



---

6-2009

## Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: Descriptions of 126 Taxonomies, 1918-2003

Floyd W. Rudmin  
*University of Tromso, Norway, floyd.rudmin@psyk.uit.no*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Encouragement and critical comments were provided by Tony Marsella, Ron Taft, and Walt Lonner.

---

### Recommended Citation

Rudmin, F. W. (2009). Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: Descriptions of 126 Taxonomies, 1918-2003. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1074>

This [Online Readings in Psychology and Culture](#) Article is brought to you for free and open access (provided uses are educational in nature) by [IACCP](#) and [ScholarWorks@GVSU](#). Copyright © 2009 International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-9845627-0-1

---

## Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: Descriptions of 126 Taxonomies, 1918-2003

### Abstract

Acculturation refers to the processes by which individuals, families, communities, and societies react to inter-cultural contact. Advances in communication and transportation technologies, and increasing migration pressures due to demographic, economic, environmental, human rights, and security disparities, make acculturation one of the most important topics for applied research in cross-cultural psychology. However, progress in acculturation research has been frustrated by our inability to pit theories against each other in meaningful ways, to summarize results by meta-analytic methods, or to improve constructs and scales all because we have been unaware of the interdisciplinary breadth of acculturation research and its historical depth. This annotated bibliography of acculturation taxonomies presents an accessible historical foundation to the literature on acculturation. The most ancient psychological discussion of acculturation appears to be that of Plato in 348 BC. In the early 19th century, DeTocqueville speculated about acculturation processes in Europe and America. The word "acculturation" was first used in 1880, and by 1900 scholars were already writing histories of acculturation theory. G. Stanley Hall was the first psychologist to write about acculturation, and Thomas and Znaniecki presented the first full psychological theory in 1918. Since then, more than 100 different taxonomies of acculturation have been published, most of them cited and summarized here.

#### Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

## INTRODUCTION

When peoples of different cultures interact and intermix, they have some probability of adopting each others products, technologies, behaviors, languages, beliefs, values and social institutions.

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).

As shown in Table 1, studies of acculturation have increased dramatically in the last two decades, possibly because more and more minority individuals are entering research careers. Dissertation Abstracts International indexes all disciplines, and PsycINFO indexes psychology, including dissertations, so these two tabulations overlap.

Table1  
Number of studies of "acculturation"

Years	PsycINFO	Dissertation Abstracts
1900-1930	0	0
1931-1940	17	5
1941-1950	60	25
1951-1960	97	49
1961-1970	111	69
1971-1980	248	153
1981-1990	572	700
1991-2000	1571	1376

Although most acculturation research is relatively recent, the topic has a long history going back at least to Plato. He argued that acculturation should be minimized but not to the extent of cultural isolation:

The intercourse of cities with one another is apt to create a confusion of manners; strangers are always suggesting novelties to strangers. When states are well governed by good laws, the mixture causes the greatest possible injury; but seeing that most cities are the reverse of well-ordered, the confusion which arises in them from the reception of strangers, and from the citizens themselves rushing off into other cities, when any one either young or old desires to travel anywhere

abroad at whatever time, is of no consequence. On the other hand, the refusal of states to receive others, and for their own citizens never to go to other places, is an utter impossibility, and to the rest of the world is likely to appear ruthless and uncivilized; it is a practise adopted by people who use harsh words, such as xenelasia or banishment of strangers, and who have harsh and morose ways (Plato, 348BC/1892, pp. 338-339).

Plato recommended that only citizens over age 40 be allowed to travel to foreign lands, and then in the company of countrymen, so that there would be less likelihood of learning bad foreign ways. He also recommended that foreign visitors be restricted to the port, outside the walls of the city, so that cultural contamination might be minimized.

Despite the ancient origins of theorizing about acculturation, it did not become a topic of research until the 19th century. The first focus was on processes by which cultures merge with one another in order to make a homogeneous population suitable to the needs of a nation state. For example, DeTocqueville's 1835 study of American political culture argued:

If this tendency to assimilation brings foreign nations closer to each other, it must a fortiori prevent the descendants of the same people from becoming aliens to each other. The time will therefore come when one hundred and fifty millions of men will be living in North America, equal in condition, the progeny of one race, owing their origin to the same cause, and preserving the same civilization, the same language, the same religion, the same habits, the same manners, and imbued with the same opinions, propagated under the same forms. The rest is uncertain, but this is certain; and it is a fact new to the world - a fact fraught with such portentous consequences as to baffle the efforts even of the imagination (DeTocqueville, 1835/1945, p. 452).

In 1901, Sarah Simons published a five-part review of 19th century acculturation research, most of it by European sociologists. They had used evidence from history to theorize about two-way processes of "reciprocal accommodation" that caused cultural merger in multicultural empires and modern nation states. In the German literature, this was called "Amalgamierungsprozess" [amalgamation processes], but in English, it was called "assimilation."

It may, perhaps, be defined as that process of adjustment or accommodation which occurs between the members of two different races, if their contact is prolonged and if the necessary psychic conditions are present. The result is group-homogeneity to a greater or less degree. Figuratively speaking, it is the process by which the aggregation of peoples is changed from a mere mechanical mixture into a chemical compound (Simons, 1901, part I, pp. 791-792)

Another metaphor of assimilation was "cross-fertilization of cultures," which was said to be the cause of progress in human development. For further history of 19th century acculturation theory, see Abramson (1980).

The first known use of the word "acculturation" is in J.W. Powell's 1880 report from the Bureau of American Ethnography on changes in Native American languages (Oxford Dictionary, 1989). In 1883, Powell explained that "acculturation" refers to the psychological changes induced by cross-cultural imitation. In 1898, W. J. McGee, a self-educated anthropologist also at the Bureau of American Ethnology, defined "acculturation" to be the processes of exchange and mutual improvement by which societies advance from savagery, to barbarism, to civilization, to enlightenment. McGee (1898, p. 243) argued that "Human development is essentially social, and may be measured by the degree in which devices and ideas are interchanged and fertilized in the process of transfer, i.e., by the degree of acculturation." Unlike Simons' concept of assimilation, acculturation can occur between antagonistic societies. Other acculturation theorists would similarly argue that positive intercultural attitudes are not necessary for acculturation (e.g., Powell, 1900; Thurnwald, 1932; Devereux & Loeb, 1943). McGee seems also to be the first to define different types of acculturation. Martial acculturation is the imitation of weapons and religious symbols. Marital acculturation is semi-antagonistic mating between groups. Commercial acculturation is the exchange of goods. Educational acculturation refers to the exchange of ideas and technologies of production.

### **Purpose**

Subsequently, scholars from sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science, linguistics and other social science disciplines have proposed taxonomies of different types of acculturation. The purpose of the present report is to catalogue such taxonomies. The intention here is to briefly describe the constructs that underlie theories about different kinds of acculturation, without adding critical or comparative commentary or making inferences about the constructs. Please note that this is NOT intended to be a review of empirical results. Empirical aspects of studies are discussed only when constructs have been discovered and defined by empirical methods, for example, factor analysis, or when the operationalization of constructs helps to explain their definitions.

