated the relationship between ethnic and national orientation on the one hand and psychological adaptation on the other. The same can be said of sociocultural adaptation, albeit that here we found a moderating effect of cultural diversity on the relationship between ethnic orientation and sociocultural adaptation only. The presence of these moderator effects means that the actual cultural diversity characteristic of a country may create a broad context in which the impact of acculturation orientations and experiences on adaptation outcomes may be either invigorated or weakened.

As guest workers, many Turks in North-Western Europe believed that they would eventually return home, even though this return migration was nowhere in sight, constituting what has become known as the myth of return (Zetter, 1999). As a consequence, many Turks deemed it advantageous to keep a strong ethnic identity, maintain a separation attitude, and stay proficient in their original language. At the same time, the attitudes of the governments and of the population of the receiving country generally seemed conducive to supporting Turkish immigrants' maintenance of their culture of origin and preference for seeking shelter in their own group. For instance, until recently, Turks in Germany could not readily secure German citizenship (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2001). This may explain why bicultural orientation scores were low among Turkish immigrants in Germany, as compared to such scores among Turkish immigrants in other countries. Moreover, as was stated in the introduction, nationals' attitudes toward immigrants, particularly Muslims, are presently getting more negative in Western

countries (Pew Research Center, 2005). This is likely to make a bicultural orientation a less feasible choice for Muslim immigrants and, thus, for many Turkish youth as well.

The country of settlement, thus, makes a difference when it comes to immigrant youth's acculturation orientations, experiences and adaptation. Apart from this general finding, the study also revealed that a country's level of cultural diversity affects the strength of the relationship between acculturation and adaptation. What does this finding mean for efforts to improve immigrant adolescents' lives in Western countries? The findings definitely suggest that immigrant youth of Turkish origin should be stimulated to try to optimize possibilities to participate in the national society, getting proficient in the national language and maintaining strong contacts with national peers, while at the same time maintaining a strong bond with their ethnic culture and the resources available in their own family and ethnic group, i.e., youth should be stimulated to opt for integration, as defined in the introduction. If, for some reason, this combined option is not feasible, it is important for the national community to respect immigrants' wish to maintain a strong identification with their ethnic culture. Culture maintenance should be permitted and supported by national and local administrative bodies, at least to the extent that it does not conflict with the overall coherence of society. After all, an increasing fragmentation and intergroup conflict is a likely consequence of separation/segregation *ad infinitum*.

The two acculturation preferences, bicultural and ethnic orientation, are more conducive to immigrants' positive adaptation and, thus, become less expensive in terms of the need to compensate for negative adaptation effects, than a strong push and rush towards a national orientation. Politicians would be wise not to depict all efforts of immigrants to maintain their own culture as acts against the national community.

Obviously, this is not enough. Orientation towards the heritage culture should not be encouraged at the expense of orientation towards the national culture. Programs should be developed and implemented that encourage and challenge Turkish and other immigrant youth to intensify their social participation and avoid isolation within their own group and low involvement with the national community. Furthermore, negative attitudes of the nationals towards the immigrant communities should be addressed. Equal opportunities in education and on the labor market need to remain important policy goals. Similarly, efforts should be made to make sure that the distribution

of affordable housing for immigrant families does not lead to ethnic segregation. Measures addressing these issues should eventually contribute to more positive contacts between immigrants and nationals and, thus, help in overcoming mutual negative attitudes. Moreover, the finding on the important role of perceived discrimination suggests that countries need strict regulations in regard to anti-discrimination. As to the latter, it might be helpful if politicians are made aware that discrimination experiences tend to push and pull immigrants towards stronger efforts to shelter the own culture and its institutions (Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002). There they seek refuge and make sure to find support when they need it.

