

**Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat**

Ursula Piontkowski, Anette Rohmann & Arnd Florack

University of Münster, Germany

(IN PRESS: Group Processes & Intergroup Relations)

Ursula Piontkowski

Psychologisches Institut IV

Universität Münster

Fliednerstraße 21

48149 Münster

Germany

Phone: international-251-8334193

Fax: international-251-8331335

Running head: Concordance and threat

Key words: acculturation attitudes, Concordance model of  
acculturation, threat

## **Concordance of acculturation attitudes and threat**

### **Abstract**

This study presents the concordance model of acculturation (CMA), which was developed with reference to Berry's acculturation model (Berry, 1997). A comparison of the attitudes of a dominant and a non-dominant group gives rise to four levels of concordance that represent different possibilities of (mis)matched attitudes: consensual, culture-problematic, contact-problematic, and conflictual. A basic assumption of the CMA is that the greater the mismatch in attitudes, the more threatening and less enriching the intergroup situation will be perceived to be. This assumption was tested in a survey study comparing the attitudes of Germans ( $N = 265$ ) with the attitudes they imputed to Polish or Italian immigrants. We were able to show that the level of concordance is related to perceived intergroup threat and/or enrichment when controlling for the underlying acculturation attitudes: the greater the concordance between the dominant group's acculturation attitudes and the attitudes imputed to immigrants, the lower the perceived threat and the higher the perceived enrichment.

### **Concordance of acculturation attitudes and threat**

When different cultural groups are in contact over a period of time, they are involved in a process of changes called acculturation. Members of the acculturating groups have attitudes towards the way in which the process of acculturation should take place. Berry, Poortinga, Segall, and Dasen (1992) define these acculturation attitudes as “the ways in which an acculturating individual (or group) wishes to relate to the dominant society” (p. 278). Although the dominant group, usually the majority, has more power and more possibilities to shape the way in which the non-dominant group should adapt, the acculturation process involves reciprocal influence between the groups. However, only a few studies have systematically investigated the attitudes of both groups toward this process of mutual adaptation (Bourhis & Bougie, 1998; Florack & Piontkowski, 2000; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001; Piontkowski, Florack, Hölker, & Obdžrálek, 2000; Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998). One reason for this may be that the impact of the acculturation process is much stronger on the non-dominant group than on the dominant group, as studies on acculturative stress have shown (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987; Liebkind, 1996). In the present article we argue that in order to understand the basic mechanism of intergroup conflict, it is crucial to consider both the attitudes of the dominant group members about how non-dominant group members should acculturate, and the strategies used by non-dominant members to deal with demands from the dominant culture. Here, we address not only the consequences of the actual attitudes of both groups, but also the way in which the strategies of the non-dominant group are perceived by members of the dominant group. From a psychological perspective, perceived discrepancies seem more important in the prediction of intergroup attitudes and will therefore be the focus of our investigations. We propose a model of acculturation that is based on the assumption that the perception of threat as an important predictor of intergroup

conflict is not only correlated to specific attitudes, but also depends on discrepancies in the attitudes of dominant and non-dominant group members.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In his well-documented acculturation model, Berry (e.g., 1987, 1997) provides a taxonomy to describe attitudes of dominant and non-dominant group members. He distinguishes four acculturation strategies based on the underlying attitudes towards the two basic issues of acculturation, namely, cultural maintenance and contact and participation. From the non-dominant group's perspective, integration is the strategy of those who wish to maintain their heritage culture and engage in relationships with the dominant group. Assimilation is the choice of those who relinquish their own cultural identity in order to move fully into the host society. Separation is the preferred option of individuals who wish to maintain their cultural identity but refuse substantial relationships with the dominant group. Finally, marginalization characterizes those who give up cultural and social contact with both their traditional culture group and the host society.

From the dominant group's perspective, the acculturation issues of contact and culture maintenance are reflected in the questions of whether the immigrant group should maintain its heritage culture and whether contact with the immigrant group has value. Again, four options are possible: integrationists accept that members of the non-dominant group wish to maintain their heritage culture and allow them to become an integral part of the society by engaging in relationships with them. Assimilationists do not accept the maintenance of cultural identity by the immigrant group, but they support social contact. Segregationists accept that an immigrant group wants to maintain its culture but do not wish to have any relationships with members of that group. Finally, exclusionists do not accept that immigrant groups

want to maintain their culture and do not wish to have any relationships with them.