The pedagogic utility of this kind of descriptive catalog is first of all as an annotated bibliography on acculturation. For students of acculturation, it is instructive to see the very high degree to which the history of acculturation research has involved minority heritage doctoral students researching their own groups acculturative situation. It is also important for students to note that empirical studies must be driven by theory, but that our theory suffers because our base knowledge is restricted by our ideologies, by the national cultures in which we work, by our disciplinary boundaries, and by our contemporary intellectual fashions. This history of acculturation theory and constructs shows some of the range of possibilities that we might normally not consider, for example, that people can acculturate to cultures they dislike, or that biculturalism is distressing, or that marginality is a positive condition with benefits, or that genocide is an acculturation strategy.

It is important for students to realize that the concepts, constructs, and theories that appear in their textbooks, or that they use in their research, all arise through a process of intellectual evolution, with continual change over time. Every scholar who has multiple studies of acculturation also has multiple and changing taxonomies of acculturation concepts and constructs. The same word can have different meanings. For example, all modes of acculturation can be conceived as some form of marginality: Assimilationists are marginal to the minority group they left and to the majority group if it does not admit visible minorities. Assimilationists may also be opportunistic cultural chameleons who do not adhere to any culture. Separationists are marginal to the mainstream society. Integrationists are bicultural and thus marginal to either or both society if exclusivity is important for either culture, for example, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam would exclude or marginalize persons professing or practicing two religions. Marginalizationists are of course marginalized from the two cultural communities, but if the cosmopolitan, acultural marginalizationists are the majority in a city or a university, they might marginalize the other three categories of people as ethnocentric and unmodern. All of this complicates and sometimes confounds literature reviews and meta-analyses. The history of a concept or construct is often necessary to understand its meaning, or the motivations for its use, or the ideology that underlies it. For further examples of how history helps us to see faults in acculturation research and to suggest ways to improvement, see Rudmin's (2003) critical history of acculturation.

These taxonomies have been ordered chronologically in Table 2. It has seemed best to use the fourfold framework promoted by John Berry to organize the acculturation constructs into four generic types, depending on the relative importance of the first-culture (F) and the contact culture (C). These four generic types have been symbolized as: 1) -F+C, 2) +F-C, 3) +F+C, and 4) -F-C, meaning 1) that the contact culture is favored, or 2) that the first-culture is favored, or 3) that both are favored, or 4) that both are disfavored. As will become clear in the descriptions of each of the taxonomies listed in Table 2, there is immense latitude within these generic types, depending on aspects of culture focused upon and whose perspective is considered. Most taxonomies describe the acculturating minority's perspective, but some describe the dominant society's attitudes or policies towards the minority. These four generic categories of constructs do not well encompass some of the taxonomies, especially when constructs have been discovered and defined empirically rather than by apriori theory, for example, in Padilla's 1980 study. My own most recent taxonomy of 16 types of acculturation was developed from a critique of the logic of the four generic categories used here, and those 16 types necessarily do not well fit these categories.

As an online manuscript, corrections and expansions are to be expected. I welcome readers critical comments about accuracy and readability. I also welcome recommendations of taxonomies that I have missed. I am aware that I probably have failed to find and include taxonomies developed and published in languages that are not English, or that come from other social science fields, for example, history, geography, law, women's studies, Black studies, culture studies, etc.

Table 2

Chronological summary of acculturation constructs, tables in four generic categories based on favoring (+) or disfavoring (-) first culture F and contact culture C.

<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>-F+C</b>	<b>+F-C</b>	<b>+F+C</b>	<b>-F-C</b>
1918 Thomas & Znaniecki	Bohemian	Philistine	Creative	-----
1920 Ross	Accommodation	Toleration	Compromise	-----
1920 Berkson	Americanization	Federation of nationalities	Melting pot; Community	-----
1923 Bartlett	Replacement	Partial replacement	Blending	-----
1924 Miller	Melting pot	Segregation	Indirection	-----
1932 Thurnwald	Reintegration	Symbiosis	Hybrid	Transition
1928 Park	Imitation	Withdrawal	Recovery	Völkertod
1934 Hoffman	No foreign language	Only foreign language	Proportionate bilingualism	-----
1934 Brown	-----	Isolation	Subordination	Fusion assimilation
1936 Redfield, Linton & Herskovits	Acceptance	Reaction	Adaptation	-----
1939 Child	Rebel reaction	In-group reaction	Double response	Apathetic reaction
1940 Srole	American-national associations	Ancestral-national associations	Bi-national associations	Sacred associations
1940 Slotkin	Rebellious; Marginal	-----	Promiscuous; Adventurous; Detached; Acculturated	Unorganized; Emancipated
1943 Devereux & Loeb	-----	Defensive isolation	Adoption of new means	Dissociative negative acculturation
1945 Senter	Acceptance	Maintain	-----	Develop
1945 Wirth	Assimilation	Secession; Militancy	Pluralism	-----
1947 Campisi	Successful	Minimal	Dilettante	-----
1948 Lewin	Negative chauvinism	Chauvinism	Double loyalty	Marginal man
1949 Ichheiser	Mimicry	Rejected	Pseudo-solutions	Denial
1949 Gordon	Marginal	Perpetuation	Affirmative	-----

Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 8, Subunit 1, Chapter 8

1949 Bogardus	Imposed	-----	Blind; Democratic	-----
1951 Voget	Marginals	Native	Modified	-----
1951 Berry	Assimilation; Annihilation; Expulsion	Segregation	Pluralism; Stratification	Amalgamation
1952 Spindler & Goldschmidt	Acculturated	Native	Transitional	Peyote cult
1952 Zajonc	Conformity	Aggression	Frustration	-----
1952 Eaton	Assimilation	Controlled acculturation	-----	Marginal
1952 Eisenstadt	Insecure transitional	Traditional	Secure transitional	Survivors
1952 Eisenstadt	Self-transforming cohesive ethnic group	Isolated stable and active families	Cohesive ethnic group	Isolated apathetic family
1952 Lee	Acculturated	Segregated	Marginal man	-----
1953 Beals	Acceptance	Reaction	Syncretism	Reformulation
1953 Willey	Colony	Refuge	Blend	-----
1953 Taft	Monism	Pluralism	Interactionism	-----
1953 Simpson & Yinger	Assimilationist	Secessionist; Militant	Pluralist	Ambivalent
1954 Barnett, Broom, Siegel, Vogt & Watson	Progressive adjustment	Reactive adaptation	Stabilized pluralism	Cultural disintegration
1955 Spiro	Assimilation	Solidarity	Acculturation	Deculturation
1955 Antonovsky	Active general orientation	Active Jewish orientation; Passive Jewish orientation	Dual orientation	Ambivalent; Passive general orientation
1956 Zubrzycki	Assimilation	-----	Accommodation	Conflict
1956 Cohen	Assimilation	Survival	-----	Indifference
1957 Richardson	Identification	Isolation	Accommodation	-----
1957 Dohren- wend & Smith	Reorientation	Reaffirmation; Nativist	Partial reorientation	Alienation; Reconstitution
1957 Horobin	Assimilation	Backward looking	Anglicized	Rootless
1957 Taft	Assimilation	-----	Accommodation	Marginal
1958 Glaser	Assimilated	Segregating	Marginal	Desegregating



