On the Patterns of Acculturation and Immigration
And how past immigration experience shape willingness for relocation

Diploma Thesis
to obtain the academic degree of
Magistra der Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften
in the Diploma Program
Business and Economics
STATUTORY DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted is my own unaided work, that I have not used other than the sources indicated, and that all direct and indirect sources are acknowledged as references.

This printed thesis is identical with the electronic version submitted.

Allhaming, January 2017

Signature
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES ........................................................................................................... 6
TABLE OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................... 7
TABLE OF APPENDICES ................................................................................................. 9
ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... 10

1. INTRODUCTION .......................................................................................................... 11
   1.1 Background of the Research Topic ......................................................................... 12
   1.1.1 International Migration ....................................................................................... 12
   1.1.2 International Assignments .................................................................................. 13
   1.2 Research Questions ................................................................................................. 14

LITERATURE REVIEW .................................................................................................... 16

2. IDENTITY ...................................................................................................................... 17
   2.1 Foundation of Identity Formation ........................................................................... 18
   2.2 Framework of the Identity Formation Process ....................................................... 21
   2.3 Influencing Factors on Identity Development ......................................................... 22
   2.4 Social Identity Complexity ..................................................................................... 23
   2.5 Ethnic Identity ....................................................................................................... 26
   2.6 Immigration as Challenge to Identity ..................................................................... 27
   2.6.1 Bi-cultural or Dual Identity ................................................................................ 29

3. CULTURE ....................................................................................................................... 31
   3.1 Sources of Origin of Culture .................................................................................. 32
   3.1.1 Ecology .............................................................................................................. 32
   3.1.2 Resources ......................................................................................................... 33
   3.1.3 People ............................................................................................................... 34
   3.2 Influence of Culture ............................................................................................... 34
   3.2.1 Cognition and Perception ................................................................................. 36
   3.2.2 Stereotypes – Prejudice – Discrimination .......................................................... 37
   3.2.2.1 Stereotypes ................................................................................................... 38
   3.2.2.2 Prejudice ...................................................................................................... 39
   3.2.2.3 Discrimination .............................................................................................. 40
   3.3 Enculturation ......................................................................................................... 40
   3.4 Cultural Change & Evolution ................................................................................. 42

4. CULTURAL TRANSITION ............................................................................................ 44
TABLE OF TABLES

Table 7.1: Framework for studying acculturation, adaptation and propensity for future relocation ................................................................. 81
Table 8.1: Contextual factors with corresponding p-values ................................................................. 97
TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Distribution of international migrants by major area of destination 2000 - 2015 12
Figure 1.2.: Contribution of natural increase and net migration to population change in Europe 1950-2010 .............................................................................. 13
Figure 2.1: Identity status proposed by Marcia .......................................................... 19
Figure 2.2: Personality and social structure model (PSSP) ........................................ 21
Figure 2.3: Alternative structures of multiple in-group representations .................. 25
Figure 3.1: Function of Culture .............................................................................. 32
Figure 3.2: How does Culture Affect Behaviour ...................................................... 35
Figure 3.3: Central concept in intercultural relations .............................................. 38
Figure 3.4: Cultural Transmission and acculturation .............................................. 41
Figure 4.1: General Framework for understanding acculturation .............................. 44
Figure 4.2: Acculturation attitudes of immigrant groups and larger society .......... 47
Figure 4.3: Framework for understanding acculturative stress ............................... 52
Figure 5.1: Framework for Studying Acculturation and Adaptation ....................... 57
Figure 8.1: Age at Immigration ............................................................................. 94
Figure 8.2: Length of Residence .......................................................................... 94
Figure 8.3: Abstract of nationalities (in %) ............................................................ 93
Figure 8.4: Accompanied by and reasons for immigration .................................... 94
Figure 8.5: Acculturation profiles ......................................................................... 96
Figure 8.6: Acculturation profiles by gender .......................................................... 98
Figure 8.7: Acculturation profiles by country of origin (selected by countries) ........ 100
Figure 8.8: Comparison of Cultural Dimensions for separation profile ................ 100
Figure 8.9: Comparison of Cultural Dimensions by integration profile .......... 101
Figure 8.10: Self-esteem by acculturation profiles ............................................. 101
Figure 8.11: Life satisfaction by acculturation profiles ....................................... 102
Figure 8.12: German language skills at point of immigration .............................. 104
Figure 8.13: Language use by length of residence .............................................. 105
Figure 8.14: Language use by age at immigration ............................................... 104
Figure 8.15: Neighbourhood ethnic composition by time .................................. 106
Figure 8.16: Acculturation profiles by neighbourhood ethnic composition (in %) .... 107
Figure 8.17: Upper Austrian immigration density 2015 ..................................... 108
Figure 8.18: Friendships today (left side) and friendships at point of immigration .... 109
Figure 8.19: Friendships by acculturation profiles (in %) .................................... 110
Figure 8.20: Support received (fairly a lot/lot) at point of immigration by profiles .... 111
Figure 8.21: Context of discrimination and forms of discriminatory behaviour (in %) 112
Figure 8.22: Forms and contexts of discriminatory behavior by gender .............. 113
Figure 8.23: Context of perceived discrimination by profiles (in %) .................... 113
Figure 8.24: Forms of perceived discriminatory behaviour by acculturation profiles 114
Figure 8.25: Form of discriminatory behavior ..................................................... 115
Figure 8.26: Contexts of discrimination .............................................................. 115
Figure 8.27: Acculturation profiles by physical ethnic differences ...................... 115
Figure 8.28: Readiness for relocation and voluntarism of immigration ............... 117
Figure 8.29: Moving to another country and discrimination .............................. 118
Figure 8.30: Moving back to country of origin and discrimination .............................................. 118
Figure 8.31: Moving to another country by profiles .................................................................... 120
Figure 8.32: Move back to country of origin by profiles ................................................................. 118
Figure 8.33: Readiness for relocation by gender (in number of person) ...................................... 119
Figure 8.34: Reasons for non-relocation ....................................................................................... 120
# TABLES OF APPENDICES

Appendix A – English Questionnaire ................................................................. 139
Appendix B – German Questionnaire ................................................................. 146
Appendix C – Contextual Variables – Migration in Austria ................................. 153
This thesis presents the findings obtained from a quantitative study conducted in an Upper Austrian university setting with students of first generation immigration and which was guided by two main questions: “Which contextual factors contribute to the internalization of the acculturation patterns of integration, assimilation or separation?” and “Does the internalized acculturation pattern of integration, assimilation or separation contribute to the willingness for further relocations?”. By employing an adapted questionnaire, which was initially designed for an international study conducted by Berry et al. (2006), evidence was found that among the tested contextual factors length of residence and received support from host nationals contribute the internalization of the aforementioned acculturation attitudes. Further, results suggest that integrated individuals have a higher propensity for future relocations, followed by individuals covered in the separation and assimilation profile.
1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout history immigration has been an important social issue and remains so today. In the modern era, immigration has occurred among nation states as a result of changing distribution of employment opportunities, population imbalances, natural disasters, and the actions of the nation states themselves (Stephan et al., 2005). This movement has made intercultural adaptation an increasingly common experience for people around the world and, whether they stay short or long term, their ability to function in their host culture rests on some degree of adjustment and cultural change, a process referred to as acculturation (Barker, 2015). Formally, one-dimensionality of acculturation has been assumed with an unlearning of own culture and assimilation into the new host culture in order to adapt to a new host environment. Only since the conceptualization of a bi-dimensional model proposed by Berry in 1989 (Berry, et al., 1989), increasing evidence has been provided that it is possible to internalize more than one cultural schema.

However, acculturation implies a two-way process by which groups of individuals of different cultural backgrounds are influenced by another and by their mutual intercultural contacts. Albeit demographic and psychological factors pertaining to the individual playing a considerable role in shaping acculturation, encounters between host nationals and immigrated individuals are also crucial to this process and can result in favourable and unfavourable attitudes on both sides. On the side of immigrated individuals these attitudes in turn can influence the extent to which they want to preserve their cultural roots or to incorporate host society culture, which results in four acculturation attitudes: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. Integrated individuals have managed to maintain their own cultural identity and to incorporate elements of the host culture, whereas marginalized individuals exhibit weak connections to both cultures and are more orientated towards achieving personal goals. Assimilated and separated individuals, however, represent contrary extremes, with the first having totally abandoned heritage culture and adopted that of host society and with the latter having totally rejected host culture and preserving own cultural heritage. Likewise, host society has also preference for one of the acculturation attitudes depending on different factors such as whether the immigrated groups are valued or devalued or on the economic cycle.

Nevertheless, cultural transition represents a major challenge to every individual’s identity as it will undergo significant changes, which requires the reorganization of the entire self and the integration of new acquired social identities.
1.1 Background of the Research Topic

1.1.1 International Migration

Historically seen, international migration is not a recent phenomenon as humans were always on the move and ever since drivers for human mobility were manifold. Numerous factors can influence an individual’s voluntary motivation to leave one’s country of birth behind in the quest for a better life. Incentives for this life-changing step can be various and can range from economic opportunities such as improvement in employment, accessibility to healthcare and education or to escape from discrimination, poverty, or climatic changes. Still, not all individuals may voluntarily take the step of emigration but they may be forced to do so. Conflicts, war and persecution are forcing people to leave their country of birth behind looking for safety and security for themselves and their families in a new place.

According to the report on Trends in Global Migration 2015 by the United Nations (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2015), the number of international migration reached an all-time high of 244 million in 2015 compared to 173 in 2000 and 154 million in 1990. Nonetheless, rate of international immigration is growing by about 1.6 % per year. Despite a significant increase in immigration flows worldwide, international migration remains concentrated within Europe and Asia, representing the two major regions for international immigration. These two continents are hosting 76 million and 75 million individuals respectively with immigration background, both regions representing nearly two thirds of the international immigration in 2015. In 2015, the largest number of international immigrants were living in the USA (47 million) followed by Germany and Russia (each 12 million), Saudi Arabia (10 million), the UK (9 million) and the United Arab Emirates (8 million).

![Figure 1.1: Distribution of international migrants by major area of destination 2000 - 2015](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration)

*Source: United Nations, Global Migration Database.*
Today numerous countries, where demographic changes (for instance growing age structure of population due to low birth rates, brain drain of highly educated) are affecting the future economic prosperity of economies, are implementing governmental and political policies to attract immigration.

One major example for strong demographic changes is Europe, where the natural increase (birth minus deaths) of the population is regressing since the 1990’s due to an increase in the number of deaths vis-à-vis the number of births (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2015). Therefore, net immigration has become an important component of population change, as it does not only affect the number of population, but it does also affect the age structure of the receiving and sending countries. In the past centuries, net immigration had a positive impact on the population structure in Europe, as it offset the population decline experienced since the 1990’s. Nevertheless, according to the United Nations Report on International Migration 2015, long-term effects of aging population can not be halted and the projected old-age dependency ratio$^1$ in Europe will increase from 26 to 48 by 2015.

1.1.2 International Assignments

Today, not only individuals are taking the opportunity for relocation in search for better living conditions, but also companies in search for more favourable market conditions, which increases the need for international assignments. According to the Global Mobility

---

$^1$ Ratio between 100 persons of working age (from 15 to 64 years) vis-à-vis dependent older persons (aged 65 or older)
Trend Survey 2015 (Brookfield, 2015) the interviewed international operating companies expected international assignments to increase by 36% or at least stay the same (39%) in future due to expected business growth (66%). Further, the GMT Survey 2015 revealed that “previous international assignments experiences” and “possession of cultural skills and abilities” were among the main criteria for the selection of appropriate candidates for international assignments, albeit companies also acknowledged that assignees going abroad often do not possess the right skills (26%) or are not able to adapt to the local culture, which are among the three most commonly named factors for assignment failure.

1.2 Research Questions

Considering the increased demand for international assignments and the ongoing increase in the number of individuals having an immigration background (and thus, possess the varieties of cultural competencies), these trends could lead to a more balanced proportion between demand (companies that are looking for appropriate candidates possessing the right skills) and supply (individuals of first generation immigration). Immigrated individuals can be seen to represent appropriate candidates for international assignments, as they possess cultural skills and abilities, as well as international assignment experience, as they have at least once undergone relocation. Nevertheless, one crucial factor underlying this relationship is the individuals “willingness for future relocations”, which might be influenced by the previous undergone immigration experience and the internalized acculturation pattern.

Before trying to examine the relationship between acculturation and willingness for future relocation, it is necessary to examine how and how well immigrated individuals are doing in their new cultural setting. According to Berry, et al. (2006), for immigrated individuals there are important differences with respect to strategies used to seek reestablishment of life in a new cultural setting and to engage in the society in which they live. However, so far no empirical consensus on contextual factors (such as intercultural contacts, language proficiency, discrimination, neighbourhood composition, age at immigration, or length of residence) that contribute to the adaption of a certain acculturation profile or outcome could be found.

Therefore, the first research question seeks to support the understanding whether and how contextual factors contribute to the internalization of a specific acculturation pattern, which is as follows:
Q1: Which contextual factors contribute to the internalization of the acculturation patterns of integration, assimilation or separation?

After answering the first research question, the basis for the examination of the second question is provided. According to Berry (1990), individuals that have internalized integration have successfully managed to incorporate both cultures within their identity, thus possess higher cognitive complexity and therefore are able to successfully deal with ambiguity in their everyday lives, compared to those individuals that are separated or assimilated. Therefore, it could be suggested that, as integrated individuals are not as rooted in one specific culture – like it is the case for assimilated or separated individuals – they have a higher willingness for future relocation. Contrary, those assimilated or separated might perceive their past immigration experience as highly stressful and confusing and thus, might be highly reluctant towards future relocations.

Therefore, the second research question should empirically examine the relationship between acculturation attitudes internalized and willingness for future relocation, which is as follows:

Q2: Does the internalized acculturation pattern of integration, assimilation or separation contribute to the willingness for further relocations?

In order to answers the research questions, the first part of the present thesis is composed of a literature review covering theoretical aspects as well as past empirical studies and findings in the realm of identity, culture and acculturation. The second part covers an empirical quantitative study conducted in an Upper Austrian university setting among first generation immigrant students.

For the purpose of this thesis the concept of acculturation proposed by Berry (1989) is adopted and studied with regard to three (out of four) acculturation attitudes (profiles) namely: integration, assimilation and separation as prior studies conducted by Berry et al. (2006) reported marginalization being the least often occurring acculturation profile.
LITERATURE REVIEW
2. IDENTITY

Within the past decades the number of research and literature on the topic of identity and identity related issues has grown significantly, due to an increased interest in this subject (Vleioras & Bosma, 2005; Cote, 1996; Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Various scholars argue that this increased interest is the result of the societal change from a pre-modern society to a late modern society that Western societies are currently undergoing. Cote (1996) defines this societal change as the shift from an agrarian to an industrial society. Even Baumeister (1991 as cited in Adams & Marshall 1996, p. 434) argued in earlier writings that “... the movement toward a modern society critically weekend several of the culture’s most powerful value bases (e.g. religion, marriage, work ethic). The result was a value gap ....” Thus, this value gap has resulted in a severe shortage of guidelines for members of modern societies, which offer abundant possibilities and often require individuals to make choices between incompatible alternatives (e.g. motherhood vs. career).

Cote and Levine (2002) argue also in favour of Baumeister’s ideas and state that these cultural changes that Western societies are recently undergoing makes it for virtually every individual difficult to form and sustain a sense of identity. The authors point out, that for most of human history self-definition was not a matter of choice but rather a matter of obligation due to inherited status or lineage. Individuals assumed and tried to fit into their culturally prescribed roles that their families had themselves adopted. Those who were not willing to fit into their culturally prescribed roles were banned from to community or had to live with some sort of sanctioning. This form of premodern society is the reference point when trying to understand how individuals in nowadays modern societies are attempting to learn how to cope with identity formation and the problems associated with it. The authors (Cote & Levin, 2002, p. 3) further point out: “…identity formation has become more difficult, precarious, and solitary process for which many people are unprepared in terms of their phylogenetic background.” Further: “… in this historical sense, humans have not been accustomed to live in societies where they are continually confronted with high levels of choice over fundamental matters of personal meaning.” In other words, even though our modern society allows individuals to make their own choices regarding who they want to be and what they want to accomplish in their lives, these choices have to be made solely while constantly self-negotiating alternatives and the responsibilities that need to be assumed for these taken decisions.
A lack of right coping strategies for dealing with the vast range of choices and possibilities, that society nowadays offers, is one of the main reasons individuals of all ages undergo difficulties such as listed by the authors Cote and Levine (2002): lack of commitment to any course of future action, openness to influence and manipulation and the unawareness of passing sense of meaning on to antecedents. In post-modern societies lack of self-definition and the loss of community as reference point for human identity are seen as main triggers for different identity related issues. Therefore the task of identity formation in today’s society has changed from a straight forward process of assuming identity early in life to a society which encourages a constant discovery and challenge of identity. The result, as Baumeister (1991) postulates, is a shift from former value bases such as religion, marriage, work ethic to “selfhood” as the major value base. Therefore, in today’s world our identity has assumed a central role in our lives as, according to Adams and Marshall (1996), serves as backbone for our self-definition and is further assumed to be (p. 433):

1. Provider of structure for understanding who one is
2. Provider of meaning and direction through commitments, values and goals
3. Provider of a sense of personal control and free will
4. Striver for consistency, coherence and harmony between values, beliefs and commitments and
5. Enables the recognition of potential through a sense of future, possibilities and alternative choices.

2.1 Foundation of Identity Formation

Research in the field of personality development is considering “identity” as key issue during the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Erikson’s (1959) pioneer work on the Psychosocial Stage Inventory represents the most influential work in the realm of identity formation and set the cornerstone for all future work in this discipline. Erikson (1959 as cited in Rosenthal et al., 1981) postulates an eight stages model, with each stage representing a critical period of conflict and possible crisis, each of which has to be resolved in order to achieve a “healthy” personality. The first four core conflicts arise during infancy and childhood (trust vs. mistrust; autonomy vs. shame and doubt; initiative vs. guilt; industry vs. inferiority), followed by the conflict between identity and identity confusion during adolescence. The last core conflicts arise during adulthood, which include integrity vs. despair; intimacy vs. isolation and generativity vs. self-absorption. Each of these stages arises due to increased maturity
that results in new dimensions of social interactions that become possible. Despite of a life-long conflict-resolution process, Erikson considers adolescence as central period of time to identity formation. Those adolescents who do not succeed in forming a strong identity are facing a difficult adulthood with unlike stable long-term relationships and vulnerability for ill-being.

Around the same time, Marcia (1966) work on the “Identity Status Paradigm” was published and extended Erikson’s work on identity formation. Marcia defines individual difference in identity formation along the dimension of commitment and exploration, a process which requires the individual to make choices and commitments on different domains of future-related issues demanded by society that can lead to irreversible roles in adult life. These dimensions are dependent from the degree of commitment and exploration on life domains such as relational choices, religion, vocation, gender roles and so on. In this framework, the dimension of exploration refers to a constant questioning of possible identity alternatives. In other words, exploration refers to an individual’s search for different values, beliefs and goals in life and, the experimentation with these various social roles, whereas commitment defines the decision-making and implementation of these set of goals and convictions relevant to identity. These two dimensions identified by Marcia are resulting in four possible identity statutes, which should not been viewed as stages or a sequential process, as this paradigm only postulates that identity is highly dependent on the commitments every individuals is entering. In a meta-analysis conducted by Kroeger and Marcia (2011) it was found that, those individuals exhibiting the strongest identity commitments had in general higher levels of self-esteem. By contrast, those individuals exhibiting low levels of commitments were found to have lower levels of self-esteem.

![Identity Status Paradigm](image-url)

*Figure 2.1: Identity status proposed by Marcia*
**Identity Diffusion:** Adolescent has the sense of not having any choices in life, has not yet made commitments and is also not willing or attempting to make any

**Identity Foreclose:** Adolescent is willing to make commitments to some relevant roles, values and goals in future but has not explored a range of options yet; tends to obey expectations of others (e.g. career direction of parents) regarding its future

**Identity Moratorium:** Adolescent has not made commitment yet but is ready to make choices; still exploring various possible commitments and is therefore currently in a crisis

**Identity Achievement:** Adolescent has already undergone identity crisis and has already made commitments to certain explored roles and values and thus to a certain identity.

Marcia’s paradigm on identity formation has long been the most commonly used conceptualization of Erikson’s work on identity research but has later been further elaborated by Berzonsky (1990), who developed a process-orientated model of identity formation in which he identifies differences in how individuals seek, process and use identity-relevant information. The result of Berzonsky is a model that distinguished among different styles of exploration, which are strongly based on Marcia’s work on identity formation (Smits et al., 2008).

**Information-orientated:** Before making any commitments these individuals (i.e. achievers and moratoriums) are actively searching and evaluating relevant information. If discrepancies with their self-conceptions are found, these individuals tend to revise their self-conception. They are self-reflective and self-critical, possess a high cognitive complexity, are open to new information, and willing to revise aspects of their identity.

**Normative:** These individuals rigidly adhere to their existing self-conception and rely on norms and expectations of significant others (e.g. such as parents).

**Diffuse-avoidant:** These individuals exhibit a rather fragmented identity structure, as they avoid personal issues and tend to procrastinate decision until situational demands force them to change behaviour.
2.2. Framework of the Identity Formation Process

According to Matthew et al. (2014) the time of identity formation – which manifests itself in an enhanced way during adolescence – represents a ground-breaking period for the individual’s propensity for identity construction. The authors name two main events as source for this internal change: Firstly, the neurological development of cognition that is taking place around this time and secondly, changes in social consciousness that lead to a critical thinking on self-related issues such as: “Who am I?” “What goals do I have in my life?” This time is also characterized by an enhanced interest in social interactions outside the family context, which can provide the adolescents with answers to the question of “belonging”, which is seen as one of the key components – beside value – of the individuals self-concept and as a fundamental developmental issue. Accordingly, “belonging” forms the external manifestation of identity, whereas “value” – that reflects the individual’s degree of value or importance it attaches to aspects of its self-concept – represents the internally negotiated dimension of identity.

For a better understanding of the undergoing process of identity formation the authors Cote and Levine (2002) used the Personality and Social Structure (PSSP) model to illustrate this process that involves three levels of analysis: Social structure, interaction and personality along with their interrelationships (Figure 2.2).
The influence of the social structure, which includes – among other things – political and economic systems, on our day-to-day life manifests itself in the socialization and social control processes that we are exposed to in our day-to-day interactions. Cultural factors and social rules put different degrees of pressure onto the individual to fit into available identity models. Therefore, these interactions, that comprise patterns of behaviours among people in socializing institutions like family or school, result in an adaptation and internalization of social structural norms and values in the person's own personality. As research in child development shows, identification and imitation are the major mechanism of social development (Adams & Marshall, 1996). This in turn manifests itself in the person’s ability in producing self-presentations in its day-to-day life. Result of these interactions is the social construction of reality, which foster the maintenance or alteration of social structural models. However, being member of a group does not implicitly imply that all members hold the same beliefs and values or engage in identical practices as identity formation is person-context process influenced by different factors.

2.3 Influencing Factors on Identity Development

Before Bronfenbrenner (1989) writings on the Ecological System Theory, research and literature on identity were primarily conceptualized as an interpersonal attribute and the influence of developmental contexts on identity formation was largely ignored. It was that every discipline was approaching identity in a very narrow sense: psychologists were interested in the individual; sociologists in the family and anthropologist were interested in society. Only since recent decades identity was started to be approached from an interdisciplinary point of view and became conceptualized as a person-context process and with Bronfenbrenner’s framework it was started to be studied in context. Bronfenbrenner (1989) distinguished in his Ecological System Theory between four types of nested systems which are influential to the formation of identity: Microsystem, with whom the adolescent shares daily contact with and therefore represents the immediate environment such as parents, friends etc. Mesosystem, which represents the interaction between two microsystems such as parents and peers. Exosystem, represents external environments, which still can indirectly influence development such as neighbourhood characteristics, belonging to an ethnic group and lastly the macrosystem, which represents the larger socio-cultural context such as ethnic or religious majority groups.
Since these advancements of broadening identity formation to a person-context relationship, also other scholars have started to recognize external factors as influential to identity development and formation. Grotevant (1987) – for example – suggested that societies can affect the individual’s process of identity formation as it can shape the individuals expectations of and beliefs about available options and can also regulate access to alternatives. Later, Nurmi et al. (1996) argued in favour of Grotevant (1987) and stated that the developmental environment or contexts in which adolescents are living such as peer groups, family, culture or society can impact identity development. Their study revealed that the sociocultural context of living – such as urban or rural environments – has an impact on identity exploration and commitments, as these two different environments differ in educational and vocational opportunities provided to adolescents. Other scholars such as Allen and Lands (1999) focus on factors from the microsystem – in particular influence of parents – to explain differences in identity formation. Their attachment theory assumed that quality of parental rearing styles would represent a fundamental factor for a positive sense of self and others, and a secure base for exploration and could only be found in high-quality parenting. Smits et al. (2008) defines high quality parenting in terms of three dimensions; support, behavioural and psychological control. Only parents that foster a supportive environment with sufficient behavioural control (communicating clear expectations for behaviour and monitoring behaviour) but absent psychological control (guilt-induction, shaming, conditional approval, etc.) provide their children with a provision for a thorough exploration of identity relevant information.