The dominant and the non-dominant groups differ in the degree to which they can control the acculturation process. Since the dominant group is in most cases the majority, it will have the power to determine whether or not the non-dominant group is allowed to maintain its own culture and have relationships with the dominant group. At the very least, the dominant group will try to impose on immigrants its own expectations concerning the correct acculturation strategy. If the immigrants' attitudes match the dominant group's expectations, it is likely that the acculturation process will take place without any significant problems and that the intergroup situation will be relatively conflict-free. Certainly, there may still be some minor conflict about how the desired outcome will be achieved, and about the form the desired acculturation strategy should take precisely in the different domains of acculturation (e.g., food, religion, child-rearing etc.). However, we assume that if the attitudes of the dominant and the non-dominant groups differ substantially, the intergroup situation will be problematic and conflictual. Thus, we maintain that the degree to which the attitudes of the dominant group and those of the non-dominant group match or mismatch is a crucial factor determining the relationship between the two groups

The assumption that dissimilarity in beliefs, attitudes, and values increases negative orientation toward others is not new. As outlined in belief congruence theory (Rokeach, 1960, 1969), there is evidence for the supposition that prejudice derives from the assumption that outgroup members' beliefs differ from those held by the ingroup (Rokeach, Smith & Evans, 1960). Schwartz and colleagues (Schwartz & Struch, 1989; Schwartz, Struch, & Bilsky, 1990; Struch & Schwartz, 1989) applied this approach to dissimilarity concerning values and were able to show that perceived discrepancies in value hierarchies between groups are related to outgroup antagonism. People who agree with our own beliefs are evaluated more positively

and should consequently be perceived as less threatening, whereas differences in values and interests may lead to intercultural threat and conflict (Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996). Recently, the relevance of taking one's own attitudes into account when it comes to the perception of the attitudes of another group was recognized in the domain of acculturation (Horenczyk, 1996). Roccas, Horenczyk, and Schwartz (2000) demonstrated that discrepancies between own and imputed attitudes (i.e. perceived pressure to assimilate) are related to life-satisfaction of immigrants.

In order to predict the outcome of the host-immigrant relationship resulting from the specific constellation of strategies, Bourhis and colleagues (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997a, 1997b; Bourhis et al., 1993) developed the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) based on Berry's work. An essential assumption of the IAM is that the combination of the acculturation attitudes held by the dominant and the non-dominant group members may yield harmonious, problematic, or conflictual relational outcomes. At the social psychological level, the IAM specifies predictions about relational outcomes that include patterns of intercultural communications between the members of both groups, interethnic attitudes and stereotypes, acculturative stress, and discrimination in such domains as housing, employment, schooling, and the legal system (cf. Bourhis et al., 1997a). Altogether, the IAM stresses the dynamic interplay of the attitudes of both groups, which are in turn influenced by the government's integration policies.

The IAM does not differentiate between discordance that arises from differences in the attitudes of the dominant and the non-dominant group over the issue of cultural maintenance, and discordance that arises from differences over the issue of contact and participation. However, in certain intergroup contexts it matters whether the difference between groups concerns their evaluation of cultural values or their attitudes toward seeking and accepting contact between the groups. If there are

profound cultural differences between two groups, disagreement over the maintenance of culture should have a stronger influence on the relationship than disagreement over the amount of desired contact, as maintenance of culture is strongly associated with group identification (Florack & Piontkowski, 2000; Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998). Therefore, if the majority does not accept the other group's maintenance of its heritage culture, this could threaten the minority's identity, since it can be assumed that ethnic groups often want to retain their cultural values (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). The majority could feel that its identity is threatened, as well, if the minority insists on maintaining its very different cultural values. We developed the concordance model of acculturation (CMA) as a modification of the IAM to account for this qualitative difference between discrepancies on the issues of contact and culture maintenance. Using the two dimensions of Berry's acculturation model, the CMA combines the four strategies of the dominant group with those of the non-dominant group.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The CMA (see Table 1) distinguishes four levels of concordance that differ in the way in which the attitudes of both groups are matched or mismatched. A consensual level is reached if the attitudes of the host community match the attitudes of the immigrants. In this case, both groups agree on the way in which they should live together. A problematic level exists if the attitudes differ on one of the two issues pertaining to acculturation. As indicated above, we assume that it may make a difference whether the disagreement concerns the issue of cultural maintenance or the issue of desired contact between the two groups. For this reason, the problematic level is subdivided into two categories: one for those who disagree on culture