Rudmin: Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: 1918-2003

1958 Bennett, Passin, & McKnight	Idealist	Constrictor	-----	Adjustor
1958 Thomas	Middle Class Indians	Conservative Indians	Generalized Indians	Rural White Indians
1959 Borrie	Assimilation	Isolation	Integration	-----
1960 Rothman	Under assertion	Over assertion	Moderate	Marginal
1960 Ausubel	Assimilative	Resistive	Adaptive	Disintegration
1961 Herman	Over-conformity	Retreat & withdrawal	Adjustment & integration	Vacillation & frustration
1961 Wallace	Assimilation	Nativism; Nationalism	Revitalization	Immobility
1962 Bailyn & Kelman	Identification	Resistance	Confirmation	Internalization
1962 Roy	Amalgamation	Social Segregation	Social Integration	-----
1963 Johnston	Subjective assimilation	-----	External assimilation	-----
1963 Nash & Shaw	-----	Traditional	Transitional	Autonomous
1963 Glazer & Moynihan	Melting pot assimilation	Cultural pluralism	Ethnic interest groups	-----
1963 Vander Zanden	Assimilation	Avoidance; Aggression; Sensitivity; Ego enhancement	Accommodation	Assimilation; Self-hatred; Flight from reality
1963 Linton	Social-cultural fusion	Nativistic movements	Directed culture change	-----
1964 Gordon	Assimilation	Structural pluralism	Cultural pluralism	Marginality
1965 Fong	Achieved assimilation	Achieved separation	Colonial biculturalism	Semi-acculturated marginalism
1966 Keesing	Assimilation	Contra-acculturative movement	Folk society; Symbiotic	Cultural fusion
1967 London	Assimilation	Pluralism	Integration	-----
1967 Nash	-----	Unadapted	Rapprochement	Bohemian
1967 Lambert	Rejected	Identified	Non-ethnocentric	Ambivalent
1968 Marden & Meyer	Acculturation	Nativism	Stabilized acculturation	Marginality
1969 Comeau	Advanced acculturation	Possible acculturation	Minimal acculturation	Probable acculturation
1969 Rabushka	Inter-marriage	Ethnocentrism	Integration	-----

Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 8, Subunit 1, Chapter 8

1969 Barth	Assimilation	Evolution	-----	Low rank minority
1970 Saruk & Gulutsan	Majority orientation	Minority orientation	Bicultural orientation	Apathetic orientation
1970 Rees	Assimilation	Accommodation	Integration	-----
1970 Born	Innovation	Retreatism	Reconciliation	Withdrawal
1970 Sommerlad & Berry	Assimilation	-----	Integration; Marginal	-----
1970 Berry	Assimilation	Rejection	Integration; Marginal	-----
1971 Sue & Sue	-----	Traditionalist	Asian-American	Marginal man
1972 Gaarder	High status unilingualism	Low status unilingualism	Coordinate bilingualism	Double demi-lingualism
1972 Berry, Evans, & Rawlinson	Assimilation	Rejection; Segregation	Integration; Colonialism	Deculturated
1973 Zak	Negative-positive	Positive-negative	Positive-positive	Negative-negative
1974 Hunt & Walker	Cultural assimilation	Cultural pluralism	Structural assimilation	Integration
1974 Pettigrew	-----	"Black Power" ghetto	Integration; Desegregation	Typical urban ghetto
1974 Berry	Melting pot; Pressure cooker	Rejection; Exclusive segregation	Integration; Paternal integration	Marginality; Deculturation
1975 Woods	-----	Traditional; Modified	Ladinoized	Ladino
1976 Berry	Assimilation	Rejection	Integration	Deculturation
1976 Schumann	Assimilation	Preservation	Acculturation	-----
1976 Clark, Kaufman & Pierce	Types 2,3,6	Type 5	Type 4	Type 1
1976 Driedger	Majority assimilators	Ethnic identifiers	-----	Cultural marginals
1976 Wagner	-----	Traditional	Transitional; American Middle-Class	-----
1977 Berry, Kalin & Taylor	Assimilation	Rejection	Integration; Multicultural ideology	Deculturation
1977 Spindler	Emulation	Reaffirmation; Boundary maintenance	Biculturalism; Synthesis; Managed identities	-----
1978 Pierce, Clark & Kaufman	-----	Type 5	Types 2,3,4,6	Type 1

Rudmin: Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: 1918-2003

1979 Camilleri	-----	Type 2	Type 3	Type 1
1979 Cohen-Emerique	Modern	Traditional	-----	Unclear
1980 Cang	Assimilationist	Traditionalist	Asian American	Marginal man
1980 Fishman	Uniglossia & unilingualism	Diglossia & unilingualism	Diglossia & bilingualism	Uniglossia & bilingualism
1980 Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez	Monoculturally involved	Monoculturally involved	Biculturally involved	Culturally noninvolved
1980 Berry	Assimilation; Melting pot; Pressure cooker	Rejection; Withdrawal; Segregation	Integration; Multiculturalism; Pluralism	Deculturation; Marginality; Ethnocide
1980 Padilla	Anglicized	Unacculturated	Moderate	-----
1980 Abramson	Convert	Traditionalist	Exilic	Missing
1981 Taft	Marginality by assimilation	Marginality by pluralistic separation	Marginality by mediation or pluralistic integration	Isolation
1981 Trosper	Removal	Autonomy	Contact	Welfare
1981 Banton	Conformist	Colonial	Transilient	Isolationist
1982 Bochner	Assimilation; Passing	Segregation; Chauvinistic	Integration; Marginal or mediating	-----
1982 Smither	Assimilation; Elimination	Segregation	Pluralism; Marginal man	Marginality; Fusion
1983 Berry	Assimilation	Rejection; Withdrawal; Resistance	Integration	Deculturation; Marginality
1984 Berry, Kim, Young & Bujaki	Assimilation	Separation	Integration	Marginalisation
1986 Schumann	Assimilation	Preservation	Adaptation	-----
1986 Triandis, Kashima, Shimada & Villareal	Accommodation; Overshooting	Ethnic affirmation	-----	-----
1987 Nelde	Assimilation	Resistance	Integration	-----
1988 Moghaddam	Normative assimilation	Non-normative heritage maintenance	Normative heritage maintenance	Non-normative assimilation
1988 Sodowsky & Carey	Mostly American; Very American	Provincial; Very Asian-Indian	Bicultural	-----
1991 Hutnik	Assimilative	Dissociative	Acculturative	Marginal
1993 LaFromboise,	Assimilation	-----	Alternation;	-----

Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 8, Subunit 1, Chapter 8

Coleman, & Gerton			Fusion; Multiculturalism; Acculturation	
1993 Sayegh & Lasry	Assimilation	Ethnocentrism	Integration	Marginalization
1995 Coleman	Monoculturation; Acculturation	Separation	Alternation; Integration	Fusion
1995 DeVos	Functional	Familial-cultural	Occupational	Ideological
1995 DeVos	Passing	-----	Accommodation	Alienation; Withdrawal; Expulsion
1997 Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senécal	Assimilation; Ethnist	-----	Pluralism	Civic
1997 Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senécal	Assimilation	Separation; Segregation	Integration	Anomie; Individualism; Exclusion
1999 Yamada & Singelis	Western	Traditional	Bicultural	Culturally-alienated
2000 Faist	Assimilation	-----	Ethnic pluralism; Border-crossing	-----
2001 Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh	Assimilation; Marginalization	Separation; Marginalization	Integration; Marginalization	Multiculturalism
2001 Berry	Assimilation; Melting pot	Separation; Segregation	Integration; Multiculturalism	Marginalization; Exclusion
2001 Montreuil & Bourhis	Assimilationist	Segregationist	Integrationist	Exclusionist; Individualist
2001 van Oudenhoven, van der Zee & van Kooten	Going-native expatriates	Hearts-at-the-parent-company- expatriates	Dual citizens	Free agents
2001 Brubaker	Droit à la différence	Ausländer-politik	Differentialist	Droit à l'indifférence
2002 Unger, Gallaher, Shakib, Ritt-Olson, Palmer & Johnson	United States orientation	Other country orientation	Both countries orientation	Neither country orientation
2003 Rudmin	Types b,h,i,n	Types a,f,g,m	Types c,e,f,h,j,k,l,m,n,o	Types d,g,i,j,l,o,p

### **1918 Thomas and Znaniecki**

According to Persons (1987, p. 45), the dominant scholar on ethnic relations at the University of Chicago was sociologist William Thomas, who partnered with Polish sociologist, Florian Znaniecki, to empirically study Polish immigrants. Theirs is the first psychological theory of acculturation and is still worth reading. They adopted Herbart's psychology to argue that culture is comprised of shared apperceptive processes, for example, habits, associations, attitudes, and beliefs, that are called schemes because they have utility in a stable social environment. Personality types derive from individual differences in the instincts of fear and curiosity: Bohemians are high in curiosity, low in fear, Philistines are low in curiosity, high in fear, and creative personalities have a balance of curiosity and fear. In terms of acculturation, the Bohemian [-F+C] is environmentally reactive and highly adaptive, but "can do nothing but adopt some other ready system instead of the rejected one" (p. 1903). Bohemians are well-suited to the dissociated state of modern, urban, efficiency oriented society, where "a multiplicity of disconnected, often radically conflicting characters can co-exist in what seems to be one personality" (p. 1888). In contrast, the Philistine [+F-C] "is always a conformist, usually accepting social tradition in its most stable elements" (p. 1854). The individual who is creative [+F+C] modifies existing cultural schema in order "to widen the control of his environment, to adapt to his purposes a continually increasing sphere of social reality" (p. 1856).

### **1920 Ross**

American sociologist Edward Ross used historical examples and biological metaphors to theorize how "diverse ethnic elements gradually adapt themselves to one another" (p. 224). Accommodation [-F+C] means mutual adaptation of two cultures in parity, or the conversion of the weaker culture by imitation of the superior culture. Toleration [+F-C] describes intermingled ethnic traditions having mutual contempt and aversion, such that "toleration is furthered by regulated avoidance" (p. 227). Compromise [+F+C] arises from a necessity for cooperation and the need to abide together in civic and economic harmony, such that the state allows "complete freedom in all cultural matters" (p. 229). Compromise involves the distress of giving up what one feels entitled to and thus should be minimized to the extent possible.

### **1920 Berkson**

Writing from Columbia University's Teacher's College, Isaac Berkson related acculturation to American liberal democracy. Since humans are self-conscious, they seek self-determination, which is "the quintessence of democracy" (p.27). Self-determination includes choosing one's own social community. Berkson evaluated competing theories of acculturation in light of liberalism. Americanization [-F+C] is an ethnocentric misconception of America as an Anglo-Saxon culture rather than a liberal democracy. Although Americanization may seem to be quick and coercive assimilation, it is inherently anti-

American, counter-productive, and a cause of criminality. The theory of America as a federation of nationalities [+F-C] "rests on the assumption that the ethnic quality of an individual determines absolutely and inevitably what his nature is to be" (p. 79), and thus is racist, deterministic, and an affront to freedom. The theory of melting pot [+F+C] mistakenly conceives that American culture is not liberal democracy but the amalgamating of immigrant cultures, resulting in the "disappearance of divergent ethnic strains and cultures within the unity of American life" (p. 73). Berkson favored the theory of community [+F+C] which conceives that cultural groups can live interspersed with others, can "engage in commerce, in political and social life ... fulfill whatever responsibilities citizenship implies even by those who have no other loyalty than to the American ethnos" (p. 102), but can also maintain their cultural heritage by educational in the family and the school. Such "double allegiance ... is greater than twice a single allegiance" since "knowledge of an additional language and culture" makes a person richer and prevents ethnocentrism which is a bane to liberalism.

### **1923 Bartlett**

British psychologist Frederic Bartlett (1923/1970) theorized on the psychology of contact between peoples. Drawing on anthropological reports and accounts of colonialism, he argued that the outcome depended on the pugnacity of the dominant culture, on the submissiveness of the minor culture, and on their degree of cultural similarity. Replacement [-F+C] of the minority culture will happen "if dominance on the one side is answered by extreme submissiveness on the other" (p. 145). If the two cultures have few institutions, customs, and habits in common, then the minority accepts incongruous aspects of culture resulting in "compromise formations" which cause "pathological developments of social life" and the possibility of "violent social reversions" (pp. 152, 148). Partial replacement [+F-C] will occur if the dominant culture is not pugnacious and the minority culture is not submissive, and if the two cultures have little in common. The minority culture in this condition will selectively adopt and adapt aspects of the dominant culture according principles of cultural conservatism. "The result is a perplexing but at the same time a vitalizing, complexity of culture" (Bartlett, 1923/1970, p. 146). Blending [+F+C] will result if the attitudes of the two cultures are sufficiently positive to allow a sense of comradeship to arise and if there is enough cultural similarity that emotional meanings can be transferred to new modifications of culture.

### **1924 Miller**

American sociologist Herbert Miller, like Berkson, focused his acculturation typology on freedom. Immigrants come to America to escape cultural oppression. Oppression psychosis entails frustration, abnormal subjectivity, hyperaesthetic sense of self, suspiciousness, and group solidarity. Hence, the melting-pot [-F+C] policy, "which aims to make a uniform society" (p. 38), continues the pre-existing oppression psychosis the immigrants bring with them. Segregation [+F-C] and other forms of ethnic solidarity are

reactions to such oppression. Inter-ethnic conflict "can only be solved by the paradoxical method of indirection" (p. 38) [+F+C], which entails teaching heritage languages in schools, encouraging ethnic newspapers, and helping resolve cultural oppression abroad. Ethnic heritage maintenance is thus a means of indirect assimilation: "Meet the immigrant more than half way with the things he wants and he will meet you two-thirds of the way to accept the things you want him to take" (p. 180).