2.4 Social Identity Complexity

As mentioned earlier, in today’s world individuals have to take numerous future-related decision on different life domains such as family, vocational, political or religious issues. By taking these decisions the individual becomes member of various groups, which membership influences values, beliefs as well as attitudes and shapes and forms identity and self-definition. Tajfel and Turner (1986) emphasized that every individual can belong to various groups at the same time, resulting in a self-concept that is composed of multiple social identities, which are interdependent and influencing each other (Tajfel & Turner, 1981 as cited in Amiot & Saloumier, 2008, p. 149) further defines social identity as “that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from his or her knowledge of membership to a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to it”.
Lazzari (2010 as cited in Moscato et al. 2014) argues that our social identity is basically constructed through three processes namely *categorization, identification* and *social comparison*. In the first stage, the process of *categorization* comprises that the individual is splitting its social environment into *in-group* and *out-group* based on factors such as sex, age, social status, religion, ethnicity etc. Through *identification*, the individual starts to identify with the group – *in-group* – it shares the most common characteristics with and initiates the process of internal *social comparison* between *in-group* and *out-group* by which the *in-group* represents the reference group for comparison with the *out-group*. In this process, the two groups undergo continuous comparison wherein the *in-group* is considered better than the *out-group*, which in turn may become devalued or criticized and could also be an explanation for xenophobic attitudes and behaviour and hence discriminatory attitudes.

To account for the representation of the multiple social identities every individual holds, Roccas and Brewer (2002) proposed a concept that became known as the *Social Identity Complexity* “… that refers to an individual’s subjective representation of the interrelationships among his and her multiple social identities” (p. 88). The concept therefore reflects on the degree of simplicity or complexity of the various and simultaneously held group memberships of an individual. Simple identity structures are maintained when different group memberships are highly overlapping and therefore convergent, whereas when memberships in multiple *in-groups* are not fully convergent or overlapping, the identity structure is more complex and therefore, an *in-group* member on one dimension can be an *out-group* member on another dimension. Considering a woman top manager and mother: within a management meeting (professional identity) with other male managers this woman will perceive her male colleagues as *in-group* members in this context (management meeting), whereas she will perceive the same male colleagues as *out-group* members in the context that emphasizes her identity as woman and mother. Thus, when group identities do not converge Roccas and Brewer (2002) proposed four identity structures (Figure 2.3), which reflect different ways to represent multiple social group identities:

**Intersection:** Simultaneous recognition of more social identities and maintenance of a single *in-group* representation by defining the *in-group* as an intersection for the various group memberships. Turning back to the female top manager that is also mother: by defining

---

2Distinction by Sumner (1906): **In-group:** refers to groups a person belongs to, and whose norms are accepted; **Out-group:** refers to a group a person does not belong to, and whose norms are rejected
herself in terms of a combination of both, motherhood and profession, she only shares this identity with other mother top managers (in-group) (Figure 2.3 a).

**Dominance:** Adoption of a key group identification to which all other group identities are of secondary nature (Figure 2.3 b). For instance: if the female top manager assigns primacy to her professional identity, she will regard all managers as fellow in-group members. The fact that she is female and a mother are only characteristics that describe her but are not extended to her primary key group identification.

**Compartmentalization:** “Through the process of differentiation and isolation, multiple identities can be activated and expressed, if more than one group identity is important to an individual” (Roccas & Brewer, 2002, p. 90). These representations of group memberships are context dependent and a certain group identity may be relevant only in a specific context (e.g. in office but not at home) and another group identity only in another context and therefore multiple group identities are maintained (Figure 2.3 c). For the female top manager this would imply that she will only use her professional identity as basis for her distinction between in- and out-group at the office.

**Merger:** Simultaneously recognition of all held group identifications (Figure 2.3 d). For the mother top manager, her identification with other mothers crosses the boundary of top-manager, and her identification with top-manager crosses the motherhood divide.

*Figure 2.3: Alternative structures of multiple in-group representations
Source: Roccas & Brewer, 2002, p. 90*
2.5 Ethnic Identity

Even though, “nation state” is a geo-political term that defines national boundaries, the resulting “ethnic identity” is a fundamental component of our own identity and self-definition. Tajfel (1981) emphasized in his work that our “self-concept” or (our self-definition) derives from our awareness of the membership in a social group and thus, the identification with a certain group (e.g. ethnicity) results in a clear and positive self-concept. Moscato et al. (2014) stated that our personal identity is largely determined by the fact of belonging to one or more groups whereby Lickel et al. (2000) argue that group membership has an important impact on every individual starting from what it considers as important, to the work it is doing to the emotions it feels. According to Shweder et al. (1998) forming an ethnic identity “.... involves taking on worldview beliefs and engaging in behavioural practices that unite people within a community.” These worldview beliefs – which can be considered as the subsume of beliefs, values and practices that an individual shares with its community – then become passed on from generation to generation through socialization and everyday practices like eating, dressing, family relationships, marriage, work and so forth (Jensen, 2003).

Studies on ethnic identity development argue that individuals fully achieve ethnic identity in late adolescence (Phinney, 1990) but acquire the capacity to form it in middle childhood (6 to 10 years) when their cognitive ability becomes more abstract and sophisticated (Aboud & Doyle, 1993). Researchers such as Bernal et al. (1990) who conducted a study with Mexican American children aged between 6 and 10 years also confirmed findings of previous studies by reporting that these children were already able to ethnically identify and label themselves correctly. The importance of a clear self-concept in terms of psychological outcomes has already been emphasized by scholars such as Campbell (1990) who argued that a clear self-concept is related to a higher self-esteem and well-being and every identity confusion can result in different motivational and emotional deficits like anxiety, depression, aggression and psychosomatic illness (Kernis et al., 1993).

However, in contemporary multicultural world – characterized by advancing globalization – ethnic identity formation has become a more complex issue than it was the case for earlier generations due to increased exposure to multiple worldview beliefs (Jensen, 2003). By reflecting on Arnett (2002) the author reasons that adolescence may be a particularly salient time to identity formation as it represents a time in which adolescents have not yet settled particular beliefs or behaviours and hence have an enhanced openness to new cultural beliefs and behaviours but still have achieved a degree of maturity that allows for more critical and
complex thinking on different life domains. This easier access to various worldview beliefs that become spread by today’s new socializing agents (such as internet, social media, movies, television etc.) have increased the degree of complexity as adolescents now can make more choices and commitments regarding cultural values. Therefore, forming an ethnic identity has become not only a process influenced by the socialization process within one owns cultural background but also by worldview beliefs from other cultures.

2.6 Immigration as Challenge to Identity

Verkuyten and Martinovic (2012) argue that “immigrants arrive in a new country with a sense of identity as members of their country of origin, for example, as Mexican, American, or Chinese”. Amiot et al. (2007) emphasized that social changes such as migration imply major intra-individual changes in the social identity of an individual meaning that the multiple social identities an individual holds undergo significant changes and require the reorganization of the entire self-concept and the integration of new acquired social identities into that self-concept. Therefore, Amiot et al. (2007) proposed a four-stage model of Social Identity Development and Integration in the Self in order to explain how changes in social self-identities are integrated and internalized prior and during cultural transition.

Identity changes in individuals are mostly starting with an anticipatory categorization which is a process that sets in in order to integrate a new identity. As most changes in life are planned and foreseen, at this stage, the individual engages in proactive activities such as planning, even though not being in actual contact with the new situation or with a new social group. During this investigative process, projection of self-characteristics and attributes are projected onto the new group memberships even though the source of information about one’s new group is only based on self-knowledge. From this form of anticipatory projection a feeling of unity with the new and still unknown in-group is perceived. This process of projection is known as self-anchoring and is the major process that defines this early stage of social identity change. Considering the situation of an immigrating individual to illustrate this early stage, this individual will start – even before arriving in its new host country and in absence of profound information about this new host society – to speculate which of his or her personal characteristics could also apply to the characteristics of the members in the new host society.

According to Amiot et al. (2007), in the second stage – which is called categorization – the individual finds him- or herself confronted with a new situation and with the existence of a new social group. Thus, the immigrated individual finds him- or herself in the new
host country context that provides him with an opportunity for a direct test of his or her assumptions made about the new host country during the first stage of anticipatory categorization. This second stage is characterized by recognition of the existence of distinct social identities and existing differences between these social identities such as values and behaviours which become heavily salient for the individual. As these characteristics of the new society are perceived as highly different – compared to one own’s “...the individual does not yet consider the possibility of being part of this group or of adopting features or elements to his or her own self-concept” (Amiot et al., 2007, pp. 151). This in turn results in a reinforcement of the individual own characteristics and in an enhanced sense of belonging to the original social group which makes this sense of belonging to the country of origin even more salient than before immigration. Further, the lack of knowledge and experience in the new host society prevents the individual from the opportunity of finding similarities between its country of origin and the new host country. Comparing it to acculturation attitudes (see later) the individual would adopt a separation attitude with a predominant identification with its original culture and rejection of host national identification.

In the third stage which Amiot et al. (2007) termed compartmentalization, due to increased contact with the new host society and its social groups, the individual starts to recognize and identify with old and new acquired identities and starts to perceive him- or herself as part of these various groups. Now the individual is less likely to engage in an all-or-nothing thinking hence new self-components starts to be more balanced with older self-components because they are not perceived as oppositional and totally external to the individual’s self. However, at this point the new self-components are not yet entirely integrated into the individual’s identity and therefore are still highly context dependent and kept compartmentalized. In fact, when interacting with family members the individual will feel distinctively native but feel increasingly as non-native when interacting with members of the new host society.

The last stage of Amiot et al. (2007) model is characterized by integration, whereby the individual having fully recognized that the various social identities are simultaneously important to him or her and can add to its overall self-concept in a positive manner. Additionally, these components are no longer context-dependent and these advances provides the individual with cognitive solutions for the integration of these multiple and distinct self-components that now result in a more complete and well-rounded person.

However, one shortcoming of this model is that it postulates a “best-case-scenario” in which the newly immigrated individual experiences the new host society and its culture as positive and is therefore inclined to adopt it to its older self-components. But, it does not con-
sider that negative experiences made by an individual within the host society context can lead to negative perceptions and evaluations of it and hence to other outcomes.

Barker (2015), for example, reported a complex and asymmetric process in which the assessment and hence selection of home compared to host culture aspects played a crucial role. The results yielded suggested that cultural features were treated as additive, integrative or mutually exclusive which entailed that host cultural features that were deemed desirable and beneficial were adopted, those deemed negative and contradictory were opposed, those deemed inferior to home culture became discarded and those superior retained.

Further, this model is designed only for individuals who plan their emigration in advance, but not for individuals who have are forced to leave their home country immediately and without planning (e.g. due to war etc.). This implies that the process of self-anchoring, which is considered as an important process in identity change by Amiot et al. (2007) does not come about and hence these individuals will find themselves confronted with a new society of settlement and potential identity related issues.

2.6.1 Bi-cultural or Dual Identity

Comparing Amiot et al. (2007) stage of integration with acculturation, this would correspond to Berry’s integration attitude or Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005) bi-cultural orientation or with what Lafromboise et al. (1993) described as cultural competence, where individual poses the abilities to live within two cultures without having to choose to favour one culture (culture of origin vs. new host culture) over the other.

Verkuyten and Martinovic (2012) refereed to this outcome as dual identity, which stands for a sense of national identification without distancing oneself from one’s culture of origin. For every individual there are different ways of managing multiple identities, from having a fused identity that is a mixture of both group identities to alternating between these different identities depending on the situational context. In literature the latter has become known as “cultural frame switching” (CFS) and refers to a bicultural person’s ability to switch between cultures depending on the context. Hong (2010) argued that bi-cultural individuals have the ability to use their dual cultural schemes in order to behave appropriately in cross-cultural settings. This bi-cultural competence is the result of behaviourl flexibility gained from multiple cultural experiences and now serves as ability to master cross-cultural interactions. It further allows bi-cultural individuals to switch between languages depending
on the social interaction context such as when dealing with own ethnic friends or with host nationals and frequent use further fosters the development of cognitive complexity.

Contemporary studies in the realm of identity argue that ethnic identity is a dynamic social construct that is malleable and adaptable depending on context and social situations and therefore can fluctuate across different contexts (Yip, 2005). Pham and Harris (2001) reported that – in their study among Vietnamese-Americans – participants reported being American or Vietnamese depends on the situation hence whether they are at home or away from home. In similar line are also the results yielded by researchers such as Arends-Toth and Vijver (2004) or Ouarasse and Vijver (2005) who reported variance in ethnic identity preference across private and public domains. Their study revealed that ethnic identity was more preferred in the private (social-emotional, value related) domain, whereas host cultural identity was more liked in the public (functional, utilitarian) domain.
3. CULTURE

When using the term culture, it often intends to refer to national or country culture, even though nationality does not define culture, as within regional boundaries there can co-exist different and distinct cultures at the same time. In a wider sense the term “culture” can be used to refer to different groups of individuals, which share certain characteristics in common such as an ethnic culture, generation culture (e.g. Baby Boomers, Generation X), professional culture (e.g. physicians), family culture and so forth. For the purpose of this thesis “culture” will refer to some definitions used in literature:

“Culture is to society what memory is to the individual” (Kluckohn, 1954)

“... culture as the entire social heritage of a group, including material culture and external structures, learned actions, and mental representations of many kinds ...” (D’Andrade, 1995, p. 212).

“... shared standard operating procedure, unstated assumptions, tools, norms, values, habits about sampling the environment, and the like”. (Berry & Triandis, 2004, p. 528)

According to these definitions, “…culture was conceptualized as a framework that includes cognitive, affective and behavioural elements that enables people to orient themselves in relation to one another and to the rest of the world and to experience and interpret the world in similar ways” (Barker, 2015, p. 57). Further, Herbig and Dunphy (1998) argued that culture establishes ways of behaviour, standards and ways of dealing with interpersonal and environmental relations and increases predictability. Culture sets the rules that the majority of a society obeys as it determines appropriate and inappropriate behaviour and hence social acceptance or unacceptance. Thus, as put forward by Matsumoto and Juang (2013), social complexity that results from the organization of our lives around groups, requires social coordination in order to avoid chaos and ensure efficient task accomplishment and hence survival. For the achievement of these goals psychological processes such as attitudes, values, behaviours as well as beliefs have been established with time, that are summarized under the abstract metaphor “culture”. Achievement and maintenance of harmony in society is therefore reached since cultural rules and norms guide our everyday lives and facilitates our interactions. Therefore, culture serves as binding link among members of the same culture, as they share similar thoughts, values and norms and gives these members a sense of a common identity.
3.1 Sources of Origin of Culture

Culture is not a recently emergent phenomenon, as fossil evidence suggests that cultures may have existed at least 1 million years ago and may have its origin more than 5 million years ago (Hofstede et al., 2010). Ever since, life on earth existed as an interrelationship with its environment and can therefore be traced back to three sources at starting point of its creation: ecology, resources and people (Matsumoto and Juang, 2013).

3.1.1 Ecology

According to Hofstede et al. (2010) ever since, human life was organized around groups as humans are social beings. However, the places humans chose to live had substantial impacts on the creation of culture. One aspect of ecology that has received substantial interest is that of climate. Climate can impact culture as it dictates and produces different ways of living which in turn creates different cultures. Exemplary are regions of hot or cold climates, which make life more demanding and difficult to adjust and adapt. These regions require special clothing and housing, special organization for the production and storage of food or different work arrangements and so forth. Matsumoto and Juang, (2013) bring in the example of Spain, where working hours have been adjusted the climatic conditions found in Spain, which entails that shops and offices are closed during mid-afternoon, which is the hottest time of the day. Thus, working hours were pushed back and dinner at 11pm became a common habit. However, harsher climatic conditions can create higher risks of food shortage and spoilage.
and health problems (such as infectious and parasitic diseases, which more often can be found in hotter climatic regions).

These climatic differences that can result in different food supplies and health conditions are also impacting the population density of regions. Regions, where food can be grown and thus the survival of its population can be ensured and sustained, will attract more people than regions with harsh climatic conditions. This in turn can impact the amount of contact people have with each other and with other cultures (e.g. recluse life of aboriginal people in Amazonas region). However, regional segregation can also result from geological conditions like is the case for many pacific islands which are bounded by oceans. This regional segregation can result in the creation of different mentalities compared to mentalities found in regions (e.g. Europe), where many different cultures are accessible since they lie close together on one continent.

3.1.2 Resources

The presence of absence of valuable resource can influence the creation of culture as well. Natural resource like water or land to grow food or animals can impact values and attitudes people hold. A region scarce of resources will foster values like teamwork and community spirit, cooperativeness and interdependence among its members as it ensures survival of the community. Whereas in regions with abundant resources these values are not essential for the residing population, and hence will not become part of their culture. Regions with harsh climatic conditions and/or scarce resources have pushed cultures toward emphasized values like hospitality, cooperativeness and companionship (Matsumoto and Juang, 2013).

In his historical analysis about ancient Greece and China Nisbett (2003) provided insights into how the interplay between ecology, resources and people resulted in different cultural values. Nisbett observed that ancient China was predominantly made up of agricultural people, which needed to get along with each other, whereas in ancient Greece trading, hunting, fishing and herding did not require to live in the same stable community. These differences in ecology and resources resulted in different living arrangements and hence different cultural values (collectivism vs. individualism).
3.1.3 People

The fact that humans are social beings has contributed to the formation of groups and hence to the creation of culture. Certainly, the formation of groups had more substantial reasons as it ensured survival for many reasons. Basic human needs, which are universal to every human in every culture such as physical needs (need to eat, drink sleep, shelter, warmth, safety and security) need to be met in order to ensure survival and ensure reproduction. Thus, a solitary survival in an environment with exposure to attacks of animals, hunting and growing food, raising children and so forth was more difficult to ensure than survival within a group, in which its members were taking care of each other. Groups were also more efficient in providing those needs as it allowed for the division of labour hence more tasks were accomplished within a group than by one person alone. The accomplishment of more tasks in turn, ensured an increase in the survival rate of its members. Noteworthy, that the formation of groups had downsides as well, as living in groups can represent a source for social conflict and chaos among its members.

Nevertheless, in order to adapt to specific environments humans needed to find solutions to address issues that arose from the different contexts they were living in such as physical environment, social factors, types and sizes of their families and communities. Fortunately, nature and evolution has equipped humans with cognition and aptitudes such as memory, cognition, hypothetical reasoning, problem solving skills, planning and so forth that allowed to address their basic needs. Hence, these universal psychological toolkits have allowed humans to create values, beliefs, norms and attitudes that resulted from their life in different environmental contexts and which are today inherent elements of every culture. Further, with the creation of language and writing systems humans were endowed with the capability to maintain complex social systems (e.g. laws, regulations for cohabitation etc.) and passing on these elements of their culture to future generations.

3.2 Influence of Culture

Theoretical perspectives on the influence of culture on psychology and human behaviour are wide-spread and opposing (Berry & Triandis, 2004). The “absolutist” perspective, for example, assumes that culture has no or little influence on the development or expression of human behaviour, as only genes play a role in differences in behaviour between individuals (Gifford, 2008). In contrast, the “relativism” perspective emphasizes that culture is of utmost
importance when trying to study or carry out psychological research and therefore psychological research can-not be done without its consideration, as virtually all of our behaviour is influenced by culture (Richerson & Boyd, 2004). Whereas the “universalism” perspective argues that human behaviour is the product of large number of innate modules in the brain, which become activated by environmental cues, which then initiate production of behaviour and hence is evoked by specific circumstance in the social environment (Barkow et al., 1992).

Nevertheless, different scholars (like Berry & Triandis, 2004; Matsumoto & Juang, 2013; Richerson & Boyd, 2005) argue that all our behaviour is partly influenced by the culture in which we developed and thus, without taking cultural aspects into consideration no complete account of psychological phenomena can be made. For a better illustration of the interrelatedness of culture on psychological processes, like behaviours and mental processes, the authors Matsumoto and Juang (2013), summarized these processes as a dynamic system illustrated in Figure 3.2. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, culture is the adaptational response to the conditions of our environments – ecology, resources and people – that has resulted in the production of different ways of living in order to meet basic needs and hence ensure survival and genetic diversity. After birth the cultural transmission process that is known as enculturation and socialization (c.f. chapter 3.4 Enculturation) starts, in order to impart established values, beliefs, norms, attitudes and behaviours. This cultural learning process in turn shapes the individual’s psychological characteristics of perception and cognition and hence how it perceives and thinks about the world, how it expresses its emotions and how it interacts with others and so forth.

![Figure 3.2: How does Culture Affect Behaviour](Source: Matsumoto & Juang 2013, p. 29)
Albeit culture being one of the major factors of influence on behaviour and mental processes, individual factors such as personality, biological and physiological factors, human nature, and situational context can have important impacts on its outcomes as well. Although, the power of the situational context on our behaviour comes mostly from culture – as culture provides it with meaning – it also serves as the mediator between cultural and individual factors as in some contexts, behaviour may be influenced by culture, whereas in other contexts behaviour may be influenced by individual characteristics.

3.2.1 Cognition and Perception

As mentioned earlier, culture does not only influence how individuals think and act, but does also influence cognitive process and hence, how individuals perceive and categorize their surrounding world. According to the Law of Cultural Differentiation (Ferguson, 1956, p. 121 as cited in Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989, p. 498) which “holds that while all populations likely have the same perceptual and cognitive process, and the same potential for perceptual and cognitive development, ecological and cultural factors prescribe what shall be learned and at what age; consequently different cultural environments lead to the development of different patterns of ability”. Therefore, fundamental psychological processes of perception and cognition are dependent from sampled environmental information but during evolution, every culture developed conventions for the sampling and weighting of these kinds of information (Mishra, 2001).

In the last couple of years, different studies in the realm of cultural cognition and perception have revealed different processes that are culturally influenced. One cognitive process that is influenced by culture is that of learning and memory. Ross and Millson (1970) found that members of literate societies have a decreased memory capacity, as they rely heavily on written records, whereas members of society with strong oral traditions have a better memory capacity.

Colour coding and categorization do also vary among cultures, as different societies do not have the same array of colour terms to describe colour spectrums. The study was put forward by Berlin and Kay (1969 as cited in Berry et al., 2011) among bilingual residents from 20 different languages residing in San Francisco. The researchers found that colour terms for black, white and red, existed in all 20 languages, whereas terms decreased for other colours such as green (19), yellow (18), blue (16), brown and purple (15), grey (14), pink (13)
and eleven for orange. Exemplary for this circumstance is cultural difference between blue and green. Some societies only use one term for both colours, hence do not differentiate between them, whereas most other societies use two different terms for blue and green. In sum, it was found that culturally simpler societies had fewer terms for basic colours than have industrial countries.

Another process that is culturally conditioned is the emphasis placed on different skills. Exemplary for this cultural circumstance is the emphasize put in Asian countries on Mathematics. In a study (Geary et al., 1992) among Chinese and American school children it was found that Chinese children had better mathematical problem solving skills compared to US children. Chinese children were not only faster in calculating, they were also performing three times better than did children from the US.

Not only is our cognition affected by culture but also our perception. In a meta-analytical review conducted by Meissner and Brigham (2001) it was found that, individuals tend to have an “own-race-bias”. The “own-race-bias” or the “cross-ethnicity-effect” influences our memory and recognition of faces. Due to the “own-race-bias” individuals tend to possess a better memory for faces of their own ethnic group and experience difficulties in recognizing faces of members of other ethnic groups.

Even though, research discusses on the influence of culture on our perception and cognition, Benson (2003) puts forward that no "culture-free" test or studies are possible since results and the validity on such tests is inevitably influenced by familiarity with the culture in which these tests were developed. Therefore, comparing people from various cultures according to a standard measures is only possible when people are assessed in the light of their own values and concepts.

3.2.2 Stereotypes – Prejudice – Discrimination

Liebkind (2004) argues that culture is an important factor in predicting discrimination as culture defines “… who constitutes ‘us’ and who constitutes ‘them’” (p. 337). Culture also serves as determinant for acceptable level of expressed bias, and serves as differentiation for describing perceived difference between social categories. Berry et al. (2011) argue that in order to understand psychological process of discrimination, which is a process on the individual level, it is important to examine the cultural context (group factors) such as history, economy and politics in order to obtain an overall view of the dynamics involved. Thus, in-
Intercultural relation distinguishes between three processes: stereotype (cognitive), prejudice (mainly evaluative) and discrimination (engagement in behaviour) (Figure 3.3).

3.2.2.1 Stereotypes

As mentioned earlier similar cognitive processes that are in place in constructing social identity are also the source for stereotyping (c.f. in chapter 2.4 Social Identity Complexity). In this cognitive process individual perception about similarities and differences among different objects are the source for distinction and categorization. Similarities then become attributed to members of the category, whereas observed differences are serving as basis for differentiation of categories. The final generalization that is made, assumes that all members of a category share the same basic attributes and ignores individual differences among its group members. Hence, stereotyping serves as mental scheme for a collective social representation of a group. Liebkind (2004) argues that stereotypes are often extreme, simple and negative, if the groups involved share a long history of conflicts. They are also symmetrical, while rating one owns groups a positive and attributing them only positive attitudes whereas the outgroup is considered as negative. This in turn results in a reciprocal process that takes also
place on the side of the out-group and is resulting in a “mirror image” pattern. This phenomenon has been studied in East-Africa by Brewer and Campbell in 1976 among members of 30 different cultural groups. The researchers found evidence that – if two groups were in conflict with each other – each group described themselves as “peaceful” whereas the other group was described as “warlike”. Liebkind (2004, p. 344) further states that “… stereotypes can also act as ideological representation for groups that are used to justify and legitimize existing social and power relations within a society.”

3.2.2.2 Prejudice

Researchers such as Stephan et al. (2005, p. 2) point out “…that fear and perceptions of threat play an important role in prejudice toward outgroups in general and immigrants in particular”. Prejudice refers to the evaluation of groups, which is a negative orientation toward a cultural or ethno cultural group (Berry et al. 2011). The Integrated Threat Theory on Prejudice (ITT) by Stephan and Stephan (1996) argue on four causal factors as source for prejudice: negative stereotypes, intergroup anxiety, realistic threats and symbolic/cultural threats. The perception of this form of threats can result in prejudices, even in absence of a real threat. Intergroup anxiety refers to the anxiety anticipated that a personal interaction with an out-group member could result in a personal threat. Realistic threats are those in economic, physical and political terms and refer to group conflicts, competition for scarce resources, or threat to own well-being. Symbolic threat refers to beliefs that own culture is threatened or undermined, or will be override by the presence of other outgroup cultures.