maintenance and agree on contact, the other for those who disagree on the contact issue and agree on culture maintenance. A culture-problematic discordance exists in case of mismatched attitudes on cultural maintenance, for example, if the host community wants to assimilate the immigrants while the immigrants prefer integration. A contact-problematic discordance exists in the case of mismatched attitudes on the contact issue, for example if the host community adopts a segregation strategy while the immigrants want to integrate. A conflictual level occurs in the case of mismatched attitudes on both acculturation issues or if the dominant group prefers exclusion. We assume that this attitude always leads to a conflictual intergroup situation because the immigrants are undesired in the host country. The basic assumption of the model is that a mismatch of the profiles of the acculturation attitudes of the dominant and the non-dominant group goes along with a perception of the intergroup situation as threatening.

### **A first test of the model**

We provided a first test of the CMA by reanalyzing a study of Piontkowski et al. (2000). In particular, we examined whether actual concordance between the attitudes of the dominant group and the preferred acculturation attitude held by the respective non-dominant group influenced the perception of threat. For this purpose, the four different study samples ( $N = 646$  members of dominant groups and  $N = 548$  members of non-dominant groups; Germans and Turks in Germany, Germans and Yugoslavs in Germany, Swiss and Yugoslavs in Switzerland, Slovaks and Hungarians in Slovakia) were merged and analyzed together. For each subject of the dominant group, we composed the degree of concordance of his or her own acculturation attitude with the acculturation strategy held by the majority of the respective non-dominant group. Consider for example the intergroup context of Turks

and Germans in Germany: The profile of the acculturation attitudes held by Turks living in Germany included in the study indicates that the majority among them prefers separation. Consequently, a German subject who held the corresponding segregation attitude was classified as belonging to the consensual level of concordance, whereas a German subject favoring integration was classified as belonging to the contact problematic level of concordance.

To investigate the assumed relationship between concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat, we compared the threat perceived by the members of the dominant groups concerning the respective immigrant group for the four levels of the CMA. The results were widely compatible with the predictions of the model. The lowest threat was perceived when the dominant group's attitude was in concordance with the preferred acculturation attitude of the non-dominant group, whereas the highest threat was experienced when dominant group members disagreed with the non-dominant group on both acculturation issues. Furthermore, it was also important which acculturation issue the groups disagreed on. Disagreement over the question of whether or not the non-dominant group should maintain its heritage culture (culture-problematic discordance) caused more threat than disagreement over the willingness to have contact (contact-problematic discordance). However, since the Piontkowski et al. (2000) study was not originally designed to test the predictions of the concordance model, the findings are open to alternative explanations. Initially we noticed that the levels of concordance were strongly related to differences in acculturation strategies between cultures: The study samples came from four different intergroup contexts, each dominated by a certain level of concordance. For example, in the Turkish-German sample, most Turks preferred a separation strategy while most Germans wanted Turks to integrate. This means that the contact-problematic level was dominant. By contrast, this level of concordance is almost

entirely absent in the German-Yugoslav context. Because of this we cannot rule out the possibility that the amount of perceived threat was influenced by the specific intergroup context. Secondly, because of the uneven distribution of acculturation strategies, certain acculturation strategies resulted in a specific level of concordance with high probability, and it is unclear whether the CMA explains variances that could not be accounted for by the acculturation strategies themselves. Finally, we asked dominant and non-dominant groups for their attitudes and in our reanalysis compared individual attitudes in the dominant groups with the profile of attitudes held by the non-dominant group. Because of this it can not be assumed that each dominant group member in fact believes that the non-dominant group held exactly the attitude as profiled. Although more important for psychological understanding, the role of discrepancies between ones' own attitudes and those imputed to the other group, even though not factual, was not analyzable. Indeed, we assume that what accounts for a variance in the perception of threat is not only the factual concordance on a profiled group level, but also, and especially, the perceived concordance on an individual level.

### **The present study**

The present study was designed to test whether the predictions of the CMA hold true for the concordance between individual attitudes and subjectively imputed out-group strategies; that is to say, in contrast to the reanalysis described earlier, this study considers perceived and not actual concordance. Furthermore, we wanted to investigate the degree to which the distinction between the two problematic levels of concordance is essential in another intergroup context. We hypothesized that the greater the mismatch between a group's own attitudes and the attitudes imputed to the other group, the higher the perceived threat. A survey was conducted in which

Germans as a dominant group were asked for their own attitudes towards either Polish or Italian immigrants in Germany, and for the attitudes they imputed to the respective immigrant group.