### **1928 Park**

Chicago sociologist Robert Park (1928) proposed a theory of marginality that described four types of acculturation. He argued that cultures are marked by geography and by racial features. Acculturation begins as a transition [-F-C] state of marginality, characterized by liberation or emancipation from the confines of culture, by enlightenment, objectivity, and less prejudice, but also characterized by spiritual distress, inner turmoil, intense self-consciousness, embitteredness and disillusionment. The racially indistinct migrant has the possibility of reintegration [-F+C] into the new secularized social order. For the racially marked migrant, segregated symbiosis [+F-C] is likely, with each cultural community more or less complete and without interbreeding, but engaged in mutual commerce. However, racially marked migrants who leave the segregated ghetto, or people of mixed blood, stay in a permanent state of cultural hybrid [+F+C], "living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples, never quite willing to break ...with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted ...on the margins of two cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated and fused" (p. 892).

### **1932 Thurnwald**

Yale anthropologist Richard Thurnwald (1932) cited historical and anthropological examples to argue that societies tend to have alternating rhythms of negative and positive attitudes towards foreign cultures. Within these waves, acculturation entails decision processes about a) which aspects of a foreign culture to adopt, b) which aspects to actively reject, c) which aspects of one's own culture to eliminate, and d) how to transform the foreign adaptations to fit with core cultural norms and practices. Thus, there are four acculturation stages: 1) withdrawal [+F-C] from contact into relative isolation, "more or less apart from the larger society" (p. 559); 2) imitation [-F+C] or "almost identification with the new or strange" (p. 563); 3) Völkertod [-F-C], the "passing of a people" or "losing of ethnic personality" (p. 563); and 4) recovery [+F+C] which is "an assertion of the cultural individuality" (p. 564) but including aspects of modernity that make the culture viable and compatible with the contemporary world.

### **1934 Hoffman**

Moses Hoffmans' 1934 philosophy dissertation at Columbia University on the bilingual environment of immigrants was probably the first psychometric study of acculturation. A

literature review on the apparent low IQ of bilingual immigrant children suggested the need to measure "the amount of English and the amount of foreign language" (p. 11) in the children's environments. Hoffman developed two equivalent versions of a 24-item questionnaire on language use, meeting rigorous psychometric standards. The three types of language acculturation measured by this scale were, at one extreme, no foreign language [-F+C], at the other extreme, only foreign language [+F-C], and in between, proportionate bilingualism [+F+C] as a ratio of English to foreign language. The questionnaire was completed by 52 foreign-born children and 547 native children of foreign-born parents. Hoffman found that bilingualism did not correlate with low intelligence as most of his contemporaries had argued.

### **1934 Brown**

Anthropologist W. O. Brown (1934) argued that cultural contact goes through a series of stages. First there is symbiotic trading, followed by conflict and temporary accommodation. If the two cultural groups are equal in power, there will be a struggle for superior status and mobilization of ideological resources, including attitudes and beliefs. There are three long-term solutions to this kind of conflict. Isolation [-F-C] of the weaker culture from the dominant is possible, but this may not be to the economic interests of the stronger group, and if imposed may anger the weaker group. Subordination [+F+C] of the weaker group is possible, such that they maintain identity and serve the roles allotted to them by the stronger group. Fusion assimilation [-F-C] entails the cultural and biological blending of the two cultures.

### **1936 Redfield, Linton & Herskovits**

In 1936, a committee of the US Social Science Research Council defined acculturation as quoted in this paper's opening paragraph (Redfield et al., 1936). Section IV of their report was entitled, "Psychological mechanisms of selection and integration of traits under acculturation" and emphasized that whether cultural traits are accepted or rejected depends on the attitudes of the receiving group towards the donor group. The report argued that the outcome of acculturative contact is either 1) acceptance [-F+C] of the contact culture's traits and eventual assimilation into it; or 2) reaction [+F-C] describes contra-acculturative movements that arise as compensation against presumed or imposed the inferiority or against loss of prestige; or 3) adaptation [+F+C] by fusing the two cultures into an "harmonious, meaningful whole" (p. 152) or by switching back and forth between F and C as the situation requires. "Psychic conflict" (p. 152) results from attempts to reconcile different social behaviors and norms, and hence should be greatest for individuals engaged in bicultural adaptation and should be least for those who reject acculturative change.



### **1939 Child**

Irvin Child's 1939 psychology dissertation at Yale University was published in 1943 and reprinted in 1970. His acculturation theory was based on Lewin's double approach-avoidance paradigm, which presumes that conditions of psychological conflict and frustration persists until a preference decision is made for one option over the other. Using this theory and interview data from 2nd generation Italian-Americans, Child described four types of acculturation. The rebel reaction [-F+C] entails abandonment of the first-culture and assimilation into the dominant group. In-group reaction [+F-C] entails minimizing affiliation with the dominant society so that loyalty and identity with the first-culture are not diminished. Double response [+F+C] entails alternation between cultures depending on the situation. An apathetic reaction [-F-C] entails escape "by a de-emotionalizing of symbols and facts relating to nationality, by an attempt to deny the personal significance of the societal and cultural conditions to which the person is responding" (Child, 1943/1970, p. 72). When such escape is not possible, a compromise reaction is made that is part-way between the two cultures. Child argued that the double response and the apathetic reaction do not resolve the cultural conflicts or end the frustrations. The double response is the least satisfactory and was not evident in any of his acculturating subjects.

### **1940 Srole**

Leo Srole's (1940) anthropology dissertation at the University of Chicago was a case study of a multi-ethnic US city. He defined four types of associations that were differentiated "according to the type of symbolism which is the association's ideal focus" (p. 72). A bi-national association [-F+C] is characterized as having almost exclusively patriotic symbols and rarely have members who were foreign-born. Ancestral-national associations [+F-C] are focused on achieving an independent national homeland abroad. Bi-national associations [+F+C] is "characterized by the fact that it is oriented to symbols both of the American society and the group's ancestral society" in order to "validate its existence and that of its group in American society by symbolically suggesting that the group has had a share in making American development possible" (p. 73). Sacred associations [-F-C] "are devoid of any national symbolism" (p. 74) because they are related solely to the Roman Catholic Church which was mutually shared by the Irish, French-Canadian, and Polish communities.