References

- Anderson, C. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 368–420.
- Beiser, M., & Flemming, J. A. E. (1986). Measuring psychiatric disorder among Southeast Asian refugees. *Psychological Medicine*, 16, 627–639.
- Bendixen, M., & Olweus, D. (1999). Measurement of antisocial behaviour in early adolescence and adolescence: Psychometric properties and substantive findings. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 9, 323–354.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 9–25). Boulder: Westview.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38, 185–206.
- Berry, J., Phinney, J., Sam, D., & Vedder, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Boog, I., Van Donselaar, J., Houtzager, D., Rodriques, P. R., & Schriemer, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Monitor rassendiscriminatie 2005* [Discrimination monitor 2005]. Leiden: National Bureau against Racial Discrimination & Leiden University.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social-psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32(6), 369–386.
- Crul, M., & Doornik, J. (2003). The Turkish and Moroccan second generation in the Netherlands: Divergent trends between and polarization within the two groups. *International Migration Review*, 37, 1039–1064.
- Crul, M., & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The second generation in Europe. *International Migration Review*, 37, 965–986.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, A. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71–75.
- Economic Intelligence Unit. (2001). *Country profile: Turkey*. London: Author.
- Georgas, J., Berry, J., Shaw, A., Christakopoulou, S., & Mylonas, S. (1996). Acculturation of Greek family values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 329–338.
- Grosfoguel, R. (1997). Colonial Caribbean migrations to France, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 20, 594–612.

- Hammar, T. (1999). Closing the doors to the Swedish welfare state. In G. Brochmann, & T. Hammar (Eds.), *Mechanisms of immigration control: A comparative analysis of European regulation policies* (pp. 169–201). Oxford: Berg.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkina, K., & Vesala, T. (2002). *Rasismi ja syrjintä Suomessa. Maahanmuuttajien kokemukset* [Racism and discrimination in Finland. The experiences of immigrants]. Helsinki, Finland: Gaudeamus.
- Koray, S. (1997). Dynamics of demography and development in Turkey. *Nufusbilim Dergisi*, 19, 37–55. (Paper in Turkish with English abstract).
- Kurian, G. T. (Ed.). (2001). *The illustrated book of world rankings* (5th ed.). Armonk: Sharpe Reference.
- Kwak, K. (1991). *Second language learning in a multicultural society: A comparison between the learning of a dominant language and a heritage*. PhD thesis, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada.
- Moos, R. (1989). *Evaluating educational environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Oppedal, B., Røysamb, E., & Sam, D. L. (2004). The effect of acculturation and social support on change in mental health among young immigrants. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 481–494.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. K. (2001). Transnational political practices and the receiving state: Turks and Kurds in Germany and the Netherlands. *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 1, 261–282.
- Pew Research Center. (2005). *Islamic extremism: Common concern for Muslim and Western public*. (<http://pewglobal.org/reports/pdf/248.pdf>) accessed July 18, 2005.
- Phalet, K., & Swyngedouw, M. (2003). Measuring immigrant integration: The case of Belgium. *Migration Studies—Studi Emigrazione*, XL(152), 773–803.
- Phinney, J. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156–176.
- Phinney, J., Horenczyk, G., Liebkina, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic Identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493–510.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Richmond, B. O. (1985). *Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS): Manual*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.). (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes: Vol. 1*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Samdal, O. (1998). *The school environment as a risk or resource for students' health-related behaviour and subjective well-being*. PhD dissertation, Bergen: University of Bergen.
- Schmitt, M. T., Brancscombe, N. R., Kobrynowicz, D., & Owen, S. (2002). Perceiving discrimination against one's gender group has different implications for well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 197–210.
- Sellers, R., & Shelton, J. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1079–1092.
- Sterling, R. W. (1974). *Macropolitics: International relations in a global society*. New York: Knopf.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries; Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Vedder, P. (2004). Turkish immigrant adolescents' adaptation in the Netherlands: The impact of the language context. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 5(2), 257–276.
- Ward, C. (2001). The A, B, Cs of acculturation. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *The handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 411–445). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Westin, C. (2003). Young people of migrant origin in Sweden. *International Migration Review*, 37, 987–1010.
- Wold, B. (1995). *Health behaviour in school-aged children: A WHO cross-national survey (HSCB). Resource package of questions, 1993–1994*. Bergen: Research Center for Health Promotion, University of Bergen.
- Worbs, S. (2003). The second generation in Germany: Between school and labor market. *International Migration Review*, 37, 1011–1038.
- Zetter, R. (1999). Reconceptualizing the myth of return: Continuity and transition amongst the Greek Cypriot refugees of 1994. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 12, 1–22.

Received February 21, 2006

Last revision received January 23, 2007

Accepted March 16, 2007

Copyright of Applied Developmental Science is the property of Lawrence Erlbaum Associates and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.