We selected two different immigrant groups with the intention of obtaining results that have a higher external validity. Both groups are predominantly Christian, like the majority of Germans. Among the immigrant groups in Germany, they are numerically strong. There are more Italians (619,060) than Poles (301,366) living in Germany (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Ausländer, 2002). Many Italians immigrated to Germany between 1955 and 1973 as guest-workers (Gastarbeiter). The Polish immigrants are part of a new group of guest workers that grew in size after the breakdown of the Eastern Bloc (cf. Wagner, van Dick, & Zick, 2001). Also, between 1988 and 1997, 593,000 people came from Poland to Germany as ethnic Germans whose ancestors had once moved to Poland (Aussiedler; Wagner et al., 2001). Because Italy is a member of the European Union, like Germany, we assumed that the attitudes towards the Italians would be more positive than those towards the Poles. However, we expected our assumptions concerning the relationship between concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat to hold true regardless of the specific immigrant group.

## **Method**

Participants. Visitors of public places and buildings in Muenster (Germany) were asked to participate in a study about cultures in Germany. Altogether, 265 Germans (124 male, 141 female) agreed to participate and were randomly assigned to answer a questionnaire about Poles ( $n = 122$ ) or Italians ( $n = 143$ ) living in Germany. The age ranged from 15 to 83 years, with a median of 37 years.

Measures. Participants responded to a questionnaire that contained items measuring their own acculturation attitudes and those imputed to the immigrant

group, the acceptance of the acculturation strategy preferred by non-dominant group members and perceived threat and enrichment. Apart from references to the respective groups, the questionnaires were identical. The items were presented in the order as they are described below. First, the acculturation attitudes were assessed according to the two basic issues of the Berry model. Participants were asked if the following items resembled their opinion (basically yes, basically no): “In my opinion, we should let them live in our country as they are accustomed to” (culture maintenance); “In my opinion, we should let them participate completely in our life” (contact). To assess the acculturation attitudes imputed to the out-group, participants were asked to respond to the following two statements: “I think that Poles (Italians) want to participate completely in German life“, and, “I think that when it comes to cultural values and customs, Poles (Italians) want to live in Germany as they are accustomed to.“ Again, for each statement participants indicated whether or not it matched their opinion (basically yes or basically no). Further, participants were asked to indicate on a 7-point bi-polar scale (1 = completely agree, 7 = do not agree at all) the degree to which they accepted the acculturation attitude they imputed to the non-dominant group members (“I agree with the attitudes of the Poles (Italians) concerning their life in Germany.”). To facilitate understanding, we recorded values in such a way that higher values indicate a higher degree of acceptance. To measure threat and enrichment, participants rated on 7-point scales whether they felt threatened / enriched by the respective out-group (1 = not at all, 7 = very much) with regard to the following issues: employment, Poles / Italians as family members, Poles / Italians in a common club, and Poles / Italians in the neighborhood (“I would feel threatened (enriched) by having a Pole (an Italian) as a member of my family.”). For threat and enrichment, the single items were summed up. The Cronbach alphas were .85 for threat and .89 for enrichment.

Concordance. In order to specify the concordance of acculturation attitudes, we first determined for each subject his or her own acculturation attitude as well as the attitude expected from the non-dominant group. To that end, we combined the answers to the two basic issues of the Berry model. For example, for a subject who answered “basically yes” to the questions about culture maintenance as well as desired contact, the resulting acculturation attitude is integration. In a next step, we computed the individual level of concordance by comparing each participant’s attitude with the attitude ascribed to the respective non-dominant group. Participants showing a consensus concerning their own attitude and the attitude imputed to the non-dominant group members were classified as belonging to the consensual level. Participants whose attitude matched the imputed acculturation attitude on only one of the two acculturation issues were categorized as belonging to either the contact or culture problematic level, depending on the issue. Participants whose attitude mismatched the imputed attitude of the non-dominant group on both issues were classified as belonging to the conflictual level of concordance. Finally, participants who held an exclusion attitude (i.e. rejected contact and culture maintenance) were categorized as belonging to the conflictual level.