### **1940 Slotkin**

James Slotkin's 1940 sociology dissertation at the University of Chicago on Jewish intermarriage was summarized in his 1942 report. Using interview data from 87 individuals and descriptive data from another 96 obtained from social service files, Slotkin found that respondents clustered into eight acculturation types. Rebellious [-F+C] people "question the validity of their own customs and perhaps rebel against them" (p. 37) and find the customs of other groups attractive and preferable. Marginal [-F+C] people identify with the

dominant group, have adopted its culture, but are not accepted by it and therefore intermarry as a means to achieve acceptance. Promiscuous [+F+C] people retain identity with their minority group, but want to engage in casual sexual relations free from cultural obligations. Similarly, adventurous [+F+C] people retain identity with their minority group, but have positive stereotypes of out-group people and thus seek relations with them. Detached [+F+C] people also retain minority group membership, but are physically isolated from their ethnic group and by default must find romantic relationships within other cultural groups. Acculturated [+F+C] people "take over the standards of the dominant group to such an extent that they look down upon their own traits ... even though they still identify themselves with the subordinate group" (p. 38). Unorganized [-F-C] people come from the urban, criminal underworld and do not conform to the social norms of the larger society nor retain any in-group sentiments. Emancipated [-F-C] people have lost the endogamous attitude and may have lost all cultural awareness, such that they treat people as individuals rather than as members of cultural groups. The emancipated comprised almost half of those who intermarried.

### **1943 Devereux and Loeb**

Psychologist George Devereux and anthropologist Edwin Loeb (1943) described ways in which cultures in contact adjust themselves in order not to become similar. Beginning with Freud's "narcissism of small differences" and Horney's "uniqueness of the Self", Devereux and Loeb (1943) theorized and illustrated three kinds of antagonistic acculturation. Defensive isolation [+F-C] is the form of acculturative resistance that employs the suspension of social contact and of foreign cultural items. The adoption of new means [+F+C] entails using the foreign culture's technology, but for different ends. Thus, although there may be a surface appearance of biculturalism, in fact, the core cultural values and goals have not diminished, and maybe have been enhanced. Dissociative negative acculturation [-F-C] entails cultural change for the purpose of enhancing differences with the contact culture, for example, by regressing to practices prior to cultural contact, or by creating different but not negative forms of behavior, or by creating customs that are contrary to those of the contact culture.

### **1945 Senter**

Donovan Senter's 1945 anthropological study of Mexican acculturation in the USA argued that there are three possible types of acculturative adjustment. First, migrants may "attempt quick acceptance [-F+C] of the new culture, the situation leading to eventual assimilation, although the path would be made rough by prejudice" (p. 33). Or, "they may attempt to maintain [+F-C] their original culture" (p. 33). Or, "they may develop [-F-C] something foreign to both their ancestral culture and that of the present majority group" (p. 33). This last option is not so much creative as it is rebellious, non-adaptive, and anarchistic.

### **1945 Wirth**

Chicago sociologist Louis Wirth (1945) conceived that a minority group has four possible group goals. Assimilation [-F+C] entails the complete loss of the minority group's identity as it is absorbed into the dominant group. For assimilation to be complete, the dominant group must accept these new members, including intermarriage. Secession [+F-C] includes separatist and independence movements, that seek a political divide and protection of the minority culture through its own political control. Militancy [+F-C] also presumes a goal of political change, not to separate from the majority, but to become the dominant force controlling the majority. Wirth gives the example of the Sudeten German minority in Czechoslovakia taking control of the whole country. Pluralism [+F+C] presumes that minority group identity and cultural practices will be tolerated within the larger society and preserved.

### **1947 Campisi**

Paul Campisi's 1947 sociology dissertation at the University of Chicago developed psychometric measures of acculturation on two dimensions of change: "(1) the degree to which a person has incorporated certain aspects of American culture and (2) the degree to which that same person has retained certain aspects of his or her ancestor's non-American way of life" (p. 16). Campisi described three types of acculturation outcomes. Acculturation is successful [-F+C] if immigrants "(1) take on the hopes and aspirations and customs of the dominant group, and (2) get rid, forget, inhibit, repress, deny or suppress the hopes, aspirations and customs of his group" (p. 14). Acculturation is minimal [+F-C] if the migrants can "be content with a minimum amount of acceptance of American ways, an amount which enables him to keep his menial job in the larger society and to withdraw after work to the security of his foreign cultural island" (p. 13). Acculturation is dilettante [+F+C] if the migrants try to make "a selection of those interesting American ways which appeal to him and to reject all other ways which do not appeal to him" (p. 14). However, Campisi argues that such biculturalism is not tenable given the coercive quality of American expectations. For Campisi, marginality was not a separate type of acculturation, but the consequence of failure:

"The process is a highly dynamic and explosive one wherein some individuals falter and fail; wherein the resultant marginality ends in suicide or pathological personality manifestations; wherein some are constantly oppressed and frustrated by feelings of inadequacy and inferiority; wherein the coercion of the foreign culture is so strong in some as to make a blending of the new and the old an almost impossible undertaking" (Campisi, 1947, p. 2).

Campisi's six sub-scales of associations, language use, self-perception, food habits, desire to acculturate, and identification were used by Weinstock (1964) to study Hungarian refugees in the USA and by Gold (1967) to study Indians in Saskatchewan.

### 1948 Lewin

Kurt Lewin included acculturation topics in his 1948 compilation of essays on resolving social conflicts. His typology of acculturation arose from field theory and from his personal experiences during the Holocaust and afterwards as a refugee in an anti-Semitic America. Negative chauvinism [-F+C] describes people who are ashamed of their minority group membership and who adopt the habits, appearances, and attitudes of the dominant group, to the degree that it allows. Chauvinism [+F-C] entails a tendency to over-rate the central values, habits, ideas, and traditions of one's own culture vis-a-vis other cultures. The bicultural situation of double loyalty [+F+C] is sociologically sound since it is possible to be loyal to many overlapping groups "without being thrown into a constant state of conflict and uncertainty" (p. 179). Rather, it is the marginal man [-F-C] who is uncertain and in conflict, who is "regarded by the privileged majority as not belonging to them" but also "not really belonging to the underprivileged minority" (p. 179). Lewin warned that "it may be difficult to determine in a given case" (p. 196) which acculturation category applies since subtle shifting of valences within a complex field cause the overall situation to change.

### 1949 Ichheiser

Gustav Ichheiser's 1949 phenomenological analyses of acculturation arose from his experiences as a Polish-Jewish social psychologist in the multicultural milieu of pre-War Vienna and as a war refugee in England and the USA (Rudmin, Trimpop, Kryl & Boski, 1987). He argued that acculturation problems inevitably arise because cultural identity has two sources, one being the inner, enduring core personality, and the other being the internalization of social attributions and misattributions based on surface appearances (Boski & Rudmin, 1989). Assimilation by mimicry [-F+C] is the most stressful acculturation situation since one must inhibit or hide one's core cultural traits in order to appear to the dominant group to have their traits. If the dominant culture conceives itself to be acultural, as does the USA, then assimilation becomes denial [-F-C] of cultural traits and denial of cultural differences:

This solution --the history of the Jews proves it-- obviously does not work ... first, because the existing differences do not disappear by the magical procedure of being denied but rather remain and sound through all the disguises, pretenses, and concealments. The majority feels, therefore, that the minority tries to solve the problem by a kind of deception ... And, second, this solution does not work, because the mimicry has to be paid for at the very high psychological price of repressing and distorting real personality (Ichheiser, 1949, p. 41).