Findings that support the ITT were made by Montreuil and Bourhis (2001) in their study on acculturation orientations in the region of Quebec, Canada among Quebecois Francophones. They found evidence that prejudices against French-speaking immigrants from Haiti and France were prevailing because of a perceived threat emanating from these outgroups. The authors concluded that one reason might be a perceived threat on the survival of Quebec because these immigrated groups could vote for political parties that favour federalist Canadian Unity the Quebecois French separatist parties. Further, these French-speaking immigrants could also become competitors on the labour market for desirable jobs within the public and private sector, where French-speaking skills are mandatory.
Similar findings were made by Gonzales et al. (2008) when examining Dutch adolescent’s attitudes towards Muslim minorities. Perceived symbolic threats and negative stereotypes were found to be the sources for prejudices against Muslims.

3.2.2.3 Discrimination

The outcome of stereotypes and prejudices is the level of discrimination within a society. Verkuyten and Martinovic (2012) described discrimination as unfair treatment, which tells people that they are not equal members of society and that their society is less valuable. Maisonneuve and Teste (2007) stated – referring to Sherif and Sherifs Theory of Real Conflict – that discrimination could be explained by competition between groups reasoning that studies have identified economic security as one key determinator for hostility on the side of host societies which becomes perceived as real threat with the arrival of immigrants on the job market. Further, scholars like Liebkind (2004) argue that discrimination does not necessarily lead to open intergroup hostility. Discrimination can also manifest itself in an unequal access to resources depriving out-groups.

So far, different studies (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2006) in the realm of identity have found strong support for the relationship between perceived discrimination and national identification and conceptualized it as the Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM). This model argues that perceived discrimination presents a threat to one’s social identity which can result into an increase in own ethnic identification and distancing from host cultural identification. Consequently, perceived social rejection and devaluation might result not only in enhanced own ethnic identification, but also in decreased identification with host society.

3.3 Enculturation

“A form of cultural transmission by which a society transmits its culture and behaviour to its members by surrounding developing members with appropriate models” (Berry et al., 2002, p. 478)
In any society, childhood is a dynamic period of time and key transition of learning occurs at 9 to 12 months, which sets the stage for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year of life, where infants begin to imitatively learn (Tomasello, 2000). During this process of raising up cultural values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours are passed on by socialization agents – such as parents, peer, siblings, school, church etc. – and thus become learnt.

The first to use the term cultural transmission was Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman (1981) in analogy to the concept of biological transmission, which takes place through vertical transmission (Figure 3.4). For cultural transmission there are two possible forms namely horizontal transmission such as from peers and oblique transmission such as from other agents of the parental generation in the society. These three forms of cultural transmission further entail two other processes namely: enculturation and socialization. During the process of enculturation cultural appropriate behaviours are incorporated into the individuals repertoire through enfolding in the context of the own culture. Whereas socialization represents a form of acquisition of cultural appropriate behaviours through specific training and instructions.

This process of cultural transmission is a prolonged process, which takes a considerable period of time with much practice and involves mimicry\(^3\) and imitation\(^4\) as one aspect of learning. Experimental studies (Meltzoff & More, 1994) on imitation have shown that imitation

\(^3\) Mimicry refers to the application of a model’s action in the absence of insight into why those actions are effective, or even what goal they served (Tomasello et al. 1993)

\(^4\) Imitation refers to the recognition and reproduction of the goal of the observed behavior, as well as the specific actions that brought about that goal (Tomasello, 1990)
tion is a powerful way for children to learn by observing adults and thus reproducing the behaviour observed by their socializing agents. Psychological aspects of learning such as the operant conditioning will then be used by the socializing agents as mechanism to confirm approval or disapproval for the infants displayed behaviour by using sanctioning or rewarding. These in turn will work as positive or negative reinforcement in order to correct or maintain the displayed behaviour. According to Berry et al. (2011, p. 44) the process of cultural transmission does not necessarily lead to an exact replication of cultural appropriate behaviours. The result of this process falls between exact transmission (hardly any differences between children and parents) and complete failure of transmission (children who are unlike their parents or culture). Cultural transmission resulting in one of the aforementioned extremes would not allow for changes that are needed in order to respond to new environmental demands and furthermore would not permit for coordinated action between members and among generations and therefore would be problematic for any society.

With time, cultural appropriate patterns of behaviours become internalized and ubiquitous and engagement into these appropriate patterns occurs automatically and unconsciously. Therefore, cultural aspects in values and behaviours can only be inferred from the way people act under various circumstance (Hofstede et al., 2010). For that reason, when asking individuals about typical aspects of their culture, it proves difficult to name typical characteristics or differences, as own culture is seen as something natural. It is only when encountering individuals from other cultural settings that are displaying different behaviours, attitudes and values, that individual are becoming aware of these differences and which then activates the process of ethnocentrism. According to Berry and Triandis (2004), ethnocentrism is one of the main human conditions as most individuals are limited to only know their own culture and thus are bound to it. This cultural knowledge is then used as reference or standard to compare own culture with those of other individuals. As these standards are used for comparisons with other cultures, any deviation from their norms and values is seen as wrong or sometimes as even immoral and most human conflicts can be traced back to the notion of ethnocentrism.

3.4 Cultural Change & Evolution

As mentioned before, cultural change is necessary in order respond to changing environmental conditions. Hofstede et al. (2010) put forward that over the last millions of years, human mankind has gone through an accelerating process of cultural evolution and has diversified in a way similar to groups of species in the natural world. Over the last 100,000 years
cultural evolution has outpaced that of biological evolution, which explains the great changes in human circumstances and the rapid increase in human population over the last 50,000 years (Gifford, 2008). Further, cultural evolution can be regarded as adaptation measure executed in forms of imitation in order to keep pace with changes in environmental conditions. However, social learning via imitation was only possible through the co-evolution of genes and culture, which equipped homo sapiens with larger brains in order to facilitate rapid and accurate social learning. One advantageous aspect of social learning via imitation is that it avoids the costly trial-and-error process in individual learning, which enabled the process of progress and improvement. Furthermore, according to Gifford (2008), improvement of cultural components already in use, was only possible through conscious attempts and not the product of randomness.

Today, scientific discoveries and innovations, such as in transportation or communication, can bring about major changes in the way of living of people and hence in cultures. “The paradox is that practices and technologies can change so fast only because, and as long as, societies function in stable ways” (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 456). The authors reason that in order to be adaptive to the environment a society needs collective action to respond to these changes. However, collective action requires cultural homogeneity and cultural homogeneity does not allow for rapid change in values. Therefore, change in values can only occur over generation but still at a faster pace than in biology. Further, Hofstede (2003, p. 34) argued, that albeit modernization will lead to somewhat similar developments in different societies, diversity will not decrease as response to these events. Diversity will even increase, as response to different coping strategies inherent in pre-existing values systems across societies.
4. CULTURAL TRANSITION

4.1 The Acculturation Framework

“Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149)

“… process by which individuals incorporate beliefs, behaviours and values from the new host culture into the context of beliefs, behaviours and values of the native culture” (Lueck & Wilson, 2010, p. 48)

The concept of acculturation has been first proposed by anthropologist by the mid-19th century and was originally thought to be a group-level (cultural) phenomenon until psychologist strong interest in the individual has contributed to an enlargement of the concept and to a distinction between group and individual level. A distinction between group and individual level is important as human behaviour interacts with the cultural and ecological context within it occurs (Berry et al. 2015). Without this distinction “psychology in turn would not be in a position to interpret these behaviours and behavioural changes that take place following this contact” (Berry, 2006, p. 720). Hence, the process of acculturation can be seen as a person-context relationship, and
without taking all factors involved into consideration no comprehensive picture of this process can be gained. Figure 4.1 illustrates a framework for the understanding of the processes and factors involved in the acculturation process:

Before attempting to understand the changes an individual undergoes during cultural transition, it is prerequisite to understand both cultures (cultural/group level) that are getting into contact with each other. During cultural transition an individual from one culture (A) is getting into contact with its new host society culture (B). For understanding the dynamics involved in this transition an examination of the cultural context the individual is coming from and of the cultural characteristics that accompany this individual is needed. This in turn helps to draw conclusions about factors such as degree of voluntarism that underlies immigration and other factors prior to immigration such as political, economic and demographic conditions in the country of origin that may influence an individual’s acculturation. Further, the culture of the new host society and its policies and orientations towards immigration need to be examined in order to obtain a comprehensive picture of all underlying factors and dynamics on the group level. However, following this contact an inevitable change on both sides will occur. Gronewold and Van Ginneken (2009) argued that – despite immigrating individuals undergoing the largest adaptations following this contact – every contact between the native population of the receiving society and the immigrant groups leads to impacts on the cultural orientations of all groups involved. Hence, social interaction between individuals from different cultural backgrounds is resulting in changing cultural features (such as religious conversion, new political and economic structures) in both societies following this contact. Berry (2004) claimed that these changes can be sometimes easily accomplished or sometimes source for major cultural disruptions. Allport’s contact hypothesis (1954) – that relates to this type of social interactions – states that the outcomes can be of positive nature such as mutual appreciation, tolerance, respect, cultural enrichment and learning or to result in negative ones, such as prejudice, stereotype, increased tension, hostility and so forth.

As individual differences in psychological characteristics exist, not every individual will undergo acculturation process in the same way. This circumstance entails a shift from the group to the individual level to account for these differences and variations and hence subsequent changes. Berry et al. (1987) distinguished among five categories of changes in environmental features an individual is faced with when undergoing cultural transition:
• **physical changes** such as a new place of living, new type of housing, more pollution or increased population density

• **biological factors** such as new nutritional status and new diseases

• **cultural changes** such as changes in political, economic, technical, linguistic, religious and social institutions

• changes in **social relationships** such as in-group vs. outgroup and exerted dominance patterns by these groups

• **behavioural and psychological changes** and an alteration in mental health. These changes can be of more problematic nature leading to uncertainty, anxiety and depression that could result from the individuals attempt to adapt to its new culture.

In order to cope with these new environmental features the individual faces in its new environment, it needs to undergo changes in order to reach adaptation. According to Berry et al. (1987) these changes include **behavioural shifts** such as changes in language knowledge and use, in food and dressing or in identity, which usually take place without great difficulties. Those changes that challenge the individual sometimes beyond its ability to cope with are called **acculturative stress** (such as change in identity) that can result in disruptions in normal daily functioning. Only in the final step an adaptation is reached, which are primarily of internal **psychological** nature such as sense of well-being and self-esteem and of **sociocultural** nature manifested in the activities of daily intercultural living.

However, a recent study conducted by Berry and Ataca (2002) reported that adaptation is multifaceted and not uniform, as factors such as socio-economic status or gender can impact outcomes of adaptation. Women covered in their study – for example – exhibited lower levels of psychological adaptation compared to men. Further, individuals of lower socio-economic status exhibited lower levels of sociocultural adaptation such as lack in foreign language proficiency and lacking interest in approaching host nationals but exhibited higher levels on psychological adaptation compared to individuals of higher socio-economic status who were socio-culturally well adapted. Therefore, socio-cultural adaptation does not imply psychological adaptation and vice versa.
4.2 Acculturation Attitudes & Expectations

4.2.1 Individual Level

In the past decades, the conceptualization of acculturation has moved from a traditional one-dimensional model and evolved to a bi-dimensional one. The traditional one-dimensional model (e.g. Gordon, 1964) emphasized that, immigrant individuals with time are moving on a continuum between heritage cultural maintenance and complete immersion into the new host culture. The underlying assumption was that – with time – every individual would become absorbed into the new host culture and thus, become assimilated.

This notion that considered acculturation as a linear process of change altered by the introduction of Berry’s bi-dimensional Framework of Acculturation introduced in 1989. Initially, this model was designed to gauge cultural attitudes, but was later enlarged to incorporate identity, social behaviour and motivations. According to Berry (2005), not all individuals undergo acculturation in the same way, as different factors prior and during acculturation can lead to different degrees of acculturation and hence adaptation. These variations of preferences in terms of acculturation became known as “acculturation attitudes” or “acculturation strategies” (formerly “relational attitudes”) when examined among immigrants and as “acculturation expectations” among host nationals. (For the purpose of this thesis the term “acculturation attitudes” will be used hereinafter). Berry further stated that acculturation attitudes and expectations are held by all groups involved – host nationals and immigrant groups –
when experiencing intercultural relations, whether they are explicit or implicit. These sets of attitudes towards acculturation are based on two underlying issues (Berry, 2005, p. 704):

1) Relative preference for maintaining one’s heritage culture and identity and
2) relative preference for having contact with and participating in the larger society along with other cultural groups.

From these two basic issues faced by all individuals’ undergoing cultural transition four acculturation attitudes can be derived (Figure 4.2, red marked field):

**Integration:** Individuals that seek both maintenance of heritage culture but also seek interaction with host society. Hence, these types of individuals successfully combine their own ethnic group customs and norms with those maintained by host society.

**Assimilation:** Individuals do not want to maintain their heritage cultural and seek daily interaction with host society members thus these individuals favour shedding their culture and becoming immersed into the host society. These individuals favour to less own their ethnic group norms and customs and to adopt mostly the customs and norms maintained by the host society.

**Separation:** Individuals want to maintain their heritage culture identity and avoid interactions with host nationals. These individuals are primarily guided by their own ethnic group norms and attitudes and less by those held by the host society.

**Marginalization:** Individuals that are not interested in maintaining neither their heritage cultural identity nor have interest in having relations with host nationals.
4.2.2 Group Level

From the point of view of host nationals, attitudes towards acculturation are referred to as “acculturation expectations” and are carrying different names. These expectations result from two dimensions with respect to the acceptance of host nationals that immigrants conserve their heritage culture and acceptance of host nationals that immigrants adopt the host culture. These patterns of expectations have been recognized by Berry and his associates in 1977 (Berry et al., 1977) during a research on the perception of immigrants by host nationals conducted in Canada, and conceptualized as the “multicultural ideology” (Figure 4.2). These attitudes and expectations held by host society on the acculturation and adaptations outcomes of immigrants are mutually and reciprocally influencing each other and can be derived from four major orientations in terms of plural societies5 (Figure 4.2, red marked field) (Berry, 1997):

- Melting pot: refers to the existence of one single dominant group (host society) and minority groups (immigrants) within a society, with the later intended to be absorbed into the host society in order to reach “one people, one culture, and one nation”. Hence, heritage culture of the minority groups should literally disappear in order to reach the goal of cultural unification.

---

5 “A culturally plural society is one in which a number of different cultural groups reside together within a shared social and political framework” (Berry, 2011, p. 2.2)
• **Multiculturalism**: Society, in which members of different ethno cultural groups, which retain their sense of heritage cultural identity, participate in one social framework (legal, economic, political) that, accommodates all groups.

• **Segregation**: host nationals prefer avoiding all relations with immigrant population.

• **Exclusion**: preference of host nationals to see immigrant population leave.

The interrelationship between these mutual acculturation attitudes have later also been apprehended and further conceptualized by other researchers such as Bourhis et al. (1997) refereeing to it as “Interactive Acculturation Model” (IAM). For the evaluation of these expectations Bourhis et al. (1997) also created the “Host Community Acculturation Scale” (HCAS) that should evaluate the four orientations conceptualized by Berry plus a fifth orientation that encompasses the preference of host nationals to consider merits of individual cases in order to evaluate individual people rather than groups (Maisonneuve, 2007). Researchers such as Barette et al. (2004) apprehending the HCA scale for their study, found preference among host society nationals for the multicultural orientation, which is also consistent with the findings of Berry (1977) in Canada.

However, even though multiculturalism may be legally and politically encouraged and fostered, host society members may still hold different attitudes towards different groups of immigrant groups. IAM (Bourhis et al., 1997) proposes that host nationals acculturation expectations towards immigrants may be influenced and hence vary depending on the national origin of the immigrant groups. In particular, this model distinguishes between the preference of host nationals for “valued” and “devalued” immigrant groups, which are evaluated on similarities with respect to similar culture, religion or already existing stereotypes. Consequently, those groups perceived as more similar are evaluated as “valued immigrants”, whereas those that are perceived to differ considerably on these factors are seen as “devalued”. Studies by Montreuil and Bourhis (2001 & 2004) found evidence that the multicultural orientation was preferred only for valued immigrants, whereas orientations of segregation or exclusion were held towards devalued immigrant groups, who often belonged to visible minorities (e.g. Haitians in Quebec). The strongest predictors for segregation and exclusionist orientations were feeling of being threatened by the presence of immigrants, tendency to endorse authoritarian and ethnocentric belief systems and held beliefs that immigrant groups were not interested in good relationship with host nationals.

---

6 “… the orientation that accepts both the maintenance of cultural identity and characteristics of all ethno cultural groups and the contact and participation of all groups in the larger plural society.” (Berry et al. 2002, p. 375)
Leong and Ward (2006) used data from the Eurobarometer Survey regarding attitudes towards immigration and multiculturalism to examine the relationships on Hofstede’s and Schwartz’s cultural values variations. The researcher found evidence that national values – such as mastery, masculinity, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism – are linked to weaker support for policies that promote multiculturalism. Values of masculinity and mastery were further found to be associated with pessimistic views and attitudes toward multiculturalism. As socioeconomic variables (such as GNP and unemployment rates) were also included in the study, evidence was found that more affluent countries had more policies regarding promotion of multiculturalism and intercultural contact.

However, these different attitudes held by host nationals towards different immigrant groups, may also be displayed by different degrees of prejudices and discriminatory behaviours, which in turn could influence acculturation attitudes of immigrant groups within the new host society (c.f. in chapter 5.3.3 perceived discrimination).

### 4.3 Acculturative Stress

According to Berry et al. (1987, p. 492) “… the concept of acculturative stress refers to one kind of stress, that in which the stressors are identified as having their sources in the process of acculturation”. According to Lueck and Wilson (2011) acculturative stress is the psychological impact on the process of cultural adaptation. Acculturative stress is further defined as a reduction in mental health and well-being of ethnic minorities that occurs during the process of adaptation to a new culture that can lead to adjustment related difficulties, expressed in negative reactions to the tensions between two cultures (Berry, 1998 & 2008 as cited in Lueck & Wilson, 2011).

Every individual that undergoes cultural transition will experience acculturation in the new host society within a particular environmental context such as in a native settlement or within an immigrant community (Figure 4.3 - left box). Depending on the varying degrees of environmental change and the thereof required behavioural changes the new environment requires – the experience of acculturation will vary from much to little. Berry et al. (2002) distinguished between two aspects of behavioural change, namely cultural shedding and cultural learning. The first is characterized by a deliberate or accidental loss of typical cultural or behavioural features from the culture of origin that follows with time after entering the host society. Whereas cultural learning is characterized by an accidental or deliberate acquisition of behavioural or cultural features that are characteristic for the new society of settlement.
However, behavioural change does in most of the cases not encompass all behaviours because these patterns of maintenance and change are variable. Hence, some old cultural patterns become replaced and substituted by patterns of the new host society, while others remain alive. One reason for this circumstance might be the different contents of culture in particular the objective and subjective elements. Objective elements such as clothes, foods, eating behaviours and so forth can be easily recognized and imitated. Whereas subjective elements such as values, beliefs, norms and attitudes are not obvious on first sight and require long-term cultural involvement and participation in the new host society until they become revealed and internalized.

These behavioural changes required, will influence the perceived degree of stressors (presented in the middle box) and will vary from many to few, depending on the individual’s perception of changes in the environmental context. For some individuals the experience of cultural transition may be perceived as an accumulation of stressors, whereas for other individuals this experience might be perceived as a form of opportunity. The result of the acculturation process is hence a perceived acculturative stress of varying degrees. Berry (2005, p. 708) argues that in terms of acculturative stress endorsing integration as acculturation outcome represents the least stressful outcome, followed by separation and assimilation attitudes which are varying with sometimes the one and sometimes the other being the less stressful one and, with marginalization representing the most stressful outcome.
Berry et al. (2002), however, suggested that the relationship between these three concepts should be seen probabilistic rather than deterministic, as these relationships are not fixed and are rather likely to occur. Further, the relationship between these three concepts may be influenced by moderating factors such as nature of the larger society; demographic, social and psychological characteristics of the individual (indicated in the lower box and will be elaborated in more detail in the next chapters). Even though, psychological characteristics will not be elaborated in more detail in this paper, they refer to personality traits such as the Five Factor Model (FFM) also called the “Big Five” (for further reading: *Cross-Cultural Research on the Five-Factor Model of Personality* by McCrae, 2002). These characteristics of the individual relate to the varying coping strategies an individual poses in order to cope with the acculturation experiences and stress. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984) coping strategies can be seen as behavioural and cognitive efforts that are directed towards the reduction of effects resulting from stress. Moreover, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) distinguished between problem and emotion-orientated coping strategies, with the first relating to the resolution of the problem by trying to find appropriate solutions or taking action against the source of the problem. Whereas emotion-oriented coping strategies refer to a reduction in the level of distress by ventilating negative feelings or focusing on the expression of tension, which result from the stressful situation of acculturation. In a study conducted by Kosic (2004) among immigrants in Rome, the influence of coping strategies on acculturation strategies and acculturative stress was confirmed and emphasized that coping and acculturation are closely related, as acculturation can be defined as coping with a new and unfamiliar culture or as specific strategy in cross-cultural adaptation.

### 4.4 Adaptation

In the past, the outcomes of psychological acculturation have been the focus of much research on immigration (Berry, 1997; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999; Ward & Kennedy, 1994). Resulting from the attempts of coping with a changing cultural environment the final step of the acculturation process is known as adaptation and takes place within an individual (intrinsic) as a response to external demands. The initial distinction between the two facets of cultural adaptation namely psychological (emotional/affective) and sociocultural (behavioural) adaptation was first proposed by Searle and Ward (1990) by virtue of their interrelatedness. According to the authors, *psychological adaptation* refers to how comfortable and happy an individual feels in its new host environment and hence, refers to well-being and satisfaction.
In contrast, *sociocultural adaptation* refers to behavioural and practical aspects of acquiring culturally appropriate skills that allows a successful mastery of day-to-day life in the new host society. “Dealing successfully with problems and positive interactions with members of the dominant culture are likely to improve one’s feelings of wellbeing and satisfaction; similarly, it is easier to accomplish tasks and develop positive interpersonal relations if one is feeling well and accepted” (Ataca & Berry, 2002, p. 14). This distinction was also confirmed by the results obtained by Berry et al. (2006) in their study conducted among first and second generation youth in 13 countries. The researchers found evidence that those adolescents that were psychological and socio-culturally well-adapted showed fewer psychological problems, higher self-esteem and life satisfaction and displayed fewer behaviour problems and good school adjustment.

Moreover, it is assumed (Searle & Ward, 1990) that *psychological adaptation* is further influenced by personal characteristics and is associated with increased personal flexibility, relationship satisfaction, approach-orientated coping styles and use of humour. *Sociocultural adaptation*, in contrast, is influenced by the length of residence in the new society, cultural knowledge, amount of interaction with host nationals, language fluency and acculturation attitudes, which are the source of cultural learning and social skills acquisition. Therefore, it is argued (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). that these two adjustive outcomes, that are inter-related but still distinct, are displaying tendencies for fluctuation over time with *sociocultural adaption* following a learning curve with rapid improvements within the first few months after cultural transition and then reaching a stable level. In contrast, *psychological adaption* is more variable over time, but has the tendency of provoking the greatest difficulties at the early stages of cultural transition.

Researchers such as Ward et al. (1998) emphasized on the limitations of the U-curve proposition, which has assumed a central position in theory and research on cultural transition and adjustment in the past decades. Contrary to the U-curve proposition, the researchers reported that both – psychological (in form of depression) and sociocultural (in form of social difficulty) adaptation problems were greatest at entry into the host cultural society. These adjustive problems decreased between entry and four months after transition and exhibited no further significant changes six and twelve months after. Therefore the researchers argued on the limitations of the euphoric “honeymoon” stage of entry into a new country and state that entry stage in their study was rather characterized by psychological distress rather than by euphoria. They reason that entry is the point in time at which the individual experiences the greatest changes and further has the most limited resource and social support to cope with
psychological distress. Similarly are the expected sociocultural difficulties at the point of entry, because the individual has least familiarity with and knowledge about the host society and limited experience with host nationals. Hence, adaption problems decrease markedly in the early period and continue to decrease slightly over time as the individuals has the experiences and opportunity of interacting with host nationals and immerse itself in the host culture. Therefore, the researchers (Ward et al., 1998) argue that the magnitude of relationship between psychological and sociocultural adjustment may be affected by a variety of factors such as individuals need, capacity and opportunity for interaction with host society and small vs. larger cultural transitions in terms of cultural distance.

However, Berry (2005) argues that adaptation does not necessarily imply that adaption does lead to an improvement in the fit between the individual and its new environment. Contrary, adaption may also involve resistance and attempts to change the environment. Therefore, the valence of long-term adaption can be positive and negative in its outcomes and can vary from poor – with individuals that are unable to carry their lives on in the new host society – to well adapted, with individuals who successfully master their lives in the new environment (Berry, 2005). Hence, in order to gain a complete picture it is prerequisite to consider the acculturation attitudes internalized. Best adaptations outcomes in terms of both – psychological as well as sociocultural adaptations – are resulting by the internalization of integration whereas marginalization attitudes result in decreased levels of positive outcomes. The internalization of assimilation or separation attitudes results in intermediate outcomes in terms of both – psychological as well as sociocultural – outcomes.