## **Results**

Acculturation attitudes and expectations. Most participants asserted that Germans should allow Poles (95.1 %) and Italians (90.8 %) to participate completely in German life, while 61.2 % expected that Poles and 55.6 % expected that Italians wanted to participate fully in German life. Seventy-six percent of participants supported Polish culture maintenance, while for Italians the percentage was 88.7. Sixty-nine and-a-half percent expected that Poles want to live in Germany the way they are used to in their home country, while 82.5 % expected the same of Italians. The acculturation attitudes and the expected acculturation strategies were

moderately correlated. The correlation coefficients were  $r(254) = .14$ ,  $p < .05$  for culture maintenance, and  $r(256) = .23$ ,  $p < .001$  for participation. However, when considering these correlations separately for each target group, only the correlation concerning the participation issue reached significance for the Italian target sample,  $r(135) = .30$ ,  $p < .001$ . The two acculturation dimensions of culture maintenance and contact were moderately correlated,  $r[263] = .39$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Concordance and acceptance of outgroup strategy. Thirty eight and-a-half percent of the participants who were asked for their attitudes towards Poles were classified as belonging to the consensual level, 24.8 % to the contact problematic level, 22.2 % to the culture problematic level, and 14.5 % to the conflictual level. Of the participants who were asked for their attitudes towards Italians, 46.7 % were classified as belonging to the consensual level, 31.1 % to the contact problematic level, 11.1 % to the culture problematic level, and 11.1 % to the conflictual level (see Table 2). The distribution of the levels of concordance was different for the Italian and the Polish targets,  $\chi^2(3, N = 252) = 11.41$ ,  $p < .05$ . A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with the level of concordance (consensual, contact problematic, culture problematic, conflictual) as independent factor and the acceptance of the expected out-group strategies as dependent variable showed that the levels of concordance were related to the acceptance of the expected out-group strategies,  $F(3, 248) = 28.39$ ,  $p < .001$ . Apart from marginal differences between both problematic levels,  $t(110) = 1.43$ ,  $p = .16$ , and between the consensual and the culture problematic level,  $t(147) = 1.64$ ,  $p = .10$ , all levels of concordance differed in the expected direction. Participants categorized as belonging to the consensual ( $M = 6.07$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ ) or to the contact problematic ( $M = 5.35$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ) or culture problematic level of concordance ( $M = 5.71$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ) were more likely to accept the expected out-group strategies than participants assigned to the conflictual level ( $M = 3.59$ ,  $SD =$

1.90),  $t(138) = 8.73$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $t(101) = 5.45$ ,  $p < .001$ ;  $t(71) = 5.82$ ,  $p < .001$ , respectively.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Concordance, threat and enrichment. The mean ratings of threat and enrichment for the different levels of concordance are presented in Table 3. Two separate 4x2 ANOVAs with the level of concordance (consensual, contact problematic, culture problematic, conflictual) and the target group (Italians vs. Poles) as independent factors revealed main effects of the target group on perceived threat,  $F(1, 241) = 5.50$ ,  $p < .05$ , and perceived enrichment,  $F(1, 239) = 9.48$ ,  $p < .01$ . Italians were perceived as less threatening and more enriching than Poles. As regards the attitudes towards Italians, the means are  $M = 1.58$  ( $SD = 0.95$ ) for threat, and  $M = 5.30$  ( $SD = 1.37$ ) for enrichment. As regards the attitudes towards Poles, the means are  $M = 1.87$  ( $SD = 1.09$ ) for threat, and  $M = 4.78$  ( $SD = 1.38$ ) for enrichment. No significant interactions between concordance and target group were found,  $F_s < 1$ , ns.

More importantly, the main effects of the level of concordance were significant on perceived threat,  $F(3, 241) = 22.96$ ,  $p < .001$ , as well as on perceived enrichment,  $F(3, 239) = 13.75$ ,  $p < .001$ . Contrast tests (all one-tailed) showed the following pattern: Participants on the consensual level of concordance rated Poles and Italians as less threatening,  $t(137) = -7.7$ ,  $p < .001$ , and more enriching,  $t(136) = 6.25$ ,  $p < .001$ , than did participants on a conflictual level of concordance. Likewise, those categorized as belonging to the problematic levels of concordance perceived less threat and more enrichment than did those on the conflictual level. The t-values for the contrasts between the contact problematic and the conflictual level are  $t(99) = -$

5.26 ,  $p < .001$ , on the threat scale and  $t(98) = 3.61$ ,  $p < .001$ , on the enrichment scale. The t-values for the contrasts between the culture problematic and the conflictual level are  $t(71) = -4.39$  ,  $p < .001$ , on the threat scale and  $t(71) = 4.65$ ,  $p < .001$ , on the enrichment scale, respectively. In addition, participants on the consensual level of concordance differed significantly in the perception of threat from participants on the contact problematic level of concordance,  $t(174) = -1.89$ ,  $p < .05$ , and from those on the culture problematic level,  $t(146) = -1.80$ ,  $p < .05$ , in the predicted direction. For enrichment, the consensual level differs from the contact problematic level,  $t(172) = 2.26$ ,  $p < .05$ , but not from the culture problematic level,  $t(145) = 0.29$ , ns. The differences between both problematic levels of concordance were not significant for either perceived threat or for perceived enrichment,  $t_s < 1.44$ , ns.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