A less stressful alternative is to display one's cultural traits with no pretenses, but this risks being rejected [+F-C] by the dominant group because deliberately displayed cultural differences can be misattributed as dislike, defiance, or anti-democratic ethnocentrism.

There are many types of intermediate, partial, bicultural solutions, which Ichheiser called "pseudo-solutions" [+F+C], since misattributions about them are inevitable.

### **1949 Gordon**

Albert Gordon (1949) described an acculturation typology in his account of the Minneapolis Jewish community. Assimilation was labeled from the minority group's perspective as marginal [-F+C], meaning that Jews are marginal to their community if they considered their minority culture to be "a liability and a misfortune", something "entirely out of place in, and out of step with, the occidental way of life" (p. 304). In contrast, some immigrants tried to perpetuate [+F-C] their minority religious and national cultures, and "resented and distrusted the American school system, which often weaned their children away from their cultural moorings" (p. 300). Jews are called affirmative [+F+C] who sought a permanent bicultural condition, "to live as completely as possible in the larger community, while retaining their interest and concern for the welfare of the Jewish community" (p. 303).

### **1949 Bogardus**

The American social psychologist, Emory Bogardus, defined acculturation to be "a process of developing one cultural system out of two or more systems whose human representatives are in contact with each other" (Bogardus, 1949, p. 125). Imposed [-F+C] acculturation "is found wherever the people of one culture try to suppress the culture patterns, for example, of immigrants and to impose their own patterns of behavior and of thought upon these immigrants" (pp. 125-126). This kind of acculturation was typified by early Americanization movements as well as by policies in totalitarian states, but fails because one's culture is a vital aspect of inner personality. Blind [+F+C] acculturation is the natural, undirected, unforced, casual kind of acculturation in which two or more societies live in a cultural mosaic for an extended period, freely borrowing and imitating in a hodgepodge, hit-or-miss manner. Blind acculturation is historically most common, as is best typified by the multicultural ancestry of English culture and language. Democratic [+F+C] acculturation arises as a result of policies to promote cultural pluralism, as typified by US acculturation policies after World War I. Democratic acculturation is characterized by 1) "the representatives of each culture view all other cultures with respect and in terms of their history and their merits" (p. 127); 2) "No compulsion is exercised on anyone as a rule to accept cultural patterns different from his own" (p. 127); 3) "It includes the proposal to encourage an immigrant to develop his cultural traits fully and then to make culture contributions to the national life" (p. 127); 4) "Democratic acculturation keeps the immigrant's identity as a distinctive person in the community alive a long time, longer than in the case of blind acculturation, and very much longer than under imposed acculturation" (p. 128); 5) "Instead of making the immigrant ashamed of the customs of his homeland, democratic acculturation dignifies his role as a liaison person between cultures" (p. 129); and 6) "As an essential aspect of democratic acculturation, cultural pluralism deprecates those racial stereotypes which are derogatory" (p. 129).

### **1951 Voget**

Fred Voget's (1951; 1952/1967; 1956) anthropological studies of North American Native Peoples concluded that there are three kinds of acculturation, depending on ethnic identification, social participation, and cultural integration. The Euroamerican marginals [-F+C] have "full identification with the dominant society and culture" and "have cut themselves off completely from social contracts" with the Native community (Voget, 1951, p. 221). Because they suffer racial discrimination from the dominant society and are not accepted, they end up marginal to both communities: "Their marginality derived in part from their own activities and from local discrimination by whites familiar with their ancestry" (Voget, 1951, p. 221). The acculturative group classified as native [+F-C] includes "those individuals whose basic orientation was in terms of the unmodified aboriginal past" (p. 221). Those classified as native-modified or Euroamerican-modified [+F+C] participate in the dominant society, in either a limited or more extensive fashion, but maintain self-identity with their first-culture. All processes of acculturation entail conflict on some issues (Voget, 1952/1967).

### **1951 Berry**

Brewton Berry's (1951/1965) sociology textbook on Race and Ethnic Relations has full chapters on possible acculturative relationships between groups in contact, and illustrates each with historic examples. The most commonly considered and studied acculturative outcome is assimilation [-F+C]. However, annihilation [-F+C] by disease or genocide, or expulsion [-F+C] are also acculturative final solutions that are rarely considered as possibilities that deserve study if they are to be prevented. Geographic segregation [+F-C], whether voluntary or involuntary, separates the two cultures and minimizes acculturative pressures. One form of biculturalism is called pluralism [+F+C], meaning that cultural minorities have the freedom to live their lives according to their own cultural norms, but participate in the economic and civic society. Pluralism as it becomes geographically structured, can tend towards segregation. Another form of biculturalism is stratification [+F+C] in which the minority retain their identity, but are subordinated and restricted in their roles and opportunities. While the cultural and biological fusion of two cultural groups is sometimes considered a form of assimilation, amalgamation [-F-C] most often results in mixed blooded individuals who are excluded by, and considered marginal to, both cultural groups.

### **1952 Spindler & Goldschmidt**

Sociologists George Spindler and Walter Goldschmidt's (1952) Rorschach study of the Menomoni native community statistically distinguished clusters of people in a two-dimensional space defined by how much they had internalized European values and how much they knew and practiced traditional native ways (Spindler & Spindler, 1958). Low-status and elite acculturated [-F+C] individuals lived in frame-houses, earned wages, and

knew little Menomini lore, witchcraft, or medicine. The elite group also participated in the Catholic Church. The native-oriented [+F-C] group seemed to "identify deeply with what remains of the old culture" ( p. 74), spoke Menomini at social gatherings, depended on subsistence hunting and fishing, and practiced traditional religion. Those classified as transitional [+F+C] lived in frame-houses and earned wages like the acculturated, but were "clearly distinguishable in their knowledge of and belief in magic and medicines, their use of medical facilities, and their knowledge and use of the Menomini language" (p. 75). Those classified as the peyote cult [-F-C] group were people "in transition for whom the stress of this adjustment was especially acute" (p. 75) and as a result had enjoined hallucinogenic practices from another Native culture. Finally, it was hypothesized that the transitional and peyote cult groups "alienated as they are from the cultural symbols of their ethnic past and at the same time not having internalized the symbols which constitute the value system of Western society, will exhibit more symptoms of personality disorganization than members of groups closely identified with the symbols of either of these culture types" (p. 80). This empirically defined typology was later replicated by Spindler and Spindler (1958).