The relationship between these two adaptation outcomes and acculturation attitudes has already been confirmed in a study by Berry et al. (2006) among youth adolescents. Patterns were found that those adolescents who pursued integration had the highest scores on both – psychological as well as sociocultural – outcomes, whereas those in the marginalization cluster had the lowest scores on both dimensions. Those who pursued separation attitudes had moderately good psychological adaption outcomes but exhibited lower levels of sociocultural adaption. Only those accomplishing assimilation had poorer scores on both adaptation outcomes, which seems surprisingly as assimilation connotes a complete fuse of the individual into the new host society. Barker (2015) reasoned that home-cultural members in host societies may exert pressure on assimilated individuals to maintain distance to host society in order to strengthen and retain their heritage group identity. On assimilated individuals this exerted pressure may result in inner conflicts and in perception of guilt towards the home culture, which in turn could lead to both negative psychological and sociocultural outcomes.
Consequently, endorsing integration and hence recognizing both culture seems most favourable in terms of both outcomes as integration has also been found to be associated with higher self-esteem. Researchers such as Pham and Harris (2001) confirmed this relationship and reported that those individuals who endorsed integration attitudes tended to have higher levels of self-esteem than those individuals who endorsed assimilation, marginalization or separation.
5. MODERATING ACCULTURATION FACTORS

In order to respond to the challenges resulting from an increasing trend towards immigration, it is important to consider different determinants of acculturation orientations. Before attempting to do so, it is important to distinguish between societal (group) and personal (individual) level (Berry et al., 2002).

![Figure 5.1: Framework for Studying Acculturation and Adaptation](source: Berry et al., 2006, p. 12)

5.1 Group Level

5.1.1 Push & Pull Factors of Immigration

Situational factors in the society of origin as well as in the host society are influencing an individual's decision for emigration and are known as push and pull factors. Push factors that influence emigration from the society of origin are ethnographic characteristics of the society of origin such as religion and values; political situation such as civil war, conflicts, repression; economic conditions such as poverty and famine or demographic factors like crowding, population explosion and so forth (Berry, 2005). Pull-factors, on the other side, are refereeing to those factors that are attracting immigration into a certain host society such as political and economic situation, immigration policies, attitudes towards immigration and
specific groups, social support and legal rights. For instance, size of the different minority groups (immigrants) within one society can also represent a major pull factor for emigration. Depending on the size of the minority groups represented in the targeted immigration society, these groups may have different degrees of power, rights and resources available in the society (e.g. Austria: bilingual town sign, crucifix in classrooms). These push and pull factors further entail the degree of voluntarism or non-voluntarism of the migration motivation of individuals. Those individuals that are primarily attracted by pull factors are those who voluntarily leave the country of origin whereas those, who are primarily pressured by pull factors, are those who experience their immigration as rather involuntary.

Despite of influencing voluntarism and non-voluntarism of migration, push and pull factors in turn also influence the intended length of residence in the new host society (e.g. Austria: nearly 50 % of immigrated individuals are leaving Austria within the first five years, (Migration & Integration Report 2015, Statistik Austria). Individuals that immigrate for voluntary reasons (e.g. seeking for better employment opportunities) may intend permanent residence into the host country, whereas those individuals who leave for involuntary reasons (like war in their home country) might seek residence only for a temporary period of time, as these individuals might intend to return to their home country. This intended length of residence in turn may further influence an individual’s attitudes towards acculturation and adaptation. Those individuals that intend to reside permanently will engage differently into the new society, than individuals whose intentions of residence are of temporary length. Consequently, these individuals will exhibit different degrees of involvement and participation in the new society. Ward (2001) reported a decreased interest among internationals students in establishing friendships with host nationals, as they primary purpose of their sojourn was to obtain an academic degree and return home. Hence, involvement and interest in the host society and its members was rather limited. These might also hold true for individuals whose immigration motivations are only of temporary nature (such as for refugees, guest workers, diplomats etc.) and who intend to return to their home country.

However, the interplay between these two group level characteristics – host and home country – may result in different acculturation experiences on both sides: for host nationals and immigrant members. Moreover, the extent of contact between the two cultural groups and the participation in the new host society may vary depending on the degree of voluntariness/involuntariness, perceived cultural distance between the two countries and the attitudes held by host society towards immigration and social support. This in turn can lead to different perceptions on both sides – about the host society and the immigrant society – as it reciprocal-
ly influences this relationship not only in the short term but also in the long-term. On the side of the host society, lack of interest and involvement into the new host society might be perceived as negative and might enhance prejudices and problems between host nationals and immigrant society.

5.1.2 Cultural Distance

“Cultural distance refers to how far apart two cultural groups are on dimensions of cultural variation.” (Berry et al., 2002, p. 361)

One of the first concepts that tried to capture differences between countries was the psychic distance concept proposed by Johanson and Vahlne in 1977 that referred to differences between any two countries on dimensions such as development, education, business and language. Only a few years later Hofstede (1980) published his work on the Dimensions of National Culture that initially identified four dimensions of culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism and masculinity/femininity. Later – in 1991 and 2010 – a fifth and sixth dimension – long-term versus short-term orientation and indulgence versus restraint have been added. However, psychic and cultural distance have often been used synonymously despite cultural distance referring to socio-cultural differences by which all societies can be characterized. These dimensions proposed by Hofstede should reflect patterns of thinking, feeling and acting and would therefore play an important role in intercultural relations.

Studies have shown that the greater the differences between two cultures in terms of factors such as language, religion, family structure, standard of living, or values the more difficult is the process of acculturation and adaptation. Scholars such as Redmond (2000, p. 153) argue that the greater the differences between two cultures, the more it can be expected that problems in adapting to the culture, in developing and maintaining relationships, meeting social needs and communicating effectively can arise. Knowledge about host cultural appropriate behavioural values alone might not be enough to combat the intrinsic cultural values with which one has been raised. Hence, cultural distance can be considered as primary factor that contributes to culture shock. Gudykunst and Hammer (1988) argued that a short cultural distance would provide sojourners with an ability of predicting and explaining host behaviour more accurately. This ability would further be very beneficial in developing and maintaining
interpersonal relationships and in reducing stress and anxiety experienced in terms of social needs.

Zlobina et al. (2006, p. 197) argued that: “… the acquisition of new skills and cultural knowledge depends on the similarity between the home culture and the new culture; the greater the cultural distance, the more cultural learning is required to ‘fit in’”. Their study revealed that low perceived cultural distance was an important predictor for host cultural acquisition of knowledge and skills. Their conjecture was that when individuals are experiencing high cultural shock – due to frequent intercultural misunderstandings and faults that arise from cultural distance – these individuals may perceive an impossibility to deal with the new culture. Whereas, when cultural shock is not experienced as severe, individuals will feel able and motivated to learn more about the new host society culture.

Therefore, entering a new cultural society requires changes that pose great challenges on an individual especially when cultural distance is great between home and host country. Changes are not only required in terms of behavioural changes but may also occur in form of changes to ethnic identity and cultural values. As mentioned earlier, Barker (2015) reported that immigrated individuals undergo a mental comparison and evaluation regarding cultural values – of both home and host country. In this mental process differences in cultural features become identified and then evaluated in terms of their desirability and benefits and further become treated as additive, integrative or mutually exclusive. In essence, those features deemed desirable and beneficial became adopted and opposed when deemed as negative or contradictory. Those that were perceived as inferior to the culture of origin became discarded and, those home cultural values that were deemed superior to those of the host society became retained by the studied immigrated individuals.
5.2 Individual Level

5.2.1. Moderating Acculturation Factors Prior to Transition

Every individual is entering the acculturation process with different individual characteristics that influences acculturation and adaptation. These moderating factors prior to acculturation are of demographic, psychological and social nature (Berry, 2002, p. 366 ff).

5.2.1.1 Age

Age has generally been regarded to have an influencing role on the outcomes of adaptation, as age is considered crucial to identity formation and cultural internalization. Younger age (prior to entry into primary school) is associated with a smoother process of acculturation and lower levels of socio-cultural conflicts compared to adults. In contrast to adults – Birman and Tricket (2001) found – children to have a higher ability to quickly pick up new language and learn new cultural behaviours and traditions. Unlike for adults, whose identity has already been consolidated, children have not formed identity yet and form a sense of self in both contexts – host country and within their own ethnic culture. This results in a gap in terms of acculturation outcomes between parents and their children, with an increase in host cultural identification among children, but only with acquisition of host cultural language and behavioural changes among parents. The interruption and reduction of exposure to culture of origin may further result in a loss in native language proficiency and culture of origin competences compared to adults, who grew up in the country of origin. This relationship between second language acquisition and age have been reported by researchers such as Tubergen and Wierenga (2011), who found evidence that individuals who immigrated at younger age had attained higher second language proficiency than had their older counterparts covered in the study.

However, it is assumed, that in young age enculturation process of primary culture is not yet fully finished and incorporated, therefore degree of comparisons between home and host culture are of limited nature (Berry, 1997). Therefore, abandon of traditional values and the adoption of host culture happens more easily compared to adults, due to a less advanced enculturation process to the heritage culture (Rosenthal et al., 1996).
5.2.1.2 Gender

Gender is a social construct that refers to “all duties, rights, and behaviours a culture considers appropriate for males and females” (Wade & Travis, 1999, p. 16). It is argued (Dion & Dion, 2001) that gap in gender roles that result from settlement into a new host society, might pose a considerable role problem on women, since it might challenge expectations about existing gender roles, hence leading to a renegotiation of roles within immigrant families. Furthermore, this emerged role problem might lead to higher risk for negative psychological outcomes such as depression and hence poorer adaptation among women compared to men.

These gender differences in rates of depression were subject to studies such as by Noh et al. (1992) which found evidence that different expectations in gender roles between home and host country led to eight times higher depression rates among immigrated employed women than for immigrated men. In particular, highest discrepancies in rates of depression between women and men were found in groups of couples with higher attained education or higher income. It is therefore suggested that high levels of depression might be attributable to the “double burden hypothesis” that women experience in a new environment. Particularly for women originated from countries that emphasize traditional gender roles, where roles for women are mainly involving duties of homemaking and parenting, fulfilment of these duties can be experienced as highly stressful alongside employment, especially when traditional gender roles are also endorsed by spouses. Lim (1997) reported that, even though men often not being opposed to employment of women, children and family duties are still considered primarily role for wives. Women, by contrast, start to pursuit the ideal of high level of work performance and achievement for themselves combined with high standard expectations regarding their traditional role as parent and homemaker. Further, employment among women start to go along with an increase in self-assertiveness and challenge to traditional gender roles on issues such as participation in domestic activities by husbands.

On the other hand, migrated women of lower socioeconomic status were found to exhibit poorer sociocultural adaptation compared to their male counterparts (Ataca & Berry, 2002). By virtue of inherited traditional gender roles that consider men responsible for work life participation, whereas women are expected to stay at home, women have fewer opportunities to acquire culturally appropriate knowledge and skills (such as second language proficiency), since they are isolated and secluded within own ethnic circles. This increased expo-

---

7 Refers to a role overload resulting from duties such as household, child care and employment responsibilities (Dion & Dion, 2001, pp. 512).
sure to host society among men may explain better sociocultural adaptation for men and poorer for women.

Differences in expectations about gender roles might also result in different socialization expectations for sons and daughters, especially after cultural transition, since maintaining and passing specific cultural behaviours and practices is often regarded as main responsibility pertaining women. Dion and Dion (2001) argued that parents might perceive a considerable threat to traditional values pertaining family relationships and traditions after migration, especially when differences on cultural values are perceived as high between home and host country. The more cultural different two countries, the higher the perceived threat and the more parental pressure on socialization is put on daughters as on sons. In turn these different levels of pressure might lead to conflicts within families and with rejection of traditional values and beliefs by daughters. Rosenthal et al. (1996), for example, reported that Vietnamese adolescents living in Australia reported to have less traditional values compared to their parents. This pattern of perception was stronger among girls than among boys. Girls also reported to less value Vietnamese traditions than boys did, and were more dissatisfied with existing gender roles in the Vietnamese culture and hence encountered more conflicts at home with parents, which they described to be less accepting of independence.

Nevertheless, culturally inherent gender roles can result in intra- and interpersonal conflicts leading to different adaptations outcomes on acculturation among men and women. Differences in culturally defined gender roles, that become apparent in the new environmental context, can result in dissatisfaction and in inter- and intrapersonal conflicts. Women that perceive dissatisfaction with traditional existing gender roles might seek for a renegotiation of existing gender roles and might seek more assimilative acculturation attitudes leaving old values behind. Ouarasse and Van de Vijver (2005) noted that, sometimes women are more favourable towards host culture and its values than men, since in many new host societies immigrated women have more to gain from more “attractive” gender roles, such as more independence and freedom.

5.2.1.3 Socioeconomic status (SES)

Countless individual’s primary motivation for immigration is a more attractive employment market offering more opportunities in the host society compared to that found in the home country. However, Aycan and Berry (1996) argue that numerous immigrated individuals experience downward mobility in occupation in the host society, when performing jobs for
which they are overqualified or not initially trained. Reasons for these discrepancies can be found in legal requirements in the host society, lack of language skills, and lack of vacant positions on the employment market or recruitment attitudes towards immigrants. Consequently, these changes in socioeconomic status can have major influences on the adaptation outcome, as these individuals perceive this kind of mobility as frustrating, which further can influence sociocultural and psychological adaptation outcomes.

Ataca and Berry (2002) examined these kinds of experiences on acculturation and adaption outcomes among 200 Turkish immigrated individuals living in Toronto and found evidence for differences in outcomes between two distinctive social groups. The first group was characterized by individuals with lower levels of attained education, originated from rural or low-income urban backgrounds, living in same-ethnic neighbourhoods and being not gainfully employed. They further were more traditional and religious, which manifested itself in their apparel and rejected contact to host nationals. Contrary to the first group, individuals in the second group were predominantly professionals, originated from urban backgrounds, living scattered in the area of Toronto, exhibiting higher levels of second language proficiency and having attained higher education which further reported having more contact with host nationals. However, results showed that the first group was more often affected by discrimination and highly endorsed separation attitudes, whereas the second group showed higher tendencies for integration and assimilation and reported being less often subject to discrimination. The researchers reasoned that those individuals in the second group had more resources available such as higher education and language proficiency, which helped them to cope with the new situation and experience less sociocultural difficulties. Whereas for the first group, rejection of contact with host nationals (presumably due to lack of language skills, lack of socializing occasions such as workplace and neighbourhood), resulted in less culturally appropriate knowledge to manage daily life in the new environment and hence exhibiting greater sociocultural difficulties compared to the second group.

Albeit experiencing more sociocultural difficulties, those individuals in the first group, felt more satisfied with their immigration and life in Canada due to an improvement in their economic and material situation compared to that in their home country. Individuals in the second group, however, reported less satisfaction with their life in Canada, due to a status loss resulting from lack of Canadian recognition of credentials and accreditations obtained in Turkey. The authors suggested that these differences may result from comparisons made that result in a perceived deprivation. Individuals from the first group made comparisons between economic situations in Canada and in Turkey, experiencing an improvement in terms of as-
sets, housing, schooling, and health benefits. Whereas, comparisons made by individuals in the second group were made with respect to own standard versus that of other cohorts in Turkey, experiencing relative deprivation and hence dissatisfaction with their new situation.

However, occupational status of parents and thus socioeconomic status of the family in turn were found to have an impact on the acculturation attitudes of descendants. Berry et al. (2006) reported that adolescents from higher socioeconomic backgrounds were found to exhibit lower levels of separation attitudes hence were more attached to the new host society and exhibited higher levels of second language proficiency compared to those adolescents of lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

5.2.1.4 Education

Literature in realm of acculturation argues on the positive outcomes of education on adaptation, suggesting that individuals with higher attained education have different cognitive abilities and therefore other problem analysis and solving abilities to cope with challenges resulting from immigration and hence experience lower levels of stress. Further, higher education is a personal asset that correlates with other factors such as income, occupational status and network availability (Berry, 1997). Nonetheless, Berry puts also forward on the limitations of education on adaptation arguing that depending on the country of origin versus country of settlement, downward and upward occupational mobility are often reality. In practice, occupational “entry status” of immigrants does not always correspond to that status prior to departure, which may be experienced as deprivation resulting in frustration and further influencing adaptation. Downward or block upward mobility in occupation among higher educated individuals therefore can result in lower levels of psychological well-being (Aycan & Berry, 1996). Individuals which primary motivation for migration is progression in professional life, education and hence profession are of more relevance than for those, whose primary motivation is improvement in economic situation. Consequently, these discrepancies resulting from different expectations with regard to one’s immigration outcome can result in social difficulties (Zlobina et al., 2006).

Nonetheless, education is reported to impact acculturation outcomes, as individuals having attained higher education were more often found to endorse integration as acculturation outcome which in turn predict higher self-esteem among this group (Pham & Harris, 2001). Further, higher attained education connotes higher proficiency in native language which in turn provides a good basis for the acquisition of a second language (Van Niejenhuis
et al., 2015). Whereas lower levels of attained education (no schooling or primary schooling) are positively associated with home country identification and negatively with host cultural identification (Abu-Rayya, 2009).

5.2.1.5 Expectations

Another factor that can affect acculturation are a priori formed expectations regarding country of settlement, with accuracy of these expectations positively affecting adaptation outcomes (Caligiuri et al., 2001).

Prior to migration, individuals usually engage in a form of anticipatory projection, which can be regarded as formation of expectations about ones future life in the host society (c.f. Social Identity Development in chapter 2.6 Immigration as Challenge to Identity). The accuracy of these pre-migration formed expectations can further influence post-migration attitudes towards both countries – home and host country – and later influence acculturation outcomes (Tartakovsky, 2010). Hence, acculturation attitudes already start to develop and shape prior to immigration, with comparisons made between held expectations and experiences made in the host society after immigration. However, theory suggests that exceeding expectations can lead to great satisfaction, whereas not met expectations can lead to dissatisfaction (“Disconfirmation Model”) (Brown et al., 2008). Yijälä and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2010) reported that the most important predictors that shaped potential acculturation attitudes among immigrants in their host country were accuracy of expectations about future host nationals with regard to their acculturation expectations vis-à-vis immigrants and their preferences for contacting immigrants. Accuracy in fulfilment of expectations may be depending on the value an individual ascribes to different aspects or domains of its life with sometimes only personally relevant factors or things having an impact on the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Mähönen et al., 2013). However, discrepancies in expectations in other domains such as in obtaining adequate employment or perceived security in the new host society were also found to shape acculturation outcomes and to be associated with acculturative stress (Negy et al., 2009).

Finding adequate employment is especially important for those individuals migrating for economic reasons and having higher expectations regarding economic achievement in the new host society. Since behaviour is directly related to expectations held and the subjective value attributed to the consequences that might occur following these actions, fulfilment or non-fulfilment of these kinds of expectations can impact adjustment and psychological well-
being (Bhugra, 2003, p. 77). Hence, not met expectations may result in depression due to a perceived failure to meet expectations and consequently in poorer adjustment.
5.3 Moderating Factors During Acculturation

In a study with Spanish-speaking immigrants in Switzerland and Italy, Ramelli et al., (2013) showed that the first initial phase in the new host society had a significant impact on the acculturation orientation of immigrants.

5.3.1 Social Support

Social support is one of the most commonly named factors that is assumed to affect acculturation and adaptation among immigrated individuals. During migratory process immigrating individuals are faced with a loss in important social ties, which are fundamental for the structure of everyone’s life, and now need to be left behind. Networks such as family and friends serve as source of psychological support and as effective coping resource, which are particularly needed when stress resulting from immigration intensifies. Hence, the reestablishment of an interpersonal network is one of the most difficult and critical problem immigrant’s face in the new host society, with its composition being of crucial importance. Hence, the representation of same-ethnic members in the interpersonal network can provide the immigrant with a family context and reduce feelings of vulnerability (Garcia et al., 2002). These same ethnic social networks may remain an important social source for immigrants that protect well-being even years after settlement into the host society (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006). Several studies (Noh & Kaspar, 2003; Finch & Vega, 2003; Jasinskaja et al, 2006) reported that immigrated individuals with greater number of own ethnic friends or with family members within their immediate social network were less often reporting poor psychological well-being, whereas those not well-connected with and supported by their own cultural communities, exhibited more frequent negative psychological adaptation outcomes.

However, composition of social networks it not only linked to the immigrant’s ability to encounter sources of support, but also to the readiness of the social network to become source of support (Garcia et al., 2002 as well as Ward & Rana-Deuba, 2000). For instance this could be the case when host society is not receptive to newly arrived immigrants, albeit the interaction between immigrated individuals and host society nationals is seen as important factor for the adaptation to the new society. Social support from host nationals is therefore considered an influential predictor for sociocultural adjustment, as it lessens the degree of perceived difficulty in the new environment (Zlobina et al., 2006). Social support from host nationals, therefore, can help immigrants to learn new roles, local language, cultural practices
and further represent a valuable source of information about work opportunities and hence make cultural adaptation easier (Garcia et al., 2002)

Albeit host nationals support on adaptation outcomes being of crucial importance, attitudes towards immigrants held by host nationals may also negatively affect this relationship. Tartakovsky (2012) reported that among students stronger perceived support from peers and teachers was associated with a more positive attitude toward the host country, while perceived discrimination was associated with less positive attitudes. Further, positive attitudes were associated with the intention to remain in the host country and with the preference for integration and assimilation. In contrast, negative attitudes were associated with the preference for separation and marginalization, which implies little contact with host nationals and further with the intention of return to the country of origin or with the intention for emigration to a third country. Therefore, according to Tartakovsky (2012) a good subjective evaluation of the host country depends on the immigrant’s perception about the supportive behaviour of its host nationals. This formation of attitudes towards the host society is therefore based on the experiences made when interacting with its host nationals. Consequently, the better the experiences made with host nationals, the more positive are the attitudes towards this country and vice versa.

On the other hand, negative attitudes by host nationals towards immigration, which sometimes manifests itself in discriminatory behaviour, was found to be linked to an increase in contacts to home country nationals or with an increase in ethnic behaviour respectively resulting in the establishment of socially segregated immigrant communities (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Nauck, 2001). This embeddedness in one’s native cultural network serves as buffer against perceived discrimination hence discrimination becomes experienced as relatively benign compared to those lacking own-ethnic social support (Finch & Vega, 2003) However, this seclusion in turn reinforces attitudes among host nationals that immigrated individuals are not willing to fit into the host society. Therefore, discrimination has a reciprocal relationship to acculturation attitudes, that is, the attitudes of members of the host society toward immigrants is likely to be reflected in the feelings of immigrant about the host society (Berry et al., 2006, p. 82).

Nevertheless, researchers (Berry, 1997; LaFramboise et al., 1993) emphasize the importance of establishing social networks composed of both cultures which is considered predictor for successful adaption into the new host society and important outcome of second-culture acquisition. This “groundedness” in two cultures is serves as an enhancement to an
individual’s coping abilities that allows for coping with pressure resulting from living in a bicultural environment. Therefore, the establishment of stable networks in both cultures are determining a successful management of a bicultural (integration) life, as it is linked to reduced stress and better adaptation (Levitt et al., 2005).

5.3.2 Language Shift & Second Language Proficiency

One of the most important elements of culture is language and in order to be culturally competent second language skills in the foreign language of the host country is prerequisite (Remhof et al., 2013). Clement et al. (2001, p. 564) emphasized the importance of language as “…it binds, through communication, those using it to a social and ethnic community. It is thus viewed as a dynamic instrument of contact, a tool of communication and thinking, and a transmitter of culture and tradition”. Therefore, second language skills are prerequisite for intercultural contact (Bourhis et al., 1997) and prerequisite for economic and social integration of an individual in the host society (Uebelmesser, 2006), as it serves as tool for understanding aspects of the new culture (Remhof et al., 2013, p. 230). Further, second language skills do not only represent mean of communication, but also means of expressing group affiliations and means for achieving development tasks such as building friendships and defining one’s identity which is especially important for adolescent immigrants (Michel et al., 2012, pp. 248).

Second language proficiency and usage is therefore considered one of the most widely used indicators of acculturation and its preference is seen as expression of cultural behaviours. It is therefore assumed that the acquisition and usage of a host society language is considered evidence that an immigrated individual is becoming involved in the new society, whereas the retention and usage of native language is seen as indicator for lower levels of involvement. Veltman’s (1983) concept on language shift – for example – assumed language shift to occur over three generations suggesting that first generation immigrants would predominantly maintain their native language; second generation would make use of both languages and only in the third generation second language would be used predominately. More contemporary studies (Michel et al., 2012) however, assume that second language proficiency follows a learning curve pattern, hence increasing over time and then levelling off, which entails language shift to occur within one generation. In conclusion, that is, language shift would be the result of culture learning and culture shedding with older skills that are not needed in the new cultural

---

*Language shift refers to the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another (Weinreich, 1953, p. 68).*
environment anymore, becoming shed in favour of new skills, which allow a better fit of the individual with the new host society.

In the past decades, researchers such as Chiswick and Miller (2004a) have provided extensive research in the field of predictors on and motivators for second-language (L2) proficiency and acquisition and come to the conclusion to focus on three predictors: efficiency, exposure and economic incentives.

*Efficiency* refers to the individual’s ability to produce second language proficiency after a given amount of exposure to this particular second language. In numerous studies (e.g. Van Niejenhuis et al., 2015; Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011) predictors for high second language efficiency were factors such as higher education attainment, higher proficiency in own mother tongue, and younger age at immigration. It is assumed that (Van Tubergen, 2010) individuals that have attained higher education are more experienced in acquiring new skills and hence are better able to acquire second language. Further, being proficient in one own first language (L1) provides a good basis for the acquisition of a second language, as individuals can draw upon an already existing knowledge (Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011). Further, “linguistic distance”, that refers to the complexity between two languages in terms of vocabulary, grammar, written form, syntax and myriad other characteristics is also one factor that contributes to lower or higher efficiency in second language acquisition (Chiswick and Miller, 2004b; Van Niejenhuis et al., 2015).