To rule out that the relationship between concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat and enrichment was determined entirely by either the acculturation attitudes held by the members of the dominant group or by those imputed to the outgroup, we included, in a second step, the participants' own as well as the imputed attitudes towards the two basic acculturation issues as covariates in the analyses. Most importantly for our purpose, we obtained main effects of the level of concordance in all cases, both for the analyses with the own attitudes as covariates (threat:  $F(3, 239) = 2.49$ ,  $p = .06$ ; enrichment:  $F(3, 237) = 4.43$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and for the analyses with the perceived attitudes as covariates (threat:  $F(3, 239) = 21.41$ ,  $p < .001$ ; enrichment:  $F(3, 237) = 6.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Thus, the level of concordance is related to the perception of threat and enrichment independent from

the underlying own and perceived acculturation attitudes.

### **Discussion**

The present study outlines the concordance model of acculturation. It suggests that it is not only the attitude toward immigrant acculturation that is meaningfully related to the perception of threat, but also the match between individual acculturation attitude and the imputed out-group attitude. Consistent with the CMA, the study found that the consensual level of concordance, in particular, differed from the conflictual level with respect to the perception of threat and enrichment. While the conflictual level was related to higher perceived threat and the consensual level to lower perceived threat, the reversed pattern was found for enrichment. This result is compatible with the model and corresponds to results from the reanalysis of the Piontkowski et al. (2000) data as described above.

The concordance model of acculturation shares its basic ideas with other models (cf. Bourhis et al., 1993, 1997a, 1997b). It differs in so far as it assumes that it may be important to draw a distinction between two levels of problematic outcomes, depending on whether there is discordance with regard to contact or culture maintenance. We hypothesized that disagreement on the culture issue would be related to a higher degree of threat than disagreement on the contact issue. In fact, the pattern predicted by the CMA was found in the reanalysis of the Piontkowski et al. (2000) data. However, the present study did not show differences in the perception of threat or enrichment between the contact and culture problematic levels of concordance. What might account for the different results in the two studies? One explanation could be that the cultural differences between Germans and Italians and Germans and Poles, respectively, are not all that threatening to Germans, because the Italian and the Polish cultures are also Christian cultures. By contrast, Germans

and Turks, as investigated in the Piontkowski et al. study, differ to a much greater extent in their religious traditions. It therefore seems appropriate, in a model of acculturation, to consider actual or perceived cultural differences as a moderating factor for the perception of threat that is experienced on the culture problematic level or on the contact problematic level. Further studies are needed to test whether the distinction between the two levels is relevant and whether empirical support can be found for our theoretical supposition that the intergroup context is a moderating factor in this direction.

Another difference between the two studies is that the reanalysis considered actual concordance, whereas the present study investigated the role of perceived concordance. A further important area of inquiry would seem to be the question of which factors influence the degree to which actual differences are perceived as such, and how actual and perceived discrepancies are related to each other.

In addition, the present study ruled out several, though not all, alternative explanations for the differences in the perception of threat. First, it showed that the variance which is explained by the different levels of concordance is not determined simply by the underlying acculturation attitudes or by the perceived attitudes of the other group. Second, since attitudes and expectations were only moderately correlated, there was a sufficient distribution over the levels of concordance within a specific intergroup context. Thus, we were able to show that the relationship between concordance and threat and enrichment does hold up within a given cultural context, whereas the study by Piontkowski et al. (2000) did not rule out the possibility that the relationship it found was attributable, in the final analysis, to differences in the various cultural settings. Furthermore, the relationship between threat or enrichment and concordance was the same for both Polish and Italian targets, although Italians were perceived as less threatening and more enriching by the Germans than Poles.