*Exposure* refers to the extent to which immigrants have been exposed to the second language (Van Niejenhuis et al., p. 77). Studies (e.g. Van Niejenhuis et al. 2015;) showed that the more years immigrated individuals spent in a host country; hence the more exposure to the second language and the higher was their second language proficiency. However, exposure is also depending on the proximity of same ethnics or availability of host nationals in the living environment (Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011). Immigrants living in environments or neighbourhoods with fewer co-ethnics have higher exposure to second language and therefore are more proficient in second language. It is therefore assumed (Chiswick & Miller, 2004) that individuals would continue to speak in their native language with other co-ethnics, which entails a decreased experience in use of second language, which skills can only improve with practice. Therefore, continuum in native language use is related to retarding in second language proficiency and negatively related to the willingness to interact with host nationals in local language (Early & Ang, 2003).
Economic incentives refers to the incentives and expected pay-offs an individual has in acquiring second language skills in terms of economic opportunities such as easier access to employment or higher wages. Chiswick and Miller (2007) found evidence that those who immigrated for employment reasons scored highest on second language proficiency, followed by those immigrated for family unification reasons in combination with employment. Whereas refugees, who immigrated for safety reasons, were those exhibiting the lowest levels of second language proficiency. It is therefore assumed that payoffs resulting from an earlier and easier access into the labour market are seen as incentive for an earlier acquisition of second language skills. Subsequently, earlier acquisition of second language skills likewise implies longer exposure to the new language and hence higher proficiency levels. However, beside economic participation, intended length of residence can be considered another factor for the prediction of acquisition of second language skills, since individuals that intend to reside permanently in a host country, will engage more readily in second language acquisition (Tubbergen et al., 2011).

Exposure to a second language, however, might not always explain patterns of second language acquisition and proficiency. Studies – for example by Chiswick (1998) found evidence that higher educational level of parents was positively related to second language acquisition of antecedents. Higher qualifications by parents are considered to relate to higher parental cognitive abilities which in turn provide antecedents with a more stimulating home environment and more learning activities. Chiswick (2008) found also gender-related factors to contribute to different proficiency levels among men and women. For women, language proficiency was found to be depending on the number of children, hence the more children the lower the level of language proficiency among women. For second language acquisition of children, second language skills of mothers were found to be more important than those of fathers.

Even in presence of adequate second language skills, intercultural communication might still be full of pitfalls and can often result in adverse emotional responses due to arising communication obstacles. Study by Spencer-Rodgers and McGovern (2002) among U.S. and international students yielded evidence that adverse emotions were antecedents for prejudice and source of intergroup hostility. U.S. students reported feelings of impatience and frustration when communicating with international students due to accent, speech, and cultural differences in non-verbal communication styles. Further, U.S. students used perceived deficits in English language for the assessment of international students, which often yielded negative
evaluations due to their deficits in English language. International students, on the other side, reported feelings of anxiety, fear of negative consequences of communication failures or awkwardness to appear foolish to others or experiencing rejection. These feelings were also reported to be perceived in anticipating social contact. Gudykunst (1988) argue that perceived effectiveness in communication does not only depend on language skills, thus understanding the meaning of word and mastering grammar, but also concerns the ability to manage anxiety and uncertainty in social interactions with host country nationals. Therefore, immigrants that perceive their own communication with host nationals as effective are also better able to manage anxiety and uncertainty in communicational contexts and are more likely to approach communication with host nationals (Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001; Ramelli et al., 2013). Further, increased language confidence has been found to be positively related to an increased identification with host country nationals (Clement et al., 2001), increase in share of host national friends (Michel et al., 2012) and decreased acculturative stress (Lueck & Wilson, 2011).

### 5.3.3 Perceived Discrimination

Another factor that has been found to impact adaptation and acculturation is the level of perceived discrimination in host society. As mentioned earlier, depending on different factors such as history, political alignment, economic situation, or cultural values, openness towards immigration and multiculturalism will vary across countries. This level of perceived discrimination in the host society can have different impacts on the adaptation of immigrants, as this will either enforce the feeling of acceptance or of rejection.

Different studies (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2006) provided evidence that perceived discrimination can result in disidentification with host society, which further can increase hostility towards host society members. It is therefore assumed that, perceived discrimination prevents immigrant individuals from developing a sense of belonging to host society, reasoning that immigrants’ willingness to cooperate originates from evaluations of the procedural fairness they experience in the host society. Perceived unfair treatment such as being discriminated against because of an ethnic background, could lead to discouragement in identification with host cultural values, which in turn may result in a tendency of disengagement and hostility towards host society. Therefore, engagement in host cultural practices is
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9 “Rejection-Disidentification Model” (RDIM)
depending on immigrants experiencing acceptance from host nationals (Tartakovsky, 2012) and is assumed to have the highest impact on adaption (Zlobina et al., 2006).

However, studies (De Vroome et al., 2011) among refugees yielded different results reporting that perceived discrimination was much lower among refugees compared to other immigrant groups. The researchers therefore reasoned that this evaluation might result from comparisons made between current situation and situation back in the home country: Individuals, who left their home country on grounds of violence or political suppression, perceived the situation in the host country as less negative compared to the situation in their home country. Whereas those, who left for economic reasons – such as for better job opportunities – perceived the new situation as more negative compared to their situation in their home country. Further, even though refugees perceived being discriminated against, there was only limited evidence for the reduction in orientation toward host society (Fozdar & Torezani, 2008).

However, literature also suggests on other aspects and outcomes of perceived discrimination on immigrant’s behaviour. Kiang and Johnson (2013) who examined self-labelling behaviours among Asian adolescents reported context-related inconsistency in 57% of the cases. Ethnic labelling used by adolescents to describe themselves varied depending on the counterparts they found themselves interacting with (peer contact with Asians, non-Asian minorities and European-Americans). Only in 25% of the situations same labelling was used across all social interactions. The researchers therefore hypothesized that experience of discrimination could be a driver for a heightened sensitivity to nuanced differences, when interacting with persons of different ethnicities and therefore reaction and self-labelling behaviour would vary across interaction context and hence interaction counterparts (c.f. ethnocentrism in chapter 3.4 Enculturation).

5.3.4 Friendships

Social interactions with members of the host society or of the own ethnic group are considered another fundamental aspect of acculturation, but with time these social networks are assumed to change as part of the acculturation process (Berry et al., 2006, p. 80). Friends are regarded as a positive reference groups10 for immigrants, as friendships are associated with close and frequent interactions and therefore initial friendships with host country nationals were found to negatively correlate with own cultural identification (Ramelli et al. 2013).

---

10 Positive reference group: refers to groups a person does not belong to, but whose norms are accepted (Sumner, 1906)
Therefore, higher share of host national friends is associated with increased identification toward host society culture (Tolsma et al., 2012). In contrast, sustaining more social ties within the country of origin was negatively associated with the sustainment of host national social ties (De Vroome et al., 2011). Albeit research debating whether affective elements such as quality of contact and relationship satisfaction (Searl & Ward, 1990) or quantity of friendships (Pruitt, 1978) are influencing adaptation and acculturation, still, meaningful friendships and in depth social interactions with host nationals provide immigrants with feelings of social acceptance and sense of host-cultural belonging (Barker, 2015).

Irrespective of the effects of quantity and quality of friendships on acculturation and adaptation, the relationship between friendships and national identification is still unclear. Leszczynsky (2013, pp. 777) reasoned relating to Social Identity Theory that every individual strives for a positive social identity, as this contributes to higher self-esteem and well-being. Due to social comparison that takes place with respect to different attributes, categorization into a favoured in-group (host nationals) and unfavoured outgroup (immigrants) results, with the immigrated individual finding itself as member of the out-group and of lower status compared to the in-group (host nationals). Hence, in order to achieve a positive social identity the individual will strive to change its “mental” membership by identifying with host national culture, which implies belonging to the perceived in-group. Furthermore, as humans are homophile in their preferences for friendships, this new “mental” membership will help to approach host nationals. In particular Leszczynsky refers to a study conducted by Van Oudenhoven and his associates (1998) who found evidence that those immigrants who identified with host society, had more host nationals friends, because host nationals perceived these immigrated individuals as more similar to themselves and thus were more willing to befriend them more often than they did with immigrants who did not identify with host society.

Albeit no consensus on the effects of quantity and quality and relationship between friendships and national identification could be found, there is strong evidence suggesting that host national contact provides opportunities for cultural learning and culture specific skills acquisition (Ataca & Berry, 2002). Further, cross-cultural contact is considered one factor to contribute to the shaping of intergroup attitudes and relations. According to a meta-analysis conducted by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) on the “Theory of Intergroup” clearly indicates that intergroup contact was negatively related to prejudices. Further, the results showed that not only attitudes towards the immediate contact group changed positively, but even attitudes toward outgroup not involved in the contact.
Of particular interest are also the findings within the Austrian context presented by the report on Migration & Integration, 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) pertaining the mutual perception of friendships between immigrants and host nationals. Host nationals (84%) reported that in order for immigrants to be regarded as integrated, immigrants should maintain friendships with Austrians. On the side of immigrants, 87% answered that in order to promote integration in Austria, Austrians should be more open toward maintaining friendships with immigrants. It can be concluded that there is a strong consensus on both sides that cross-cultural friendships can shape cross-cultural relations.

5.3.5 Legal Immigration Status

Legal immigration status is one factor that so far has not obtained much consideration in the realm of acculturation studies. However, in a study by Zlobina et al. (2006) the researches showed that this factor was among the three most powerful predictors for sociocultural adjustment among immigrants. Therefore, Zlobina and her colleagues concluded that official residence permits would not only facilitate access to assistance and services in the new host society, but would also facilitate access to specific cultural knowledge shared only by members of the host culture. Hence legal immigration status would enable immigrated individuals to participate more easily in the new society, whereas those immigrants without official residence permits would lead an “invisible” life perceiving themselves as not equal. Individuals that participated in the study further reported to avoid going out on the street, due to the threat of being repatriate back to the home country. This “invisible life” therefore can result in experiencing high levels of social exclusion, since almost no to less contact to host nationals can be established.

Further, according to De Vroome et al., (2011), legal immigration status is also linked to the participation in structures and institutions such as labour market or educational systems. This participation in economic life can provide individuals with a sense of achievement, self-esteem and belonging, which can foster positive attitudes towards host society.

5.3.6 Neighbourhood Ethnic Composition

Another important factor that can impact acculturation is the presence or proximity of other co-ethnics represented in the new host society. Immigrants that are present in large numbers often form communities in which they maintain their heritage culture and distance
themselves from host cultural members by spending their time predominantly with co-ethnics (Barker, 2015). As consequence, limited contact prevents immigrated individuals to assimilate or integrate into host society, which in turn can result in negative attitudes and adverse feelings on the side of host nationals.

Studies (Berry et al., 2006; Ataca & Berry, 2002) reported that living in same-ethnic neighbourhoods was associated with lower levels of integration attitudes but with increased attitudes towards separation compared to living in neighbourhoods with more diverse ethnic backgrounds (at least 50 %). Further, residents reported to use native language predominantly and to have fewer host national peer as friends, whereas in more diverse neighbourhoods residents reported higher use of second language and more contact with host country nationals. It is therefore argued (Schwartz et al., 2006) that in communities, where culture of origin is predominant, retention of culture of origin might not decline with greater time of residence in the host country nor with nativity (first or second generation immigration), due to an isolation from host society culture. This negative effect of neighbourhood composition on length of residence and on acculturation attitudes might be particular salient for individuals who immigrated as adults to own ethnic communities. Even if media or contact with host society may promote acquisition of host society cultural practices, own ethnic community might act to counteract the effects of the host society on the loss of culture of origin.

Further, proximity to host nationals is considered opportunity for using second language and acquiring second language proficiency (Michel et al., 2012). Therefore, the more co-ethnics living in proximity to another, the greater the likelihood that immigrated individuals will predominantly use their native language and the less likely they will acquire second language proficiency. Presumably, this in turn can lead to other problems such as distance to host nationals due to communication difficulties, feelings of marginalization and isolation, lack of integration or misperceptions on both sides.

5.3.7 Length of Residence

Length of residence is one of the most powerful predictor for acculturation and adaptation outcomes (Zlobina et al., 2006). As both, psychological as well as sociocultural problems, are greatest at point of entry, time spent in host society helps individuals to acquire more knowledge about and familiarity with the host society (Ward et al., 1998). Further, length of residence was also found to be associated with other factors such as second language proficiency and use and contacting host society nationals (Berry et al., 2006;
Niejenhuis et al. 2015). Researchers such as Pham and Harris (2001) and Abu-Rayya (2009) reported that among other factors shorter length of residence in the host society was associated with acculturation attitudes of marginalization and separation. They therefore concluded that only a short time of residence in the host society would not provide individuals with enough time to acquire the knowledge needed to understand host culture, which consequently makes individuals feel uncomfortable and unable to participate in it.

However, greater length of residence does not always seem to be related to integration and positive adaptation outcomes, as different studies report demographic factors to counteract this effect. For example, traditional values diminished with time spent in the host country only among adolescents with average age of 18 years (Rosenthal et al., 1996), whereas in other studies years spent in the host country were only related to adoption of host culture for females, who immigrated prior to age 21, but not for males (Schwartz et al., 2006). However, Birman and Bricket (2001) reported that for adolescents length of residence of about four to five years appeared to be extremely important as second language use and host cultural behaviour exceed that of native language and behaviours of heritage culture. Further, results suggested that after approximately six to seven years participants exhibited a shift from ethnic culture to a more balanced acculturation outcome concluding that acculturation process unfolds at different times for different age groups and for different dimensions.
6. INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY READINESS

Looking beyond home countries for career opportunities has resulted in a movement of labour across a globalized market (Thorn, 2009). Depending on the initiative for movement two distinctions for sojourners can be made: self-initiated movers and assigned expatriates. According to Remhof et al. (2013, p. 225) “… self-initiated expatriates are self-motivated to work abroad and work towards self-managed careers independent of the opportunities provided by their employers”, whereas assigned expatriates are supported by a company. According to the Global Mobility Trends Survey 2016 (Brookefield, p. 37) more than 50 % of the companies surveyed reported that their primarily objective for oversea assignments was to fill managerial or technical skills gaps, among which 36 % forecasted that due to business growth, future assignments will increase in the coming years. However, crucial to this movement is one’s personal readiness for international mobility which defines the willingness to cross international borders for work reasons resulting in a change of one’s place of residence (Andresen & Margenfeld, 2015). Further, the companies surveyed reported that 38 % of assignment refusal reasons were family concerns followed by spouse/partner career/income (18 %), candidates reward vis-à-vis move considerations (16 %) and perceived insufficient compensation (15 %) (p. 41).

Regardless of the initiative for a move, the emphasis on the permanence of settlement is crucial to adjustment and adaptation as the importance of variables in immigrant adaptation varies among immigrants and sojourners (Ataca & Berry, 2002; Grinstein & Wathieu, 2012). Movements can be of temporary nature with the intention of returning to the home country at some point of time such as for sojourners like international students, business people or diplomats, or of permanent nature with migration to the new country. Even though expatriates might be distinct from immigrants by virtue of the permanence of their settlement, it is well accepted phenomenon that sojourners on overseas assignments likewise experience some form of acculturative stress. Working and living in a new cultural setting is considered an event which can provoke significantly high levels of stress, requiring adaptation to uncertain conditions and circumstances (Kaye & Taylor, 1997). The Global Mobility Trends Survey 2015 (Brookfield) reported that 18 % of assignees experienced difficulties in adapting to local culture or business environment and was among the three most commonly quoted reasons of assignment failure.
Tung (1998) studied acculturation attitudes – that were formerly only studied among immigrants – among over 400 expatriates in their overseas assignments and reported that for one third of the expatriates it took six to twelve months to adjust (mainly those from the senior management level), whereas those in non-supervisory positions needed the least amount of time (one to three months). Albeit earlier studies suggested that cultural distance may affect adjustment and performance, Tung reported that most of the expatriates endorsed integration and hence favoured the selection and choosing of elements of both cultures, hence home and host culture. Although assimilation attitudes were mostly rejected, expatriates reported attempting to do things the local way even if such practices were not consistent with the norms of the home country. Tung reasoned that successful adaptation and performance among the studied expatriates might stem from the fact that numerous participants in the study were bilingual or multilingual and had already lived or worked abroad for extended periods of time.

Remhof et al. (2013) argued that prior experience in foreign countries could be influential for shaping attitudes towards working abroad and foster the development of cultural awareness. These made experiences could provide individuals with a direct evaluation on the personal pros and cons of living and working abroad and allow anticipating the challenges and uncertainties related to such changes. The researchers found empirical evidence that individuals with prior foreign experience were more highly inclined to search for and accept jobs in a foreign country compared to individuals without prior international experience. They even reported that individuals having acquired cultural knowledge – that results from prior international experiences – develop greater levels of interest to work abroad in more distanced countries.
EMPIRICAL PART
7. METHODOLOGY

7.1 Research Framework

In order to answer the first research question, namely: “Which contextual factors contribute to the internalization of the acculturation patterns of integration, assimilation or separation?” four sets of variables need to be answered:

- **Context** (group level) variables about the receiving host society with regard to immigration climate and the orientation to diversity adopted by host nationals that immigrated individuals experience.
- **Intercultural** variables (individual level) which describe how immigrated individuals view and feel about relationships among groups and behave in their new environmental and cultural setting.
- **Adaptation** (individual level), that is queried in terms of sense of well-being (self-esteem and life satisfaction), that should answer how well immigrated individuals are doing, as it represents a flow from both – host society and their intercultural relations.
- **Demographic and background** variables (individual level), which are assumed to contribute to variation in intercultural relations and adaptation such as age at immigration, length of residence, neighbourhood composition (current and at point of immigration), language use and proficiency and friendships.
For the purpose of answering the second question namely: “Does the internalized acculturation pattern of integration, assimilation or separation contribute to the willingness for future relocations?” a fifth variable was included that should capture views on further relocations:

- Relocation propensity, pertaining views on job related relocations and objections, migration to third or country of origin and time frame pertaining these relocations.

In order to provide an overview on the contextual variables (group level) (Figure 7.1) found in the Austrian society, data from the Report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) will be used (Appendix C). This report published yearly by Statistik Austria outlines quantitative as well as qualitative data on the issue of immigration in Austria. For the purpose of obtaining data for answering demographic, background, intercultural and adaptational variables as well as relocation propensity, a questionnaire will be used which is described in more detail in the following subchapter (7.2. Questionnaire).

7.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire used for the empirical part of this thesis has been conceptualized by Berry et al. (2006) and used in their international study with adolescent immigrants in 2006. The questionnaire (Appendix A) was adapted to fit the needs of the current study by shortening parts that were not relevant to it. To fit the needs of the present study, questions such as A14, B4, C, G, I, K, L from the original questionnaire were removed, as the target group for Berry’s conducted study were schoolchildren aged between 13-to-18 years and their parents. These removed questions were dealing with school and family issues such as “At present I like school” or “Children should obey their parents” which were not relevant for the present study, as the target group were young adult students that predominantly immigrated to Austria by themselves or lived already alone.

Due to the current political situation in the Near East and the thereof resulting tensions and conflicts between religious groups, questions concerning religious attitudes were removed from the questionnaire in order to avoid insult of participants, even though religion having considerable influence on attitudes, values and believes. Consequently, the role of religious differences on acculturation outcomes and adaption will not be analysed nor discussed in the present thesis.
In order to take into consideration the language skills of the targeted participants the new adapted English questionnaire was also translated in German language (Appendix B). These two versions enabled to draw from a larger pool of participants as not all immigrated students at JKU have profound German or English language skills. Therefore, students that did not have sufficient German skills could make use of the English version and vice versa. As the questionnaire for this study was adapted from the original English questionnaire by Berry and the added questions were also designed in English language a translation into German was needed. After the German translation was available the questionnaire was then back-translated into English by an English native speaker in order to avoid translation mistakes and to ensure proper sharing of meanings in both languages.

7.3 Additional Questions

7.3.1 Time Upon Immigration

In order to correspond to the needs of the current study the original questionnaire designed by Berry et al. (2006) used in an international empirical study was adapted. Questions that were not relevant to the present situation were removed and enlarged by additional questions, which purpose was to capture the experiences during immigration more in depth. For achieving this goal, a separate question section was created that exclusively dealt with questions regarding experiences during the initial time after immigration to Austria. The purpose of these newly designed question was to further allow for a comparison between past and present and thus to capture the development the individuals have gone through since their immigration to Austria as this could lead to differences in outcomes of acculturation.

The first questions of the section concerned the company the individual had when coming to Austria. Therefore, the question reads as follows:

AQ1: “When you came to Austria who accompanied you?”

The basic assumption for this question was that the company an individual had during immigration could influence the stress level experienced during this time and thus the resulting adaptation could be different depending on the persons that accompanied the individual. An individual that was accompanied by its parents would probably not experience the same stress level and perceive immigration experience differently as a person who came alone or was accompanied by its partner or spouse. Aronowitz (1984) noted that experiences made by
adults (such as parents) resulting from strains of immigration (e.g. finding employment, housing, immigration bureaucracy) and strains of everyday life such as coping with strains on parental and spousal roles can not necessarily be applied to adolescents. The reason behind it is the autonomy level that requires different efforts for setting up a life from scratch (need to find occupation, earning money to support family, new housing, bureaucracy etc.) in a new cultural setting. Individuals that come alone or with a partner/spouse will need to be more self-reliant and act on their own responsibility and therefore look after and deal with all these issues concerning immigration and settlement on their own. It could also be assumed to hold true for individuals who were accompanied by their siblings in the case that parents remained in the country of origin. Those accompanied by parents due to different factors such as lack of age of majority might not be as involved in the process of immigration will also not have to deal with issues such as finding occupancy and housing as these issues might be responsibility of parents. These adolescents might only embody a support role for their parents during this time and providing support to their parents with foreign language skills, which are needed for different visits to the authorities. Depending on the level of autonomy and self-reliance during time of immigration, stress levels and immigration experiences might be different due to different initial challenges and difficulties that the individuals experience and can impact adaptation and acculturation.

**AQ2: Can you remember what was your (or the persons´ who accompanied you) motivation behind the immigration to Austria?**

The second question of the additional section was dealing with the motivation and the voluntarism for immigration. On the scale of answers the participants could choose between three answer options: “Voluntary” (such as better economic situation), “Involuntary” (such as war in home country) and “Other motivators” which allowed for filling in comments from the participants. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, these different push and pull factors can impact acculturation outcomes. Individuals that are primarily motivated by pull factors are those that chose to immigrate for voluntary reasons and are attracted by opportunities available in the country of intended settlement. These individuals might be better prepared with information about the country of settlement and appropriate language skills to enter the new society. Whereas individuals that are leaving their country of origin for involuntary reasons such as war or persecution may be forced (like the current refugee seekers in Europe) to unpreparedly leave the country of origin and claim asylum in a country that authorities are allocating to
them. These factors prior to entering the new society can impact the experiences during acculturation and thus adaptation into the new society of settlement (Udahemuka & Pernice, 2010).

**AQ3: Which statement is true about the neighbourhood you lived in when coming to Austria?**

The third question was adapted from Berry’s et al. (2006) questionnaire and dealt with the neighbourhood composition the individuals were living in when coming to Austria. In the first section of the questionnaire, the same question comes up again with the slight difference that it asks for the current neighbourhood the participants are currently living in. The intended purpose for these questions was to find out whether the neighbourhood composition had an impact on the adaptation of the individual and thus on the acculturation pattern internalized (Ataca & Berry, 2002; Schwartz et al., 2006). Individuals that are living in a neighbourhood that is compound of individuals from the same cultural background are maybe more prone to stay in their own community that is having the same values and traditions and thus lack contact with host nationals which will probably result in a limited adaptation to the host culture. For this reason, not only interaction with host nationals is limited but also foreign language skills are not trained as these individuals are predominantly in contact with individuals from their own cultural background (Chiswick & Miller, 2004a, b). Further, the comparison of past and current situation allows for an assessment of development since immigration to Austria.

**AQ4: Upon your arrival to Austria: how well did you understand the German language, speak German, read and write in German?**

The section further asked about the individual’s German language skills in speech and writing as well as in speech comprehension upon arrival to Austria. Individuals possessing adequate second language skills may feel more confident in interacting with host nationals and hence would be more open to establish contact with host nationals. This in turn could foster adaptation process as second language skills implies easier access host nationals as source for cultural learning and hence to knowledge about the new host culture.

Individuals lacking adequate language skills when arriving into the new host country may perceive it as more difficult and challenging to get to know host nationals and establishing friendships with them as lack of adequate language skills represents a major barrier to communication on both sides. Both, host nationals as well as immigrated individuals may find communication as very challenging and exhausting due to lack of speech comprehension on
both sides and thus probably avoid these encounters that could result in miscommunication and misunderstandings, which in turn could lead to biased views on both sides. Moreover, lack of second language skills could also result in an isolation of immigrated individuals from host nationals into a surrounding with predominantly members of the own cultural background (c.f. Barker, 2015; Ataca & Berry, 2002).

AQ5: Who supported you (or your family) during this initial phase in Austria?

The next additional question dealt with the support the individual or its family (depending on the persons who accompanied the individuals to Austria) received during the initial time spent in Austria. The question had to be rated on a 5-point scale from “not at all” to “a lot” on members of own cultural background, other cultural background and Austrians. The intended purpose of this question was to find out whether this initial support received could have an impact on the acculturation outcomes (Garcia et al., 2006). Individual’s that might have received support from host nationals during their initial time in the new country of settlement might perceive these initial experiences with host nationals as positive and pleasant and thus might be more open toward host culture and also adapt to it (Zlobina et al., 2006). Whereas for individuals that might have experienced their initial time as more negative by experiencing lack or limited support from host nationals to overcome immigration challenges, this experience could have resulted in inner feelings of not being welcome into the host society and hence provoke an inner resistance to the adaptation to the new culture. This might be especially the case when cultural values are taken in consideration as well. Numerous countries pay significant importance to values such as hospitality and community support. Hence, if there is a major gap between host and home cultural values individuals are probably not as prone to adopt these contrasting values as they are not matching with their own believes and values.

AQ6: Did you find it difficult to get to know Austrian, establish friendships with Austrians, get along with Austrians?