Extending prior work in the acculturation domain, Bourhis et al. (1993, 1997a, 1997b) as well as Piontkowski et al. (2000) argued that for an understanding of the development of intergroup conflicts, it is important to take into account the strategies that dominant as well as non-dominant groups pursue in an effort to cope with current cultural changes. The present study and the reanalysis of the Piontkowski et al. data provide initial support for the hypothesis that the interaction between the strategies of both groups, or at least between individual strategies and the attitude imputed to the out-group, is meaningfully related to the perception of the out-group as threatening or hostile. This implies that under certain circumstances even strategies intuitively considered conflict-eliciting can be related to peaceful intergroup relations, and, conversely, that even strategies intuitively considered harmonious may induce threat. This means that a particular acculturation attitude has to be considered in the context of the specific intergroup relationship and/or in the context of the strategies pursued by all groups involved.

Since the present research is of a correlational nature, the results do not allow interpretations that point to a causal relationship between the levels of concordance and the perception of threat, even if the CMA does indicate as much on a theoretical level. Other research has demonstrated the impact of intergroup threat on intergroup attitudes by experimental manipulations of threat (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; Florack, Piontkowski, Rohmann, Balzer, & Perzig, in press). However, Stephan and Stephan (1985) have discussed the reciprocal causation involved in the relationship between threat and prejudice. In their view, important antecedents of threat are factors such as the strength of identification with the ingroup, the nature of the contact between the groups, and knowledge of the outgroup (Stephan, 1999). Accordingly, it seems appropriate to assume that the relationship between concordance and threat is likewise determined by reciprocal influences. In future

studies, experimental research must demonstrate whether a causal influence of concordance on threat exists, as the CMA assumes. Other possible explanations, for example the assumption that perceived threat in an intergroup context influences the degree of perceived concordance in the acculturation attitudes, have to be investigated as well.

So far, the CMA has been discussed mainly as a model for dominant groups. However, the model is not limited to dominant groups. The model's explicit objective is to integrate the perspectives of the dominant and non-dominant groups and to make predictions for both plausible. There is evidence that for immigrants, as well, the match between the actual acculturation attitudes and those imputed to the dominant group influences self-esteem (Florack & Quadflieg, in press) and immigrants' well-being (Roccas et al., 2000). Systematic studies with different immigrant groups could reveal whether the situation of the group (e. g. voluntary vs. involuntary) has an impact as a moderating variable on the consequences of the different levels of concordance of the CMA. The relationship between the mismatch of the acculturation attitudes and perceived threat is complex and should be analyzed systematically under different political and economic circumstances and from both perspectives (i. e. non-dominant and dominant) to identify the causal connections and to reveal possible moderating variables on this relationship.

## References

- Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen (2002). Daten und Fakten zur Ausländersituation. (Data and facts about the situation of foreigners.) [Online]. Available: <http://www.bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.de>.
- Berry, J. W. (1987). Acculturation and psychological adaptation: a conceptual overview. In J. W. Berry & R. C. Annis (Eds.), Ethnic psychology. Research and practice with immigrants, refugees, native peoples, ethnic groups and sojourners (pp. 41-52). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46, 5-68.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. International Migration Review, 21, 491-511.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., & Bougie, E. (1998). Le modèle d'acculturation interactif: Une étude exploratoire [The interactive acculturation model: An exploratory study]. Revue Quebécoise de Psychologie, 19, 75-114.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, C. L., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997a). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. International Journal of Psychology, 32, 369-386.
- Bourhis, R.Y., Moïse, C. L., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997b). Immigration und Multikulturalismus in Kanada: Die Entwicklung eines interaktiven Akkulturationsmodells (Immigration and multiculturalism in Canada. The development of an interactive acculturation model). In A. Mummendey & B. Simon (Eds.), Identität und Verschiedenheit. Zur Sozialpsychologie der Identität in komplexen

Gesellschaften (pp. 63-107). Bern: Huber.

Bourhis, R. Y., Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hölker, P., Lintemeier, K., Schulze-Eckel, M., & Suhl, U. (1993). Immigrant-host community relations: an interactive perspective. Sommerakademie auf Schloss Reissburg, Interdisziplinäres Graduiertenkolleg, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster.

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. Journal of Social Issues, 54, 698-724.

Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2000). Acculturation attitudes of the Dutch and the Germans towards the European Union: The importance of national and European identification. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 21, 1-13.

Florack, A., Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., Balzer, T., & Perzig, S. (in press). Perceived intergroup threat and attitudes of host community members towards immigrant acculturation. Journal of Social Psychology.

Florack, A., & Quadflieg, C. (in press). Akkulturation und Selbstwert von Eritreern in Deutschland. (Acculturation and self-esteem of Eritrean immigrants in Germany.) Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie.

Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), Changing European identities. Social psychological analyses of social change (pp. 241-250). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, R. R., & Lind, A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: is separatism the problem; is assimilation the answer? Psychological Science, 7, 40-45.

Liebkind, K. (1996). Acculturation and stress: Vietnamese refugees in Finland. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27, 161-180.

Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32, 698-719.

Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hölker, P., & Obdržálek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24, 1-26.

Roccas, S., Horenczyk, G., & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Acculturation discrepancies and well-being: the moderating role of conformity. European Journal of Social Psychology, 30, 323-334.

Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic books.

Rokeach, M. (1969). Beliefs, attitudes, and values. A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Rokeach, M., Smith, P., & Evans, R. I. (1960). Two kinds of prejudice or one? In M. Rokeach (Ed.) The open and closed mind. (pp. 132-168). New York: Basic books.

Schwartz, S. H., & Struch, N. (1989). Values, stereotypes, and intergroup antagonism. In D. Bar-Tal, C. F. Graumann, A. W. Kruglanski & W. Stroebe (Eds.). Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing conceptions (pp. 1512-167). New York: Springer.

Schwartz, S. H., Struch, N., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Values and intergroup social motives: a study of Israeli and German students. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53, 185-198.

Stephan, W. G. (1999). Integrated threat theory and attitudes toward immigrants. Unpublished manuscript.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. Journal of Social Issues, 41, 157-175.

Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 364-373.

Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). Theories of intergroup relations: International social psychological perspectives (2nd ed.). Westport, Praeger Publishers.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B.P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. European Journal of Social Psychology, 28, 995-1013.

Wagner, U., van Dick, R., & Zick, A. (2001). Sozialpsychologische Analysen und Erklärungen von Fremdenfeindlichkeit in Deutschland. [Social psychological analyses and explanations for xenophobia in Germany]. Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 32, 59-79.

#### Author's note

Correspondence should be addressed to Ursula Piontkowski, Psychologisches Institut IV, Universität Münster, Fliednerstr. 21, D-48149 Münster, Germany, email: pio@psy.uni-muenster.de

#### Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Victoria Esses and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper.

#### Biographical notes

Ursula Piontkowski is Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Münster, Germany. Her research interests include intergroup communication and intergroup relations, including intercultural relations and acculturation processes; social categorization and language; social interaction and conflict.

Anette Rohmann is a post-graduate student in social psychology at the University of Münster, Germany. Her research interests include acculturation, the influence of self-categorization on intergroup attitudes, and justice perceptions and identity.

Arnd Florack is lecturer at the University of Münster, Germany. His research interests include stereotyping, acculturation, intergroup relations, implicit information processing, and the context dependency of social judgments.

Table 1

The Concordance Model of Acculturation

<b>Dominant group</b>	<b>Non-dominant group</b>			
	<b>Integration</b>	<b>Assimilation</b>	<b>Separation</b>	<b>Marginalization</b>
<b>Integration</b>	consensual	culture problematic	contact problematic	conflictual
<b>Assimilation</b>	culture problematic	consensual	conflictual	contact problematic
<b>Segregation</b>	contact problematic	conflictual	consensual	culture problematic
<b>Exclusion</b>	conflictual	conflictual	conflictual	conflictual

Table 2

Percentages of People Categorized as Belonging to the Different Levels of Concordance

Level of concordance	Attitudes towards	
	Poles	Italians
	( $\underline{n}$ = 122)	( $\underline{n}$ = 143)
Consensual	38.5 %	46.7 %
Contact problematic	24.8 %	31.1 %
Culture problematic	22.2 %	11.1 %
Conflictual	14.5 %	11.1 %

Table 3

Subjective Concordance and Perceived Threat and Enrichment

		threat	enrichment
Level of concordance			
Consensual	<u>M</u>	1.40 <sub>a</sub>	5.42 <sub>a</sub>
	( <u>SD</u> )	0.62	1.11
Contact problematic	<u>M</u>	1.61 <sub>b</sub>	4.99 <sub>b</sub>
	( <u>SD</u> )	0.81	1.39
Culture problematic	<u>M</u>	1.62 <sub>b</sub>	5.36 <sub>a, b</sub>
	( <u>SD</u> )	0.75	1.14
Conflictual	<u>M</u>	2.89 <sub>c</sub>	3.84 <sub>c</sub>
	( <u>SD</u> )	1.65	1.65

Note. The higher the score, the greater the perceived threat and the greater the perceived enrichment. Means in the same column that do not share subscripts differ at  $p < .05$ , one-tailed.