The second last question of the questionnaire dealt with contact and friendship establishment with Austrians during the initial time in Austria. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point scale from “not at all” to “a lot” on issues such as difficulty to get to know Austrians, establishing friendships with Austrians and getting along with Austrians. The background of this question was to find out whether establishing friendships and getting to know host na-
tionals could influence the acculturation pattern internalized. Individuals that may find it difficult to get along with host nationals and hence being befriend with less host nationals may probably also lack more profound knowledge about the host culture. However, establishing contact and friendships with host nationals may also be influenced by the immigrated individual second language skills. Individuals that might lack adequate language skills will probably seek friendships with other co-ethnics or at least with individuals with whom it has a language in common (c.f. Michel et al., 2012; Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001; Florack et al., 2013).

**AQ7: What was the cultural background of your friends back then?**

The last question of this section dealt with the cultural background of friends during the initial time in Austria. This question could be rated on a 4-point scale from “none” to “many” regarding the following issues: friends from own cultural background, Austrian background and other cultural backgrounds. A similar question pertaining cultural background of current close friends can also be found later in the questionnaire. Reason for the comparison of past and current friends allows for an assessment of the development the individual has gone through since its immigration to Austria. This development of friendships in the country of settlement may also be influenced by the time the individual has already lived in the new society (Garcia et al., 2002). Individuals who have already spent a longer time in the new country of settlement might have already changed the initial circle of friends due to factors such as changing interests, better language skills to access and contact host nationals, new neighbourhood, job environment (Berry et al., 2006).

### 7.3.1.1 Future Relocation

Another aspect that was intended to be captured by this questionnaire was also the attitudes immigrated students were holding about future relocations and international job assignments. For this reason, a section (section J in Appendix A) concerning these attitudes was designed in order to capture attitudes on relocation that are a vital part of numerous jobs in today’s fast growing globalization development. The section is compound of five questions ranging from “In future: do you plan or can you image to…” “Move to another country” and “move back to your country of origin” and “if yes, would this be …” with answer possibilities of “temporarily” or “permanently”. Further, the questionnaire also asked to indicate the willingness to go abroad for a certain period of time in case of a job offer as well as to indicate the willingness to relocate for job purposes. If one of these last two questions was answered
by “no” the participant had also to give reasons by answering the fifth and last question on the reason for the unwillingness with answer options such as “family concerns”, “quality of life at job location”, “length of assignment”, or other. Main background for questioning the willingness for future relocations was the idea that individuals that have already once undergone immigration may be either more prone or more reluctant to future dislocations. Boneva and Frieze (2001), for example, argue that individuals, who have once undergone migration, are more willing to migrate than those individuals who have never migrated before basing their argumentation on studies such as by Kupiszewski (1996). The underlying hypothesis was that individuals that may have adopted an acculturation pattern of separation or bi-culturalism may be more prone to relocate in future because they do not feel that connected to the new host culture as they do not perceive Austria as their “home country”. Contrary, those individuals that have assimilated and feel connected to their new country of settlement would not be as easily willing to leave their new life they have built from scratch behind. Or are individuals that have already once undergone relocation and immigration not as willing to make these experiences again due to the challenging and exhausting time they have experienced during cultural transition. However, it must be mentioned again, that the answers given to these questions cannot be viewed solely and separately as they are again interacting with other factors such as time already spent in the new society, experiences made in new host society, opportunities received and other circumstances that the individual has already experienced.

7.4 Participants

For the empirical study, students aged between 18 to 35 years from JKU University were addressed with the questionnaire. Main reason for choosing solely students was the aim to obtain a homogenous group of participants that would allow for a better comparison of the results obtained from the questionnaires. By choosing students, factors such as upward mobility in occupation and the thereof resulting status loss could be eliminated. As mentioned earlier, this factor has been found to be associated with frustration, depression or other psychosomatic disorders and could influence adaptation and acculturation (Aycan & Berry, 1996). Furthermore, by addressing students, factors such as education could be fixed at the level of higher attained education, which has been found to be associated with better adaptation skills, as these individuals were found to have better problem analysis and coping skills, that allow to overcome stress situations more easily (Berry, 1997).
Contrary to the study conducted by Berry et al. (2006), where data from over 7,000 immigrant youth from 13 countries were collected – including both first and second generation immigrant youths – this study addressed only students of first generation immigration that immigrated to Austria before at least six months (at time of the survey). These individuals were born in a foreign country and have later immigrated to Austria, which allowed them to live in both cultural settings, namely home and host country and have therefore undergone immigration experience. As second generation immigrant students were born in Austria and did not undergo immigration experience, these students were excluded from the empirical study.

Further, international students, who were located at JKU as exchange students were excluded as participants from this study as well, as international students are seen as sojourners (like diplomats, guest workers, expatriates etc.). Due to their temporary residence in a certain country, the process of becoming involved into the new culture is more difficult since these individuals are cognizant about their future leave and their return home or move to another country. This circumstance and knowledge may result in hesitation towards becoming involved into the new society and in lower levels of identification with the host culture.

In addition, as Austria is home for numerous German residents who live, work or study in Austria, German students were excluded from the study. As Germany and Austria are not only sharing a common border but also a common language, traditions (e.g. Bavaria) and other commonalities, immigration experience is not as remarkable and stressing as for individuals from culturally more distanced societies.

7.5 Data collection

At Johannes Kepler University around 1,600 enrolled students have an immigration background (first generation). In order to access as many students as possible, the questionnaire has been distributed to these students in different ways. One channel of distribution was the online discussion forum available via KUSSS, which can be accessed by every enrolled student at JKU with its matriculation number and password. In this forum, a discussion thread was posted addressing students with immigration background and asking for a voluntary participation in a study for a diploma thesis. Students that were interested in participation could access the questionnaire by following the link that was distributed in the discussion thread.
In order to obtain more participants, the questionnaire was also distributed to students in German classes that are held at JKU. Prior to distributing the questionnaires in class, the German lecturers were contacted via Email, explained the purpose of the thesis and questionnaire and asked for permission for the distribution in class. After obtained permission and scheduled date the author of this thesis was attending the German classes equipped with German and English printout versions of the questionnaire. Students were explained the purpose of the thesis and the questionnaires and were asked for completion. As the participation was on voluntary basis, only students were distributed with questionnaires who wanted to participate. Those students were then asked to choose between a German or English printout version of the questionnaire, which was then subsequently handed over. Those students who finished earlier could return their filled questionnaire back to the author of the study. All other students who did not finish during the scheduled time were asked to return their filled questionnaire during next class to their German lecturer who subsequently would return it back to the author of the study or to place the questionnaire in a designated box that was located at the secretary of the Institut für Fremdsprachen (Centre for Business Languages and Intercultural Communications) at JKU.

Another channel of distribution for the questionnaire was via Email. In cooperation with REMI – Referat für Migration und Integration (Department of Migration and Integration) at JKU an Email in German and English language was sent to students with immigration background that were registered in the database of the REMI. In this email, students were explained the purpose of the diploma thesis and the questionnaire and were asked for voluntary participation in the survey and provided with a link that accessed the questionnaire.

7.6 Obtained Data

The questionnaire has been distributed in printout or online version to students with immigration background at JKU. In particular, 60 questionnaires were distributed in printout version in German classes at JKU of which 28 were valid, which results in a response rate of 46.67 %. The link to the online version of the questionnaire was distributed via email or KUSSS to around 1,600 students at JKU. This link has been accessed by 314 students obtaining 160 valid questionnaires, which represents a response rate of about 10 %. In total, 188 valid questionnaires were available for the statistical survey.

During field phase it showed that those students participating in the online survey were using the German version more often (149 German and 112 English filled question-
naires). The contrary – with 16 English and 13 German filled questionnaires – applied for the printout version of the questionnaire that has been distributed to students during German classes.

For the statistical evaluation of the questionnaires the IBM SPSS Statistics Software was employed, which is a data collection, analysis and reporting software. Those data sets that already have been available in electronic format (from the online questionnaires) have been loaded to SPSS, whereas data from the printout versions of the questionnaires have been entered manually to SPSS. Further, to provide readers with a better illustration of the obtained data graphs and tables were created by using Microsoft Office Excel.
8. RESULTS

8.1 Individual Level

8.1.1 Demographic Variables

Among the 188 respondents, 51.6% were female and 48.4% male respectively with a medium age of 27.6 years (Figure 8.1) and a medium length of residence in Austria of 7.85 years (Figure 8.2); hence age at immigration was around 20 years (19.75 years).

The sample consisted of students of 60 different nationalities (Figure 8.3) of whom 70.2% were originated from Europe, 13.8% from Asia, 6.9% from the Middle-East, 5.3% from Africa and 3.7% from the Americas. In particular, 14.4% of the participants emigrated from Bosnia (27 persons), 5.9% from Romania (11 persons), 4.8% from Kosovo (9 persons), 4.8% from Russia (9 persons), 4.3% from Croatia (8 persons), 3.7% from China (7 persons), 3.7% from Iran (7 persons) (A3).
Further, 90.4 % (170 persons) of the respondents did not have the Austrian citizenship whereas the remaining 9.6 % (18 persons) respectively had obtained their citizenship half a year ago (0.65 years) at the time of survey at the end of June 2015 (A5). One possible explanation for these low rates might be the legal requirements for the application for the Austrian citizenship stipulated by the Austrian government regarding length of residence in Austria of about six to ten years. Further, the expense factor starting from € 1,000,-/per person for the granting of the Austrian citizenship and the non-approval of dual citizenships by the Austrian government may be other factors contributing to these low levels. However, these results seem also to reflect a regressing trend since the mid-2000s where more than 34,000 persons obtained the Austrian citizenship compared to only 8,100 in 2015 (Statistik Austria, Statistik der Einbürgerungen, 2016).

Moreover, only 11.2 % of the respondents left their home country for involuntary reasons (B2) such as war in the home country, whereas 88.8 % left for voluntary reasons such as better education, no tuition fees at universities, partnership, better future for children, career opportunities, second language acquisition or foreign experience (Figure 8.4 – right side). The majority (52.1 %) of the students covered in this sample came alone to Austria, 26.1 % were accompanied by parents, 14.9 by siblings, 8 % by their partner/spouse and 10.1 % by other persons such as uncle/aunt, friends, other students or children (Figure 8.4 – left side) at the time of relocation (B1). These results (reason for immigration and companionship during immigration) are not surprising as patterns of immigration to European countries consider immigration to react to incentives such as economic and labour market opportunities or following already established migration networks (Hooghe et al., 2008).
8.1.2 Intercultural Variables – Acculturation Profiles

Due to results obtained by Berry et al. (2006), reporting that marginalization was the least often occurring acculturation profile, the present study focused on three acculturation profiles only: integration, assimilation and separation. As consequence, the questionnaire asked only questions that depicted those three acculturation profiles, whereas questions pertaining the marginalization profile were excluded. Therefore, the aim of the questions represented in Section E, 1 to 15 to depict acculturation profiles was as follows:

- **Integration**: Question 3, 5, 9, 10 and 14
- **Separation**: Question 1, 2, 7, 12 and 15
- **Assimilation**: Question 4, 6, 8, 11 and 13.

In order to allow for further calculations, the answer possibilities ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree – also including not applicable – were then recoded in numerical points as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next step using the created question groups of integration, separation and assimilation a sum was aggregated from the five questions pertaining each profile according to the numerical recoding. Therefore, the highest sum that could be reached for every profile was 25 points meaning that all five questions pertaining a certain profile have been answered with “strongly agree”. After all sums for each studied participant have been created according to this schema, frequencies for each profile was counted and aggregated (maximum points: 25; minimum points: 0). Consequently, the profile that had the highest aggregated points compared to the other two profiles was then counted as clear pattern for either the integration, separation or assimilation profile.

Nevertheless, from the 188 respondents, 167 persons showed a clear pattern for one of the three tested acculturation profiles. The remaining 21 persons were either close to two profiles (e.g. integration and assimilation) or had same scores on all three acculturation profiles. In particular, 11 persons were close on the integration and assimilation profile, 4 persons close on separation and assimilation, 2 persons close on integration and assimilation and 4 persons had same scores on all three acculturation profiles. In order to make a clear distinc-
tion in these cases, the questions represented in Section C (question 1, 3 to 5 referring to separation; question 2, 6 to 8 referring to assimilation) have been considered for each of the 21 participants individually and counted and aggregated following the same procedure as already explained above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score to be reached ranged between 20 points (which means that all four questions pertaining one profile have been answered with strongly agree) to 4 points (which means that all four questions have been answered with strongly disagree). Again, the profile that had the highest aggregated points (compared to the other profile) was then counted as clear pattern for either separation or assimilation. If for both profiles aggregated points were close to each other this was considered as integration. After these additional calculations, the 21 persons a priori indicating a diffuse profile were classified as follows: Integration: 8 persons; Assimilation: 7 persons; Separation: 6 persons, which then lead to the following final results:

Among the three acculturation profiles studied (Fig. 8.5), the most frequently occurring profile consisted of 155 students (82 %) who indicated high involvement in both national and their ethnic culture. The second profile consisted of 19 students (10 %) who indicated a strong orientation towards the Austrian host society, followed by 14 students (8 %) showing orientation towards their own ethnic culture. One possible explanation for these results could be the homogeneity of participants of the study which focused exclusively on students. As already reported by Pham and Harris (2001) individuals having attained higher education are
more often endorsing integration over the other profiles as these individuals have cognitive abilities that allow for other problem solving and coping strategies when dealing with immigration that allow them to become “bi-cultural”. Further, Austria pursues a multicultural orientation, which assumes a mutual accommodation of all ethno cultural groups in Austria. These expectations of the Austrian society toward integration of immigrated individuals may represent a more encouraging environment for individuals with immigration background to integrate into the Austrian society, as they may not feel pressured to assimilate and leave their culture of origin behind. However, Mähönen et al. (2013) indicate that such results should still be considered carefully as the integration option is normative in the discourse on immigration in Western societies. Therefore, when conducting as survey immigrated individuals as well as host nationals could tend to indicate “integration” as their preferred acculturation orientation while holding back their true opinions and attitudes on immigration since “integration” represents the only socially accepted way of thinking about immigration.

As the questionnaire provided room for additional comments and suggestions, some of the participants also informed about their thoughts pertaining acculturation, which also conveys a slight idea about the views and feelings that underlie the acculturation profiles found:

“… No one can do something about its origin… Austria offers everyone the possibility to feel here at home. It is up to us to make something of it. I love my culture and my home country but I love Austria just as much or even more.” (Female, 30 years from Albania, 1 year in Austria)

“I’m proud to be part of Austrian cultural socio economic integration because is the best integration part in the world.” (Female, 30 years from Macedonia, 1 year in Austria)

“Foreigners and Austrian culture are just like water and oil!” (Male, 26 from Cracovia, 6 years in Austria)

“… We have been exposed to international living and travelling, so living abroad is not new for me … I do have some identity issues’, since I do not know which culture I belong to. I do not feel 100 % Russian or American, because both cultures have influenced my view on the world…” (Female, 32 years from Belarus, 2 years in Austria)

“…but after a long while I’m sure that I will adapt more in this country, and I will feel it like my mother country.” (Female, 19 years from Syria, 1 year in Austria)
Even though research is largely inconclusive with respect to gender differences in acculturation profiles, women covered in this sample were more often found in the integration profile compared to their male counterparts (Figure 8.6). By contrast, men were more strongly represented in the assimilation and separation profiles compared to women. These results are also in line with results yielded by Berry et al. (2006) reporting same gender differences among profiles.

Additionally and in order to explain which factors contribute to the internalization of a particular acculturation profile, Chi-Square goodness-of-fit-test was conducted which is a likelihood-ratio test and allows for the conclusion whether the observed frequencies result from random sampling or not. For Chi-Square test statistical significance is indicated with p-value being ≤ 0.05.

For the purpose of Chi-Square test only factors – demographic as well as contextual – presented in Chapter 5, which have already been found in previous studies to contribute to internalization of acculturation attitudes, were considered. These particular factors are presented in Table 8.1, which aspects have been covered in the questionnaire (Appendix A) with relevant questions (see for question number in brackets).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (A1)</td>
<td>0.520582764511284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact establishment with Austrians at immigration (B6)</td>
<td>0.0558670249100622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current friends (D1)</td>
<td>0.0939429866201948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current neighbourhood (A7)</td>
<td>0.218230302885936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships at immigration (B7)</td>
<td>0.319702880854099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (A2)</td>
<td>0.672993231534261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration neighbourhood (B3)</td>
<td>0.268771063159085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills at immigration (B4)</td>
<td>0.54660443583352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence (B4/B1)</td>
<td>0.000056460671424786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination (H6-8)</td>
<td>0.602111381296289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support received (B5)</td>
<td>0.010466963574725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntarism of immigration (B2)</td>
<td>0.0598343450286464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Contextual factors tested with corresponding p-values
As results presented in Table 8.1 indicate, Chi-Square test yielded significant values (p value ≤ 0.05) for the factors “length of residence” and “support received”, which means that there is strong evidence that length of residence or supportive behaviour by host nationals at point of immigration can impact the outcomes of acculturation and consequently the preferred acculturation attitudes of immigrated individuals. These results are not surprising as time factor pertaining length of residence has already been reported by numerous researchers (Pham & Harris, 2001; Ward et al., 1998; Zlobina et al., 2006; Berry et al., 2006) to be a powerful predictor for acculturation and adaptation. It is argued that longer length of residence in a particular new host society would provide individuals with more time to acquire knowledge needed in order to understand host culture, whereas more recently immigrated individuals would lack this time for learning and would therefore feel confused and uncomfortable to participate in the host society.

Same findings were reported by researchers such as Zlobina et al. (2006) or Tartakovsky (2012) pertaining social support. Researchers argue that host national support can help immigrants to better integrate into host society by providing them with learning opportunities about cultural values and behaviours. In turn immigrated individuals perception about supportive behaviour of host nationals results in a positive attitude toward the host society which in turn foster and enhances desire to integrate.

8.1.3 Acculturation Profiles & Cultural Differences

Scholars such as Redmond (2000) argued that the greater differences between two cultures are the more problematic adaptation to the new culture can become. Shorter cultural distance, by contrast, would provide individuals with an ability of prediction and explaining host cultural behaviour and values more accurately (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1988). Hofstede (2003) argued that culture can only be used meaningfully by comparison. Therefore, and in order to control whether cultural distance has an influence on the preferred acculturation profile countries of origin were compared to Austria. For the comparison only countries were considered which had at least reached a representation of 3 % (Figure 8.3). As the other remaining countries were represented by five or less persons it was considered unreasonable to include them in the comparison, as conclusion and interpretation from these results would be difficult and only of limited nature.
As results indicate (Figure 8.7) individuals from Russia, Romania, Turkey, Macedonia and Bosnia are those most strongly represented in the separation profile. In order to find a possible explanation for these results Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions were used in order to compare countries. For comparison Hofstede’s homepage (https://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html) was accessed which provides a tool on Cultural Dimension which is needed for the intended comparison. Unfortunately, cultural dimensions for Macedonia and Bosnia were not available hence comparison on cultural dimension is made between Austria compared to Russia, Romania and Turkey (Figure 8.8).
However, as Hofstede (2003) argued, relative scores on cultural dimension have proven to be quite stable over time, as cultural shift happens very slowly and affects many countries at the same time. As a consequence, relative position of countries remains the same. As Figure 8.8 shows, dimensions of power distance, masculinity and indulgence differ significantly between Austria and immigrated individuals countries of origin. Nevertheless, it can still be said that, the countries compared are similar to each other on the dimensions of individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and indulgence.

![Figure 8.8: Comparison of Cultural Dimensions by integration profile](image)

The same procedure was applied for the countries of which most of the individuals endorsed integration (Figure 8.9). As the Cultural Dimensions by Hofstede did not provide data on Kosovo, scores for Albania have been considered for the comparison, as these two countries share a similar history. Remarkably is that Austria and Albania share very similar scores on the dimensions of masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation. Compared to Austria, the chosen countries differ significantly on the scores of power distance and indulgence. In general it can be said, that the four compared countries are very similar on the scores of power distance, individualism and indulgence. Nevertheless, no clear pattern between acculturation profiles and cultural distance could be found. However, as Lazarus (1997) argued culture should not been considered as monolithic concept assuming that everyone growing up and living in one particular culture would share the same cultural values or beliefs. One comment received by a participant confirms this statement:

“As being Russian by passport I’d like to notice that people from different parts of Russia have different perspectives. I am from Moscow and all my relatives as well. We can’t say we are Russians, we are Moscow people and this is of such big distinction”. *(Female, 23 years from Russia, 4 years in Austria)*
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8.1.4 Adaptation

Adaptation to a new cultural environment is measured – as proposed by Searle and Ward (1990) – in terms of psychological and sociocultural adaptation. For the purpose of the present study only psychological aspects of adaptation – namely life satisfaction (I6-I10) and self-esteem (I1-I5) – were measured.

![Figure 8.10: Self-esteem by acculturation profiles](image1)

![Figure 8.11: Life satisfaction by acculturation profiles](image2)

In line with expectations and results yielded in other studies (such as by Berry et al., 2006; Berry et al., 2012 and Pham & Harris, 2001) those individuals endorsing integration exhibited highest levels on self-esteem and only slightly lower levels on life satisfaction than those represented in the assimilation profile. Contrary to Barker (2015) on the possible negative outcomes on psychological well-being for those endorsing assimilation due to perceived group pressure among co-ethnics, assimilation profile exhibited nearly same levels of life satisfaction and self-esteem than those covered in the integration profile. However, those pursuing separation had clearly lower scores on both – life satisfaction and self-esteem – compared to the other two profiles (Figure 8.10 and 8.11).

However, as Berry et al. (2006) argued adaptation outcomes may also be moderated by contextual factors found in the social environment of the country of settlement such as the acculturation expectations held by host nationals towards immigrants. For example, the Austrian society is pursuing a multicultural orientation that tries to accommodate all ethno cultural groups by determining that integration is the acceptable way to engage in intercultural relations. This provides immigrated individuals with a sense that cultural diversity is welcomed and accepted. Whereas, a melting pot ideology, which expects the individual to assimilate by
giving up its heritage roots would spark the notion of superiority and inferiority of cultures, which could result in feelings of perceived discrimination, resistance and frustration which consequently could result in lower levels of self-esteem and life satisfaction on the side of immigrated individuals. Therefore, adaptation of the immigrated students covered in this sample reflects how well their goals and preferences match the opportunities offered to them in the Austrian society.

Controlling adaptation profiles for gender differences, contrary to other studies (Dion & Dion, 2001; Noh et al., 1992) suggesting that women more often suffer from poorer psychological adaptation outcomes, women covered in this sample exhibited only slightly lower levels of life satisfaction than their male counterparts but slightly higher levels of self-esteem. However, no evidence for a relationship between gender and psychological adaptation could be found in this sample. One possible explanation for these results could stem from the fact that the Austrian social environment is promoting gender equality in almost every life domain especially in the academic sector. This might provide female students not only with a greater freedom of choice pertaining future life direction but also with a notion of proud in terms of their academic achievements, which consequently enhances their self-esteem. Nevertheless, as Lazarus (1997) already put forward there is much more going on in an immigrant’s life beside the acculturation experience such as emotional reactions to developmental issues and life transitions. Therefore, daily hassles such as partnership issues or parental or homemaking issues, which are still reserved for women could contribute to slightly lower levels of life satisfaction among women compared to men. Further, as Dion and Dion (2001) reported higher socialization pressure that is put by parents on daughters due to different gender roles persistent in the culture of origin might also result in lower levels of life satisfaction among female students than among their male counterparts.
8.1.5 Background Variables

8.1.5.1 Language Use

Among the respondents the majority (42% to 46%) reported that German language skills were not existent at point of immigration, whereas only around 20% reported that German language skills were fairly well when arriving in Austria (B4) (Figure 8.12).

According to Chiswick and Miller (2004a) three factors can contribute to the ability to produce second language proficiency namely: exposure, efficiency and incentives. Exposure, which refers to time spent in a new country, was around 7.85 years in this sample. Those respondents living less than six years in Austria choose in 85% of the cases English over German. Chi-Square test significantly suggests a relationship between language use and length of residence $\chi^2$ (df 3)=45.882 p< 0.01 (Figure 8.13). One possible explanation could be the fact that the majority (60%) of the respondents reported that in more than 60% of the cases German skills (understanding, speaking, read and writing) upon arrival were little to non-existent.

Figure 8.12: German language skills at point of immigration

Figure 8.13: Language use by length of residence

Figure 8.14: Language use by age at immigration
Furthermore, within university setting incentives for learning German may be limited, as German language skills are not necessarily mandatory since numerous academic courses are offered in English and university staff (professors, administrative staff) as well as other students are fluent in English language. Consequently, immigrated students have always the option of using English as lingua franca; hence exposure to the German language may be depending on the persistence and willingness to rigidly rely on German as means of communication in every situation. One comment received by a student confirms this assumption:

“…since in the university everybody speaks English (I am doing a PhD) and I do not have free time enough, to learn German is something almost impossible...”. (Female, 37 years from Spain, 2 years in Austria)

For the third factor reported by Chiswick and Miller (2004a), namely efficiency, which refers to an individual’s ability to produce second language proficiency after a given amount of exposure to this particular second language but being influenced by age at immigration, Chi-Square test was significant suggesting a relationship between language use and age at immigration $\chi^2(\text{df } 5)=36.231$ p < 0.01 (Figure 8.14). Those respondents that settled after age of 18 to Austria predominantly used English, whereas those prior to age 18 used predominantly German over English for the completion of the questionnaire.

Additionally, the questionnaire asked about language use with family members as well (A8). Among those respondents that were accompanied to Austria by parents (26 %) or siblings (14 %) reported that in 83 % and 81 % of the cases they use predominantly native language to speak with parents respectively siblings. These results provide space for different explanations: The most obvious explanation could be that language skills within the family are still weak or non-existent due to shorter length of residence or other factors (e.g. Michel et al., 2012) such as proximity to co-ethnics in neighbourhood or unemployment resulting in fewer occasions to practice German (Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011); hence communication within the family still takes place in native language. Another possible explanation could be one that has already been reported by different researchers such as Yip (2005), Pham and Harris (2001) or Ouarasse and Vijver (2005) that identities are context dependent and preference for the ethnic identity, hence for native language use is more preferred in the private sector (e.g. in the home setting with family or siblings).
8.1.5.2 Neighbourhood Composition

Barker (2015) reasoned that presence or proximity of other co-ethnics often result in formation of communities, which in turn prevent immigrants to integrate into the new host society, as they predominately spend time segregated within these co-ethnics communities.

The questionnaire revealed that in 75.5 % of the cases respondents current neighbourhood was made up of “a majority” to “almost all” people from other cultural backgrounds, 14.9 % of an equal mix of same ethnics and other cultures and only 9.6 % of “a majority” to “almost all” people from the own cultural background (A7). Comparing this situation to the responses about the situation right upon arrival to Austria: 57.5 % lived in neighbourhoods, where “a majority” to “almost all” people were from different cultural backgrounds, 14.4 % lived in balanced neighbourhoods and 28.2 % in co-ethnic neighbourhoods (B3) (Figure 8.15). With time spent in Austria a transition of almost 20 % from own cultural neighbourhoods to neighbourhoods of different cultural backgrounds took place. However, one reason for this result could be the fact, that students are often living in student residences, which host not only local students (with different national backgrounds) but also exchange students from different countries, hence students typically have only a limited amount of choices as to the ethnic neighbourhood composition.

![Figure 8.15: Neighbourhood ethnic composition by time](image)

Considering neighbourhood ethnic composition by acculturation profiles, respondents endorsing integration are predominantly living in neighbourhoods made up of diverse ethnic backgrounds and likewise exhibited the lowest scores on co-ethnic neighbourhoods (Figure 8.16). This is not surprising as already Schwartz et al. (2006) argued that in communities where culture of origin is predominant, retention of culture of origin would not decline with greater time of residence nor with nativity. Hence, neighbourhoods hosting diverse cultural
backgrounds (including host national culture) provide immigrated individuals with greater opportunity for social interactions with host nationals and hence host cultural acquisition, than neighbourhoods hosting predominantly home country nationals.

Contrary to the expectations those respondents endorsing separation are also predominantly living in neighbourhoods of diverse ethnic backgrounds, but only in 14% of the cases in neighbourhoods predominantly made up of co-ethnics. This seems surprising as findings reported by Ataca and Berry (2002) suggest that immigrated individuals endorsing separation predominantly lived segregated in own-ethnic communities, which often counteracted the effects of host cultural acquisition and integration.

Surprisingly, among those respondents being assimilated to the Austrian culture 37% lived in neighbourhoods predominantly made up of members from the own cultural background, which represents the highest share (compared to 5% integrated and 14% separated). This seems surprising as proximity to co-ethnics is assumed to have a counteractive effect on host cultural acquisition because culture of origin is predominant and hence retention of host culture might not decline with time spent in the host country (Schwartz et al., 2006).

However, considering the small share of respondents endorsing separation and assimilation (7.6% and 10.3%) and the fact that living environment of students are often student residences or at home with parents, the validity of the results should rather been viewed as of limited nature. Further, one comment received by a responded was:

“… I do barely have any ethnic friends for the simple reason I grew up on the country side where no other ethnic people lived…”
This received comment further suggests, that amount of choice as to the ethnic composition of a neighbourhood is limited, as the proximity to host nationals or to people of different cultural backgrounds are subject to regional distributions, with metropolitan areas sometimes being more densely populated by individuals with immigration background than rural areas. Exemplary for this pattern of distribution is also Upper Austria (Figure 8.17), where metropolitan areas such as Linz, Wels or Steyr having immigration population rates of above 20 % compared to rural areas around Freistadt or Rohrbach below 5 % (Migration & Integration Report 2015, Statistik Austria).

![Figure 8.17: Upper Austrian immigration density 2015](source: STATISTIK AUSTRIA, Statistik des Bevölkerungsstandes 1.1.2015)

8.1.5.3 Friendships

In line with the findings reported by Berry et al. (2006), also the circle of friends changes with the length of residence, albeit change being small (Figure 8.18). More precisely, 8 % of the individuals reported that share of “none” Austrians in their circle of friends has decreased from 25 % to 17 % between point of time at immigration and time of the survey (B7 and D1). One possible explanation for this low decrease might be that the majority (76 %) of the interviewed students reported that establishing friendships with Austrians was
somewhat” to “fairly a lot” difficult. Evidence\textsuperscript{12} for a relationship between difficulties in establishing friendships (B6) with Austrians and close present Austrian friends could be found. Some of the respondents reported about their different experiences made regarding getting to know host nationals and establishing friendships with them:

“In the Austrian culture or for Austrians is hard to make international friends at the beginning because I think they are quite closed. But then they are really nice.”  \textit{(Female, 22 years from Spain, 1 year in Austria)}

“Austrian people treat quite good foreigners and the only problems (as in everywhere) are that at the beginning you are the rare, but in a few period of time, you voice also counts.” \textit{(Male, 28 years from Spain, 1 year in Austria)}

“I would like to acknowledge that there are a lot host nationals (Austrians) that are open towards foreigners.” \textit{(Male, 29 years from Afghanistan, 15 years in Austria)}

Comparing these results with the three acculturation profiles, those individuals endorsing integration have more balanced circle of friends composed of friends from different cultural backgrounds (Figure 8.19). Whereas those represented in the separation and assimilation profiles, have the majority of friends from their own cultural background and from the Austrian background, respectively. These particular characteristics found for each of the profiles have been reported in numerous earlier studies such as by Barker (2015) or De Vroome et al.

\textsuperscript{12} Chi-Square for “getting to know Austrians” \(x^2\) (df 4)=23.163 \(p<0.01\), “getting along with Austrians” \(x^2\) (df 4)=21.578 \(p<0.01\) and “establishing friendships with Austrians” \(x^2\)(df 4)=31.366 \(P<0.01\)
(2011). Hence, sustaining more social ties with host nationals is associated with greater host country identification, whereas more contact with co-ethnics is associated with increased attitudes towards separation (Leszcenzky, 2013).

However, proximity of Austrian people or people from other cultural backgrounds is also a crucial issue pertaining friendships as settlement density of people with immigration background may sometimes differ significantly (from 0 % to 20 % and more) in urban or rural areas (e.g. Upper Austria, Figure 8.18) as one comment suggests “…until university I barely had any contact to people from other ethnic backgrounds because there never was a chance to (living at country side). Since university I am befriend with other ethnic people even though these friendships are not as intense as the ones I have since my childhood.” (Male, 24 years from Bosnia, 23 years in Austria)

These findings are also reflected in the results yielded to the question pertaining leisure time (D2 to D4). A balanced frequency of leisure time activities with individuals from different cultural backgrounds was exhibited by those represented in the integration profile. Those represented in the assimilation profile reported predominantly (47 % of the cases) spending time with host nationals and in the same amount of cases never to seldom with co-ethnics. As Barker (2015) argued meaningful friendships with host nationals provide immigrants with a feeling of social acceptance and sense of host cultural belonging, which in turn foster integration or assimilation as they provide opportunities for cultural learning. The most significant result could be found in the separation profile, where 92 % reported spending leisure time “sometimes” to “often/always” with co-ethnics and other cultural backgrounds, but only in 57 % of the cases with host nationals. This goes in line with the findings reported by De Vroome et al. (2011) arguing that sustaining more friendships with home country nationals was negatively associated with host cultural friends. However, another possible explana-
tion for these found patterns could be that host cultural identification is associated with more host cultural friends like reported by Van Oudenhoven et al. (1998). According to the researchers host country nationals perceived immigrated individuals that identified with host society (integration or assimilation profile) as more similar to themselves and were therefore more willing to befriend them. Whereas immigrated individuals who did not identify with host society (separation profile) were perceived as different and therefore host nationals were not as willing to befriend them.

8.1.5.4 Support

Social support from host nationals has been found to be an influential predictor for acculturation and adjustment, as it lessens the degree of difficulty in the new host society (Zlobina et al., 2006). According to Tartakovsky (2012) the better the experiences made with host nationals, the more positive are the attitudes towards this society.

![Support received at point of immigration by profiles](image)

As mentioned previously, Chi-Square test provided strong evidence for the relationship between acculturation profiles and support (B5). In particularly, those individuals that received considerable support at point of immigration by Austrians are represented in the assimilation profile, whereas those in the separation profile received more support from own ethnic members, and those in the integration profile experienced a balanced mix of support from individuals from different cultural backgrounds (Figure 8.20).

Furthermore, this initial support received at the point of immigration reflects itself in friendships held today with Chi-Square test being significant\(^\text{13}\) for this relationship. Findings

\(^{13}\) Support by Austrians and close Austrians friends \(\chi^2\) (df 4)=13.307, \(p=0.009\); support from other backgrounds and close friends of other backgrounds \(\chi^2\) (df 4)=13.877, \(p=0.007\); ethnic support and close ethnic friends \(\chi^2\) (df 4)=9.259, \(p=0.054\).
by Briman & Tricket (2001) reporting that received support from host nationals was associated with closer contact to nationals, whereas received support from home country nationals was related to increase in contacts with home country nationals, support these present findings.

8.1.5.5 Perceived Discrimination

Perceived discrimination is assumed to be an important factor pertaining immigration experience. Tartakovksy (2012) concluded that the formation of attitudes towards the host country is based on the experiences made when interacting with its host nationals. Within the university setting apparently being discriminated (H6 to H8) against by professors or other students happens never (84 %) to rarely 75 % (Figure 8.21 – left side). Outside university setting there is a significant gap pertaining this perception to only 54.7 %. One student acknowledged: “Racism and discrimination is real in Austria! And there’s nothing anyone is doing about it…” (Male, 19 from Nigeria, 2 years in Austria). The report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) reported that the highest tendency for xenophobic behaviour could be found among elderly (age of +60), low-income earners, low educated or among housewives and pensioners. These findings could also provide an explanation for the low rates of discrimination found in this sample within the university setting and for the higher rates of perceived discrimination outside the university (Figure 8.21 – left side).

Further, the obtained data show that perceived discrimination represent itself most of the time in form of unfair treatment, teasing or insulting, followed by perceived feelings of non-acceptance by host nationals (Figure 8.21 – right side). Threating and attacking apparently seem to be rarely the case (H1 to H5).
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**Figure 8.21: Context of discrimination and forms of discriminatory behaviour (in %)**

Further, the obtained data show that perceived discrimination represent itself most of the time in form of unfair treatment, teasing or insulting, followed by perceived feelings of non-acceptance by host nationals (Figure 8.21 – right side). Threating and attacking apparently seem to be rarely the case (H1 to H5).
Results presented in Figure 8.22 suggest a gender gap in perceived discrimination. Male respondents indicated being more often subject to discriminatory behaviour in all three studied contexts (outside university, by other students, by professors). The most significant result indicates that among those reporting being subject to threats or attacks due to immigration background male students were in 80% affected by these kinds of behaviour. One possible explanation might be that immigrated men are sometimes perceived as aggressive by host nationals by virtue of their apparel or physiognomic differences and are therefore treated differently, which is then perceived as discriminatory behaviour by these immigrated men. However, as the question pertaining attacks/threats did not explicitly indicate the cultural background of the person displaying this sort of behaviour it is unclear whether it was originated from a host national toward an immigrated individual or between immigrated individuals from different cultural backgrounds themselves.

Research (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2006) on discrimination suggests that there is a reciprocal relationship between discrimination and acculturation, reasoning that discrimination and separation are reinforcing each other. Consequently, those being assimilated should exhibit lower levels of discrimination compared to those covered in the separation profile.
Interestingly, those covered in the assimilation profile exhibit highest perceived level of discrimination compared to the other two profiles in all three contexts (Figure 8.23). However, one possible explanation could be the fact that the questionnaire did only ask about feeling of perceived discrimination in general and not explicitly about the cultural background of the person displaying this kind of behaviour. Hence, conclusion whether discriminatory behaviour was originated from an Austrian towards a foreigner or among foreigners themselves (e.g. between a Hungarian and a Romanian) is not clear and hence, conclusions should be drawn cautiously.

![Figure 8.24: Forms of perceived discriminatory behaviour by acculturation profiles](image)

Outside university unfair treatment, perceived feeling of non-acceptance and teasing or insulting are the most commonly occurring forms (Figure 8.24). However, the report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) reported that federal states, which already have a long migration history such as Vienna and hence in which multicultural living is seen as something common, are less prone to discrimination and prejudices. Some comments received by respondents confirm the possible implications of region/city and point of time on discrimination:

“I have had different experiences in Linz compared to Vienna for example. I would also like to say that Linz was the place where I really felt not welcome (just because I was a foreigner, no matter the ethnic group).”  *Female, 29 years from Romania, 3 years in Austria*

“… I live in Austria for ages and I love this country, Austria, more than I love my home country, … but in the last couple of weeks/months, there is so much baiting on the net, that you almost lose your faith in the good-nature of Austrians…”  *Male, 21 years from Kosovo, 20 years in Austria*
8.1.5.6 Discrimination by Physical Ethnic Differences

Ethnic categorization resulting from visual stimuli such as identifiable ethnic or religious signs or dress codes always had ramification for the social and economic life of people throughout the world. However, Kelly et al. (2005) argue that skin colour and physiognomic differences are mostly used to create such categorizations. Further, the researchers reported that this sensitivity to detect physical ethnic differences is formed around the third month after birth, when the face processing system becomes more tuned.

However, in order to examine differences in discrimination resulting from physical ethnic differences five categories (A3 and A6) (in alphabetical order) were created, which has been adapted from Kelly et al. (2005) study:

- African
- Asian
- Caucasian
- Middle Eastern
- South-American

Results suggest that in general individuals originated from Africa, Asia, Middle East followed by Caucasians are those being most often subject to different forms of discriminatory behaviour (Figure 8.25). However, only individuals from South-America reported to experience least strongly discrimination in all three contexts (outside university, by other students, by professors) (Figure 8.26).
However, the most commonly occurring forms of discriminatory behaviour were reported to be perceived feeling of non-acceptance, unfair behaviour and teasing or insulting. One comment by a student confirms these results:

“Some people in Austria are really so unfriendly … Maybe because of my colour (black).” (Male, 20 years from Nigeria, 1 year in Austria)

Apparently, discrimination seems to be strongly present outside university setting with individuals from the Middle East, Africa and Caucasian being affected by it. However, results suggest that discrimination among students themselves is least often occurring followed by teachers or professors. Albeit university setting displaying a higher sensitivity towards cultural diversity, one possible explanation for higher perceived discrimination by professors or teachers might be due to issues regarding grading and grading systems. Sometimes received negative grades or evaluations on exams might be taken personally by students considering professors or teachers’ assessments being not objective enough instead of considering it as the result of one’s own weak performance.

Contrary to studies (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2006) supporting the RDI-Model which assumes perceived discrimination to prevent immigrated individuals from developing a sense of belonging to the host society, due to perceived unfair treatment by host society members, the results yielded show a different picture (Figure 8.27). Even though individuals originated from Africa or Asia who reported being often affected by discrimination, these individuals were less often covered in the separation profile. Instead, these individuals were predominantly found in the integration and assimilation profile compared to individuals being to a lesser extent subject to discrimination (Caucasians). However, it should be mentioned that – due to low numbers of individuals covered in the assimilation and separation profile – these result are to be considered with caution.
8.1.6 Relocation

The last part of the questionnaire dealt with issues related to relocation. It was assumed that undergone immigration experience would make individuals more prone or more reluctant to relocations. Results show that half of the respondents answered that they were in favour or planned to move to another country, whereas 30.3% were not sure and 19.7% were not willing to take this step again (J1). Moving back to country of origin was favoured by only 26.6%, whereas 35.6% were not sure and 37.8% were not favouring this step at all (J2) (Figure 8.28). However, one possible explanation for why individuals covered in this sample would still like to relocate might be one that has already been provided by Boneva and Frieze (2001). The researchers argue that individuals that have once undergone immigration would be more prone to do so again compared to individuals who have never relocated before beyond national borders. However, the report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) for example reported that only 20% of immigrated individuals reside for more than five years in Austria. This could also be the case for individuals that migrated for involuntary reasons and which are yet not sure whether to reside temporarily or permanently in Austria. Individuals in this sample who migrated to Austria for involuntary reasons indicated in 57% of the cases their willingness for relocation compared to only 49% of those individuals that migrated for voluntary reasons.

![Figure 8.28: Readiness for relocation and voluntarism of immigration](image)

However, another explanation for the desire or willingness to relocate could be provided by considering perceived discrimination. Those individuals reporting being subject to discriminatory behaviour such as unfair treatment, teasing or insulting (answer option: “somewhat” to “strongly agree”) are also reporting their willingness for relocation in more than 40% of the cases (Figure 8.29). Albeit individuals reporting discriminatory behaviour from the side of host nationals and displaying strong tendency for relocation to another coun-
try, there is quite a consensus that relocation should not lead back to country of origin (Figure 8.30). Relocation back to country of origin can be imagined by 42% of individuals who reported being subject to threats or attacks due to their immigration background. One possible explanation could be – as provided by the RDI-Model (c.f. in chapter 5.3.3 Perceived Discrimination) – that perceived discrimination represents a threat to one own’s social identity which results in an increase in own ethnic identification and with a decreased identification with the host society. This in turn could further strengthen the desire to move back to country of origin.

Taking a look on acculturation profiles and readiness for relocation (Figure 8.31) results suggest that individuals covered in the integration profile are those that are more readily willing to relocate again (53%) followed by those covered in the separation (38%) and assimilation profile (37%). Further, as expected individuals covered in the separation profile are in 46% of the cases are willing to move back to their country of origin (Figure 8.32), which further confirms the RDI-Model whereupon strong identification with culture of origin can result in a strengthen desire to move back to country of origin.
However, willingness for relocation was also tested by gender differences with Chi-Square test being significant for the relationship between gender and movement back to country of origin ($x^2$ (df 3)=12.827 p=0.003. Results suggest that women are more readily willing to move to another country than men but in significantly less cases willing to move back to country of origin than their male counterparts (Figure 8.33). One possible explanation for this gender gap could be as Ouarasse and Van de Vijer (2005) argued that sometimes existing gender roles in the host society are perceived as more favourable by women and hence these women in turn feel more attached to the host society than to country of origin. This could also be one explanation for the results yielded in this sample. Existing gender roles in Austria and gender equality within the university setting may be perceived as more attractive to women compared to existing gender roles in country of origin wherefore these female students are now reluctant to move back to country of origin.

However, of those female respondents who planned or could imagine relocation were in 52 % of the cases in favour of doing this temporarily and in 48 % of the cases permanently.

8.1.7 Expatriation

The last part of the questionnaire dealt with issues pertaining job related temporary assignments and relocations.

Individuals indicated in 72.9 % of the cases their willingness for a movement for a certain period of time because of a job assignment, whereas the remaining 20.7 % and 5.3 % were not sure or not willing respectively to do so (J3).

Again, the majority of the respondents (78.7 %) considered relocation for a job whereas only 18.6 % were against this idea (J4). The most commonly quoted reason for non-relocation (Figure 8.34) were family concerns (36 %) (comment received: “…I will relocate for my job ONLY when my family come with me.”), followed by spouse/partner’s career (14 %) (J5). These results pertaining objections regarding family relationships are in similar
line with the numbers presented in the Global Mobility Trend Survey 2015 (Brookefield, 2015). Those individuals interviewed for the report indicated family concerns (38 %) followed by spouse/partner’s career (18 %) as major objections for non-relocating for job purposes.

Figure 8.34: Reasons for non-relocation
9. CONCLUSION

9.1 Summary of Findings

The main purpose of this study was to apply Berry’s acculturation framework and gain understanding of the process of acculturation within the Austrian setting. Acculturation attitudes was defined by Berry et al. (2006) as way on how people prefer to live in intercultural contact situations and is therefore based on two issues: To what extent do immigrants wish to have contact with host nationals and to what extent they wish to maintain their cultural attributes. However, different factors – demographic as well as contextual factors found in the society of settlement – can impact acculturation outcomes. Thereof, two questions were tried to be answered with this present study:

Q1: Which contextual factors contribute to the internalization of the acculturation patterns of integration, assimilation or separation?

Q2: Does the internalized acculturation pattern of integration, assimilation or separation contribute to the willingness for further relocations?

9.1.1 Factors of acculturation

As whole, results suggest that length of residence in the host society and support from host nationals are the most influential factors that explain the internalization for all three acculturation profiles studied. Further, immigrants in this sample show involvement with the Austrian society but still retaining their ethnic heritage which reflects itself in the dominance of the integration profile in terms of figures. The internalization of integration as acculturation profile is also mirrored in the degree of expectations regarding acculturation held by the Austrian society, which also sees integration of immigrated individuals as the preferred form of acculturation to the Austrian culture. This mutual consensus held by host nationals as well as by immigrated individuals might also foster integration. However, assimilation was the second most often occurring acculturation profile followed by separation.

Controlling for gender differences it shows that women are more likely to be found in the integration profile compared to their male counterparts, who in contrast are more likely to endorse assimilation and separation. These gender differences persist also for perceived discrimination with male respondents more often reporting being subject to discriminatory be-
haviour. However, the context of perceived discrimination is mostly outside university setting with unfair treatment, teasing or insulting or perceived feeling of not being accepted as the most commonly occurring forms of discrimination. Those individuals represented in the integration profile reported being less often subject to discrimination followed by individuals represented in the separation profile. Unexpectedly, those endorsing assimilation reported being very often subject to discriminatory behaviour, although assimilation implies that individuals have become absorbed into the host culture by having adapted to the customs and norms of the society.

Considering differences in perceived discrimination resulting from physical ethnic differences, results suggest that individuals originated from Africa, Asia and the Middle East are more often subject to discrimination, which manifests itself most strongly outside the university setting. Albeit these individuals being more often subject to discrimination, they endorse integration and are less likely to be found in the separation profile.

Those individuals endorsing integration also reported living in neighbourhoods predominantly made up of individuals of different cultural backgrounds. When comparing neighbourhood cultural composition in the passage of time (point at immigration to time of survey), 20% of the individuals reported a change from “neighbourhoods of own cultural background” to “neighbourhood of different cultural backgrounds”.

A similar change resulting from passage of time (point at immigration to time of survey) has also been reported regarding cultural background of circle of friends. Albeit this reported change was minor (6%) individuals reported that – since time of immigration – share of host nationals in their circle of friends has increased to “many”. However, this slight increase could be attributed to the reported difficulties in establishing friendships with host nationals. However, integrated individuals reported having culturally equally mixed circle of friends, whereas assimilated and separated individuals reported having more Austrian or more same-cultural friends respectively. Same patterns replicated in the leisure time context, with integrated individuals reporting spending time with individuals from different cultural backgrounds, and assimilated and separated with host nationals and own-cultural friends respectively, which appears obvious.

However, acculturation attitudes held by immigrated individuals provide only one aspect to the immigration experience and without considering adaptation to acculturation no clear picture on how well immigrated individual adapted can be obtained. Adaptation was therefore assessed by measuring self-esteem and life satisfaction. Results suggest that those
covered in the integration profile exhibited highest scores on self-esteem and only slightly lower levels on life satisfaction than those represented in the assimilation profile. Those individuals represented in the separation profile had the lowest scores on both indicators. It therefore can be suggested that a joint positive orientation toward the ethnic culture and the Austrian culture is the most beneficial orientation in terms of psychological outcomes. However, gender differences found were modest with women exhibiting higher levels of self-esteem but slightly lower levels of life satisfaction than their male counterparts.

The results obtained in this present study provide a picture on the complexity on the topic of acculturation. Although over 80% of the respondents being integrated into the Austrian society in terms of their attitudes, supporting these beneficial outcomes is likely to depend on the future political and attitudinal climate in the Austrian society. Results clearly suggest that process of acculturation is not static and patterns can change with time spent in Austria. Therefore, presented results provide only a snapshot in time. Enlargement of the current study to other settings (e.g. outside the university setting) would be needed in order to make more general applicable statements about the acculturation situation within the Austrian society. Further, replication of the study at different point in times would be needed in order to gain understanding whether acculturation attitudes are malleable over time or not.

9.1.2 Willingness for relocation

Results suggest that individuals covered in the integration profile are those that are more likely willing to relocate to another country followed by those in the separation and assimilation profile. Individuals more willing to move back to country of origin are those covered in the separation profile followed by assimilation and integration. Again, gender differences persisted with female respondents being less likely to move back to country of origin compared to their male counterparts. However, patterns across acculturation profiles were not as significant as to make a general applicable statement of the underlying relationship. Consequently, further and additional studies would be needed in order to find clearer patterns.
9.2 LIMITATIONS

One limitation of the current study is the sample that focused exclusively on students. As reported in other studies such as by Pham and Harris (2001) or Abu-Rayya (2009) higher attained education correlate with integration as acculturation outcome and with lower levels of ethnic identification. This could represent an explanation for the low levels of separation and assimilation profiles found in the sample and for the predominate representation of integration as acculturation outcome. Consequently, the small sample of assimilation and separation as acculturation outcome represented in this sample, may limit the generality of implications pertaining these profiles.

Secondly, due to results yielded by Berry et al. (2006) reporting that marginalization was among the least preferred acculturation profiles and for the purpose of keeping the questionnaire as compact as possible but still cover relevant aspects, questions pertaining marginalization profile were excluded, hence only three acculturation profiles were studied.

Thirdly, targeting only students may also limit the generality of implications of the results presented. As Lazarus (1997) argued struggles and challenges resulting from immigration may vary among the different family members. For parents, immigration may be more difficult and frustrating compared to children, who are young enough to learn a new language and change patterns of behaviour and get the same opportunities regarding education and occupation as host national youths. Therefore, the result cannot be generalized to all immigrated individuals living in Austria, as factors such as socioeconomic statuses or educational levels could have impacted results differently.

The present study did not take into consideration personality traits, even though personal traits can influence how individuals experience and cope with challenges pertaining cultural transition. Hence, a qualitative study that captures these individual characteristics would be needed in order to gain a more profound picture on how personality can influence acculturation process. The same approach would be needed in order to ascertain in how far cultural distance between county of origin and host country can impact acculturation, albeit it cannot be assumed that all or most people within a culture share the same cultural values and beliefs (Lazarus, 1997)

Further, Lazarus (1997) also argued that acculturation is only one aspect pertaining lives of immigrated individuals beside everyday issues and struggles such as job, partnership or parenthood. These everyday issues and struggles can in the short-run affect how individuals see and perceive the world and environment around themselves. Such momentary moods
and emotions can then be reflected in the answers provided in such questionnaires like the present one. Therefore, the picture obtained by the presented results does only provide a static view and represents only a snapshot in time. Consequently, an understanding of the process underlying acculturation and adaptation can only be attained when assessments are made at more than one point in time.

9.3 IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study clearly suggest that integration path is – both for immigrated individuals as well as for host country nationals – the most beneficial path. However, for immigrated individuals to follow integration path host country governments need to:

1. Develop policies and programs for the enlightenment of host nationals to encourage acceptance and understanding that integration is a reciprocal path and a matter of time that implies that immigrated individuals are conceded to live both cultures without living the one over the other.
2. Develop policies to ensure the integration and participation of immigrated individuals in everyday life, without immigrated individuals being isolated in own cultural communities.

For immigrated individuals, results suggest that:

- Integration into host society is the most beneficial outcome in terms of both psychological as well as sociocultural adaptation - compared to all three acculturation profiles presented and therefore, seeking to follow the integration path is recommended.

Trend toward globalization is increasing and cannot be stopped. One major aspect of globalization is free movement of people. As Aristoteles said: “We cannot change the wind, but we can adjust the sails”. Therefore, in order to take advantage of the opportunities offered by immigration, governments need to develop and implement policies to foster the integration of immigrants, as governmental actions play an important role in shaping the flows, conditions and consequences of international migration. As already put forward by Berry (1997) in order to accommodate all parties involved and manage pluralism, understanding on both sides is necessary. Host nationals need to understand, that immigrated individuals who are facing
everyday prejudice and discrimination, are exposed to reduced psychological welfare, which can also impose costs on the host society in terms of social conflict and control.

On the other side, immigrated individuals need to understand and accept the core values and basic norms found in the host society. Non acceptance of these cultural values can induce irritation among host nationals and even social conflicts. Further, immigrated individuals should be aware that discrimination will not disappear even though one might be integrated into the host society.

9.4 DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As results presented show, the multicultural orientation pursuit by the Austrian society is also reflected in the integration orientation predominantly found among the students represented in the study. However, every application of a framework at a single point of time will deliver only static results that can only deliver a picture of the situation at that particular point in time. In order to gain a better understanding of the acculturation experience replication of the study at different points in time would be needed. This would allow assertion whether acculturation profiles are malleable over time. For example: between the end of field phase and finalization of this paper one year passed. Within this time Europe has undergone major events like the immigration stream resulting from war in Syria or terrorist acts in countries like Germany, France or Turkey. These events gave rise to right-wing parties and right wing leaders among European countries as response to perceived threat of the European population and changes in mindsets of people pertaining immigration and hence national and economic security. Therefore, replication of the current study covering the same sample of participants would allow for a comparison in how far political changes have impacted current presented results for example in terms of acculturation profiles, perceived discrimination, support by host nationals or willingness for relocation.
LIST OF REFERENCES


138


APPENDIX A – ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Here are some questions about yourself and your background. Fill in the blank or check the answer that applies best.

1. How old are you?

............... years

2. What is your gender?

☐ Female
☐ Male

3. In which country were you born?

.............................................................

4. How old have you been when you came to Austria?

............................................. years

5. Are you an Austrian citizen? – If yes, since when?

☐ Yes, since .......................  
☐ No

6. What is your ethnic background?

.............................................................

7. Which statement is true about the neighbourhood you currently live in?

☐ Almost all people are from a different cultural background than mine
☐ A majority of the people is from a different cultural background than mine
☐ There is about an equal mix of people from my cultural background and other backgrounds
☐ A majority of the people is from my cultural background
☐ Almost all people are from my cultural background
8. What language do you speak with your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Half the time</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>All the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I speak in native language with my parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak German with my parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak in my native language with my siblings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak German with my siblings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. This section of this questionnaire will deal with the time right upon your arrival to Austria. Please check the answer that corresponds best to your own experiences.

1. When you came to Austria who accompanied you? (Multiple answers possible)
   - ☐ My parents
   - ☐ My siblings
   - ☐ My partner/spouse
   - ☐ I came alone to Austria
   - ☐ Other persons ...........................................

2. Can you remember what was your (or the persons who accompanied you) motivation behind the immigration to Austria?
   - ☐ Voluntary (e.g. better economic situation, job opportunities, education system etc.)
   - ☐ Involuntary (e.g. war in your home country etc.)
   - ☐ Other reasons. Which one?...............................\

3. Which statement is true about the neighborhood you lived in when coming to Austria?
   - ☐ Almost all people were from a different cultural background than mine.
   - ☐ A majority of the people was from a different cultural background than mine
   - ☐ There was about an equal mix of people from my cultural background and other backgrounds
   - ☐ A majority of the people was from my cultural background
   - ☐ Almost all people were from my cultural background

4. Upon your arrival to Austria: how well did you ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Fairly well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand the German language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak German</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and write in German</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Who supported you (or your family) during this initial phase in Austria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Fairly a lot</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of my own cultural background</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrians</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of other cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Did you find it difficult to ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Fairly a lot</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get to know Austrians</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish friendships with Austrians</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get along with Austrians</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What was the cultural background of your friends back then?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends from your own cultural background</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends from other cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. People can think of themselves in various ways. For example, they may feel that they are members of various cultural backgrounds and that they are part of the larger Austrian society. These questions are about how you think of yourself in this respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think of myself as ethnic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think of myself as Austrian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel I am part of my ethnic culture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am proud of being ethnic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am happy to be an ethnic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that I am part of the Austrian culture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am proud of being Austrian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am happy to be Austrian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Here are some statements about friends and people you know. Please check the answer that applies best to you.

1. What is the cultural background of your friends today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close friends of your cultural background</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Austrians friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friends from other cultural background than mine</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How often do you currently spend free time with ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of your cultural background</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrians</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of other cultural backgrounds than yours</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How often do you participate in traditional ethnic activities or customs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>A few times a year</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>Whenever there is a chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How often do you participate in traditional Austrian activities or customs?

|                                | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

E. Here are some statements about language, cultural traditions, friends etc. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by checking the answer that applies best to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that ethnic group should maintain their own cultural traditions and not adopt those of Austria</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would rather like to be in a relationship with an ethnic than with an Austrian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that ethnic groups should maintain their own cultural traditions but also adopt to those of Austria</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would rather like to be in a relationship with an Austrian than with an ethnic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be just as willing to be in a relationship with an Austrian as with an ethnic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that ethnic group should adapt to the Austrian cultural traditions and not maintain those of their own</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. It is more important to me to be fluent in ethnic than in German

8. It is more important to me to be fluent in German than in ethnic

9. It is important to me to be fluent in both German and ethnic language

10. I prefer social activities that involve both Austrian and ethnic members

11. I prefer to have only Austrian friends

12. I prefer to have only ethnic friends

13. I prefer social activities that involve Austrians only

14. I prefer to have both ethnic and Austrian friends

15. I prefer social activities that involve ethnic group members only

16. My parents encourage/d me to maintain our heritage culture

17. My parents encourage/d me to be open towards the Austrian culture

H. When people of different backgrounds are together one may sometimes feel treated unfairly. The following questions are about these kinds of experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think that groups have behaved in an unfair or negative way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards my ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I do not feel accepted by Austrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that Austrians have something against me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. have been teased or insulted because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my cultural background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have been threatened or attacked because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my cultural background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often did or do the following people treat you unfairly or negatively because of your cultural background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Professors, teachers, at university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other people outside university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. How do the following statements apply to how you think about yourself and your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel that I have not much to be proud of</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In most ways my life is close to my ideal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The conditions of my life are very good</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. So far I have got the important things I want in my life</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. The following questions are about your attitudes on expatriation and relocation.

In future: Do you plan or can you imagine to ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Move to another country?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Move back to your country of origin?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If yes, would this be ...?
   ☐ Temporarily
   ☐ Permanently

4. In case you are offered a job assignment, would you go abroad for a certain period of time?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ Not sure
   ☐ No

5. Would you relocate for your job?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
6. If no – for what reasons? (Multiple answers possible)

☐ Family concerns (e.g. partner's resistance to int. assignments, children's education etc.)
☐ Spouse/partner's career
☐ Inability to speak local language
☐ Length of assignment
☐ It was already hard to adjust once
☐ If company is not offering an adequate compensation
☐ Quality of life at job location
☐ I don't think it would help my career
☐ Other .........................................................

Dear participant!
Thank you that you have participated in this survey! If there is something else you would like to let us know, please fill in your comments in the box below!
APPENDIX B – GERMAN QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Hier sind einige Fragen über dich selbst und deinen Hintergrund. Fülle deine Antworten ein oder kreuze an was am besten zu dir passt.

1. Wie alt bist du?

........................... Jahre

2. Was ist dein Geschlecht?
☐ Weiblich
☐ Männlich

3. In welchem Land wurdest du geboren?

.................................................................

4. Wie alt warst du als du nach Österreich kamst

................................. Jahre

5. Bist du österreichische/r StaatsbürgerIn?
☐ Ja. Seit wann? ......................
☐ Nein


.................................................................

7. Welche Aussage trifft am ehesten auf die Nachbarschaft zu in der du zurzeit lebst?
☐ Fast alle Menschen gehören einer anderen ethnischen Gruppe an als der meinigen
☐ Ein Großteil der Menschen ist von einer anderen ethnischen Gruppe als meine
☐ Es ist etwa eine gleiche Mischung von Menschen meiner ethnischen Gruppe und andere Gruppen
☐ Ein Großteil der Menschen ist von meiner ethnischen Gruppe
☐ Fast alle Menschen sind von meiner ethnischen Gruppe
8. In welcher Sprache sprichst du mit deiner Familie?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antwort</th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>Ein bisschen</th>
<th>Gemischt</th>
<th>Sehr oft</th>
<th>Die ganze Zeit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich spreche in meiner Muttersprache mit meinen Eltern</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich spreche Deutsch mit meinen Eltern</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich spreche in meiner Muttersprache mit meinen Geschwistern</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich spreche Deutsch mit meinen Geschwistern</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Wenn du an die Zeit unmittelbar nach deiner Ankunft in Österreich zurück denkst, welche Aussagen treffen am besten zu deinen gemachten Erfahrungen zu?

1. Als du nach Österreich kamst - wer hat dich hierher begleitet? (Mehrfachnennung möglich)
   - Meine Eltern
   - Meine Geschwister
   - Mein/e Partner/in, Ehemann/frau
   - Ich kam alleine nach Österreich
   - Andere – Wer? …………………………………………………..

2. Was war die Motivation für deine Immigration nach Österreich (bzw. was war die Motivation für die Personen, die dich begleitet haben)?
   - Freiwillig (z.B.: bessere Wirtschaftslage, Beschäftigungsmöglichkeiten, Bildungssystem etc.)
   - Unfreiwillig (z.B.: Krieg im Heimatland)
   - Andere. Welche Motivatoren? ………………………………………….  

3. Welche Aussage trifft am ehesten auf die Nachbarschaft zu in der du damals gelebt hast?
   - Fast alle Menschen gehörten einer anderen ethnischen Gruppe an als der meinigen
   - Ein Großteil der Menschen gehörte einer anderen ethnischen Gruppe an als der meinigen
   - Es war etwa eine gleiche Mischung von Menschen meiner ethnischen Gruppe und anderen Gruppen
   - Ein Großteil der Menschen gehörte meiner ethnischen Gruppe an
   - Fast alle Menschen waren gehörten meiner ethnischen Gruppe an
4. Nach deiner Ankunft in Österreich – wie gut konntest du ....?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>Ein bisschen</th>
<th>Etwas gut</th>
<th>Ziemlich gut</th>
<th>Sehr gut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch verstehen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch sprechen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch lesen und schreiben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Wer hat dich oder deine Familie in deiner/eurer Anfangsphase in Österreich unterstützt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>Ein bisschen</th>
<th>Etwas</th>
<th>Ziemlich viel</th>
<th>Sehr viel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitglieder meiner ethnischen Gruppe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österreicher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitglieder anderer ethnischer Gruppen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Empfandst du es damals als schwierig ...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>Ein bisschen</th>
<th>Etwas</th>
<th>Ziemlich</th>
<th>Sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ÖsterreichInnen kennenzulernen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freundschaften zu ÖsterreichInnen aufzubauen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mit ÖsterreichInnen auszukommen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Wie war dein damaliger Freundeskreis zusammengestellt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keine</th>
<th>Wenige</th>
<th>Einige</th>
<th>Viele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freunde meiner ethnischen Herkunft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Österreichische Freunde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freunde anderer ethnischer Herkunft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wie denkst du von dir selbst?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ich denke, dass ich ethnisch bin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich denke, dass ich Österreicher/in bin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich fühle mich als Teil meiner ethnischen Kultur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich bin stolz einen ethnischen Hintergrund zu haben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich bin froh einen ethnischen Hintergrund zu haben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ich fühle mich als Teil der österreichischen Kultur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ich bin stolz ÖsterreicherIn zu sein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ich bin glücklich ÖsterreicherIn zu sein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Hier sind einige Fragen zu Freunden und Menschen, die du kennst. Kreuze die Antworten an, die am besten auf dich zutreffen.

1. Wie ist dein Freundeskreis heute zusammengesetzt? Hast du ...?
   - enge Freunde deiner eigenen kulturellen Herkunft
   - enge österreichische Freunde
   - enge Freunde anderer kultureller Herkunft

2. Wie oft verbringst du freie Zeit mit ...?
   - Mitglieder deiner ethnischen Herkunft
   - ÖsterreicherInnen
   - Mitglieder anderer ethnischer Herkunft

3. Wie oft nimmst du an traditionellen ethnischen Aktivitäten oder Bräuchen teil?

4. Wie oft nimmst du an traditionellen österreichischen Aktivitäten oder Bräuchen teil?
E. Hier sind einige Aussagen über Sprache, kulturelle Traditionen, Freunde usw. Bitte gib an, wie sehr du diesen Aussagen zustimmst oder nicht.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Ich denke, dass ethnische Gruppen ihre eigene Kultur aufrecht erhalten sollten und nicht die österreichische Kultur annehmen sollten</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
<th>Nicht anwendbar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich würde eher eine Beziehung mit einem/r Mann/Frau meiner ethnischen Herkunft führen als mit einem/r ÖsterreicherIn</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich denke, dass ethnische Gruppen ihre eigene Kultur aufrecht erhalten sollten, sie aber auch die österreichische Kultur annehmen sollten</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich würde eher eine Beziehung mit einem/r ÖsterreicherIn führen als mit einer/m Frau/Mann meiner ethnischen Herkunft</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich würde sowohl eine Beziehung mit einer/m ÖsterreicherIn als auch mit einer/m Frau/Mann meiner ethnischen Herkunft führen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ich denke, dass Menschen mit einem anderen ethnischen Hintergrund, die österreichische Kultur annehmen sollten und nicht ihre eigene behalten sollten</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mir ist es wichtiger meine Muttersprache zu beherrschen als die deutsche Sprache</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mir ist es wichtiger, die deutsche Sprache zu beherrschen als meine Muttersprache</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mir ist es wichtig sowohl meine Muttersprache als auch die deutsche Sprache zu beherrschen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ich ziehe soziale Aktivitäten vor an denen sowohl ÖsterreicherInnen als auch MitgliederInnen anderer ethnischer Kulturen teilnehmen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ich ziehe es vor nur österreichische FreundInnen zu haben</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ich ziehe es vor nur FreundInnen meiner ethnischen Kultur zu haben</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ich ziehe soziale Aktivitäten vor an denen nur ÖsterreicherInnen teilnehmen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ich ziehe es vor sowohl österreichische als auch FreundInnen aus meiner ethnischen Kultur zu haben</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ich ziehe soziale Aktivitäten vor an denen nur MitgliederInnen meiner ethnischen Kultur teilnehmen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Meine Eltern haben mich ermutigt unsere eigene Kultur aufrecht zu erhalten</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Meine Eltern haben mich ermutigt der österreichischen Kultur gegenüber offen zu sein</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Wenn Menschen unterschiedlicher Herkunft zusammen sind, hat man manchmal das Gefühl, ungerecht behandelt zu werden. Die folgenden Fragen beziehen sich auf diese Art von Erfahrungen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ich glaube, dass andere ethnische Gruppen sich unfair oder negativ gegenüber meiner ethnischen Gruppe verhalten haben</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich fühle mich von Österreichern nicht akzeptiert</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich habe das Gefühl, dass Österreicher etwas gegen mich haben</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich bin aufgrund meiner ethnischen Herkunft geneckt oder beleidigt worden</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich wurde aufgrund meiner ethnischer Herkunft bedroht oder angegriffen</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wie oft fühlst du dich von den folgenden Personen aufgrund deines ethnischen Hintergrundes unfair oder negativ behandelt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Professoren, Lehrer an der Uni</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Andere Personen außerhalb der Universität</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Andere Studierende</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Inwiefern treffen die folgenden Aussagen darauf zu, wie du über dich selbst und dein Leben denkst?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme weniger zu</th>
<th>Nicht sicher</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Im Großen und Ganzen bin ich zufrieden mit mir</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich glaube, dass ich einige gute Qualitäten habe</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich bin in der Lage Dinge genauso gut zu machen wie andere Leute auch</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich habe das Gefühl, dass es nicht viel gibt worauf ich stolz sein könnte</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich glaube, dass ich ein wertvoller Mensch bin, mindestens auf gleicher Ebene mit anderen</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In den meisten Aspekten ist mein Leben nahe an mein Ideal</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Die Bedingungen meines Lebens sind sehr gut</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ich bin zufrieden mit meinem Leben</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Soweit habe ich die wichtigen Dinge in meinem Leben erreicht, die ich haben wollte</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wenn ich mein Leben nochmals leben könnte, würde ich fast nichts daran ändern</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Die folgenden Fragen beziehen sich auf deine Einstellung zum Thema Expatriation und Auswanderung.

In Zukunft: Planst du oder könntest du dir vorstellen ....

1. in ein anderes Land zu ziehen? ☐ Ja ☐ Nicht sicher ☐ Nein
2. in dein Heimatland zurück zu ziehen? ☐ Ja ☐ Nicht sicher ☐ Nein

3. Wenn ja, wie würde dies sein? (Mehrfachnennung möglich)
   ☐ Vorübergehend
   ☐ Permanent

4. Im Falle, dass du ein Job Angebot bekommst, würdest du dafür für eine bestimmte Zeit ins Ausland gehen?
   ☐ Ja
   ☐ Nicht sicher
   ☐ Nein

5. Würdest du bereit sein für einen Job in ein anderes Land zu ziehen?
   ☐ Ja
   ☐ Nein

6. Wenn nein, aus welchen Gründen? (Mehrfachnennung möglich)
   ☐ Familiäre Gründe
   ☐ Karriere meines/r Ehemann/Frau, Partner/in
   ☐ Nicht-Beherrschung der lokalen Sprache
   ☐ Dauer des Auslandeinsatzes
   ☐ Es war bereits schwer sich einmal kulturell umzustellen
   ☐ Unternehmen bietet keine angemessene Entschädigung
   ☐ Lebensqualität im Einsatzland
   ☐ Ich denke nicht, dass es meiner Karriere helfen würde
   ☐ Andere ............................................

Liebe/r TeilnehmerIn!
Vielen Dank, dass du dir die Zeit genommen hast diesen Fragebogen auszufüllen. Falls du mir noch etwas mitteilen möchtest, nutze bitte diese Box.
APPENDIX C – Contextual Variables – Migration in Austria

Historically seen – back in time of the Austrian Monarchy – Austria has always been a home for international migration mobility and – according to data – today still resides among the top third countries in Europe with immigration rates of 12 persons per 1,000. According to the report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015, pp. 23), more than 1.715 millions of those individuals living in Austria were having an immigration background\textsuperscript{14} of whom 1.254 million were first generation\textsuperscript{15} and 460,000 second generation\textsuperscript{16} immigrants. This represents more than 20 % on the total population of Austria, and has increased remarkably in the past decades (1960: 1.4 %; 2008: 17.5 %; 2013: 19.4 %). The largest group were originated from Germany with nearly 171,000 persons, followed by Turkey (115,000 persons), Serbia (114,000), Bosnia and Herzegovina (92,000), Romania (73,000), Croatia (66,000), Poland (54,600) and Hungary (46,000). The regional distribution is largely concentrated in Vienna, where 40 % of the residents have an immigration background followed by Vorarlberg (18.8 %) and Upper Austria with more than 18,000 individuals (12 %).

According to the Report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) the Austrian population has increased by over 1 million persons since the 1960’s due to immigration. According to the forecasts presented in the report, the future Austrian population development will largely depend on immigration surpluses, as due to ongoing low birth rates (1.32 children/women) and the aging Austrian population, the total Austrian population would fall by 2.2 % by 2031 and to 7.48 million by 2050. As due to higher birth rates among immigrant women (between 1.83 and 2.02 children/women) the Austrian population would grow by 7.5 % to over 9 million people within the next 20 years due to immigration. According to the report on “World Population Policies 2013” by the United Nations, Austrian policies on immigration are largely focused on an increase of immigration as a proactive counteract to the negative future prospects of population development without immigration. However, in this regard appropriate policies are needed to foster integration on both sides – nationals and non-nationals – as data shows that in general 45 % of the individuals immigrated to Austria do not remain in Austria for more than five years.

\textsuperscript{14} According to the definition of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) on the “Recommendations for the 2010 censuses of population and housing” individuals with “immigration background” are those individuals whose both parents were born abroad.

\textsuperscript{15} “First generation” immigrants relates to individuals who were also born abroad like both parents.

\textsuperscript{16} “Second generation” relates only to individuals who were already born in the host culture but whose both parents were born abroad.
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Attitudes on Acculturation & Integration

Austria is pursuing a *multicultural* orientation, which defines the attitudes of mutual accommodation. Hence, host national society is willing to adapt national institutions (e.g. education, health, justice, labour) to meet the needs of all groups living together in the society that allow immigrated individuals to adapt the core values of the Austrian society. The report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) reported that among Austrian nationals only 17% expected immigrants to assimilate to the Austrian culture. Most of the Austrians reported that they would like immigrants to integrate into the Austrian culture by opening up to Austria while continuing ones previous way of life. This openness should manifest itself in terms of German speaking abilities (88%), cultivation of friendships with Austrians (84%), exhibition of interest in and identification with Austrian culture (71%). However, there was mutual agreement on both sides (host nationals 86% and, immigrants 81%) that responsibility for integration lies with the immigrants.

Further, the report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015) surveyed the subjective views of nationals and non-nationals on the topic of immigration. The majority (60%) of the Austrian nationals that integration of immigrants in Austria is not working at all or is not very effective, respectively. However, it is reported that these attitudes can be mainly found among persons aged 60 years and over, poorly skilled and unskilled manual workers and those with low incomes. On the other side, non-nationals perceive integration in Austria more positively than do nationals: 90% of non-nationals claimed to feel mostly or completely at home in Austria, whereas only 7% claimed to feel less at home and only 3% responded that they did not feel at home at all in Austria. Perceived attitudes were reported to vary among gender (females feel more at home) and by length of residence in Austria. Over 58% of those residing for more than 20 years in Austria reported to feel mostly or completely at home, while this was only the case for 25% for those living less than five years in Austria.

Immigrants were further interviewed on their sentiments of affiliation (to which country they tend to belong): 70% of the respondents answered that they identify with the country they are currently living in, namely Austria and 30% that they felt stronger affiliation with their country of origin. Factors that contributed to a stronger identification
APPENDIX C

with the host country were found to be higher attained education (e.g. such as university), income and the length of residence.

Perceived Discrimination

Empirically, perceived discrimination has been found to be associated with perceived feeling of affiliation to the host country and to contribute to acculturation patterns internalized (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Berry et al., 2006)

The report on Migration & Integration 2015 (Statistik Austria, 2015, pp. 96) also surveyed aspects of perceived discrimination and asked whether immigrants perceived being discriminated against in Austria due to immigration background. More than 30 % reported that they were always, mostly or often subject to discrimination due their ethnic background, whereas the majority (50.3 %) reported being rarely/never subject to discrimination. Here again, several factors contributed to different views on perceived discrimination: individuals 60 years or older reported lower levels of discrimination (only 26 %), whereas individuals with lower levels of attained education perceived discrimination as higher. On the side of nationals 35 % reported that they think, that immigrants experience discrimination in Austria due to their immigration background. This response was especially apparent among young people and individuals with higher attained education.

When immigrants were interviewed on their perception on cultural differences between home and host country (“When you look at Austrian people, the way that most people live their lives and the values and aims on the basis of which they live, in general: do you fully approve or disapprove of this?”): more than 80 % of the respondents fully or largely approved the Austrian way of life but only 4.4 % totally disapproved. Again, factors such as age and length of residents contributed to the approval of the Austrian lifestyle among immigrants, whereas country of origin affect their answers as 88 % of those from Former Yugoslavia but only 77 % from those Turkish immigrants approved the Austrian lifestyle. However, reasons for these results may be related to the visibility of minority groups and perceived discrimination and the xenophobia attitudes of nationals, which may result in the rejection of the Austrian lifestyle.