### **1952 Zajonc**

Robert Zajonc (1952) used Freudian theory and the frustration-aggression hypothesis to argue that there are inherent psychological processes that lead acculturating minority individuals to have aggressive and critical attitudes toward the dominant culture. First, "that a stranger must conform to many norms of the host culture is perhaps self-evident if only to mention things like language, laws, taxes" ( p. 206). Host culture conformity [-F+ C] entails the psychodynamics of superego control of behavior, but the stranger's superego was molded within a different cultural context. Thus, efforts towards host culture conformity lead to the frustration [+F+C] of trying to fit first-culture psychodynamics to contact culture norms, threatening the deeper layers of the superego. Strangers have exemption from fully conforming to host culture norms, and thus have the license to aggress against those norms. This attitude of aggression [+F-C] leads to rationalization against conformity, and the stranger regresses to the original psychodynamics of first-culture behavior. Zajonc (1952) presented empirical data from 40 foreign students to confirm this theorizing.

### **1952 Eaton**

Sociologist Joseph Eaton (1952) described the acculturative process by which the Hutterite minority in the USA and Canada have avoided, or at least delayed, assimilation [-F+C]. Hutterites are a communal, agrarian anabaptist society that have faced persecution and refugee flight for over 300 years. Pressure for cultural change comes from external opposition to their norms of common property, self-sufficiency, and communal living and from internal disaffection with their norm of austere simplicity and anti-materialism. Controlled acculturation [+F-C] "is the process by which one culture accepts a practice from another culture, but integrates the new practice into its own existing value system

[but] does not surrender its autonomy and separate identity" (Eaton, 1952, p. 338). The goal of controlled acculturation is to maintain the viability of a culturally separate and distinct community, with intact values. The loss of values by minority groups is the marginal [-F-C] condition that arises when a minority loses confidence in its culture but adheres to it for lack of an alternative.

### **1952a Eisenstadt**

Sociologist Shmuel Eisenstadt's (1952a) first psychometric study of Jewish settlement in Israel presented an acculturation typology based on identity and participation. Immigrants classified as insecure transitional [-F+C] have "relatively strong aspirations towards entrance into the Gentile society and identification with it" as well as "a feeling that belongingness to a Jewish community usually constitutes an impediment for the achievement of status and successful mobility" which results "in a constant state of tension, status-anxiety, and insecurity" (Eisenstadt, 1952a, p. 237). For immigrants classified as traditional [+F-C], their "cultural orientation towards the out-group is mainly negative" and the orientation towards the in-group one of "solidarity and cohesion" (p. 237). Immigrants classified as secure transitional [+F+C] have "strong primary identification with the general community and secondary, associational identification with the Jewish community" (p. 237) such that "belonging to the Jewish community proved to be a source of a specifically strong feeling of security" (p. 238). Survivors [-F-C] are immigrants from the Jewish communities of Europe that were destroyed during the Holocaust; they are immobilized by their experience in the death camps and have little self-consciousness as Jews.

### **1952b Eisenstadt**

Shmuel Eisenstadt developed a second acculturation typology of immigrant families in Israel, again with the focus on identification with the new country and with the family, and on participation in the society and compliance with its norms. The interviews focused on what the immigrants criticized and complained about. The isolated stable [+F-C] families have narrowly focused fields of interest related to family needs and have negative predispositions to change. The isolated active [-F+C] families have also lost ties with their original groups during the war, but are more positive towards the new country and more active participants. The cohesive ethnic group [+F+C] maintain their ethnic identification and institutions, but are positive towards the new country and its values and actively participate in its institutions. The self-transforming cohesive ethnic group [-F+C] have a high degree of solidarity with their families but "very slight insistence on their specific cultural patterns" (Eisenstadt, 1952b, pp. 387-388). This group is ideologically positive towards the new country and active participants in it. "Owing to their high positive predisposition to change, their group cohesion, and mutual help ... the conditions of absorption do not affect their personalities to a great extent, but mainly their group identifications" (p. 388). The isolated apathetic [-F-C] families have "negative identification



towards the new social structures and its social values" and "the scope of their social participation is minimal" (Eisenstadt, 1952b, p. 380).

### **1952 Lee**

Robert Lee (1952), from the Pacific School of Religion, argued that assimilation of visible minorities in the USA is "well-nigh impossible if we are to understand assimilation to mean being transformed into a homogeneous part of the majority society's core culture" (p. 319). He identified three groups of Chinese in America: The acculturated [-F+C] are second, third, and fourth generation Chinese who may reject their cultural heritage, cause family strain and social ostracism by the Chinese community. The segregated [+F-C] are mostly new immigrants who have been completely cut off from the majority culture, live in segregated communities, and are content with traditional Chinese ways. The Marginal Man [+F+C] describes second, third, and fourth generation Chinese who are thus Americanized, but who maintain a respectful attitude towards some aspects of Chinese culture, and thus have intimacy and good rapport with the majority and minority community. Lee (1952, p. 320) argued that the minority needs to be engaged in more activities in the mainstream culture, but also "there is an equally great need for members of the majority society to participate in the activities of minority groups, thus paving the way for freer association" such that "acculturation thereby is a dynamic two-way process of interaction."

### **1953 Beals**

Ralph Beals (1953) reviewed the history of anthropological research on acculturation, and concluded: "Virtually all discussions point out acceptance, syncretism, and reaction as being possible results of culture contact" (p. 636). Acceptance [-F+C] of another culture's traits leads to assimilation, unless modified by other attitudes. Reaction [+F-C] includes "a variety of contra-acculturative movements ... with emphasis on the psychological factors" (p. 630). Syncretism [+F+C] entails various kinds of bicultural blending. Reformulation [-F-C] in one form of syncretism that produces "entirely new cultural structures" (p. 636) which are not evident in either of the original contact cultures.

### **1953 Willey**

Anthropologist Gordon Willey (1953) used archeological evidence to argue for a kind of acculturation he called "cultural colonialism". An invading society first establishes a dominating, fortified colony [-F+C] that imposes its culture on the local inhabitants by brute force and hostility to the indigenous culture. Some natives flee to refuge [+F-C] in the hinterland to maintain their culture and escape that of the intruder. It is in the refuge that gradual acculturation takes place by self-directed processes of imitation and borrowing, until eventually a third culture arises which is a blend [+F+C] of the alien and native

cultures. This new culture eventually engulfs and consolidates the refuge and colony communities and thus ends cultural conflict.

### **1953 Taft**

Australian social psychologist, Ronald Taft (1953; 1963), theorized that societies have three possible orientations towards the assimilation of immigrants. Monism [-F+C] means that migrants should be culturally and socially assimilated into the dominant society as quickly as possible. Pluralism [+F-C] means that, "beyond the acceptance of supra-ordinate national values essential to the nation's existence there need be no agreement between immigrants and native citizens excepting that their cultural difference be mutually tolerated and preserved" (Taft, 1963, p. 279). Interactionism [+F+C] is a process of communication and negotiation that arises from multiple frames of reference, with "the expectation that social interaction between immigrants and native citizens will lead to a gradual convergence of behavior and shared norms" (Taft, 1963, p. 279). Whereas monism is oppressive and pluralism is socially divisive, interactionism is respectful of each individual and each ethnic group and should facilitate social cooperativeness.

### **1953 Simpson and Yinger**

Simpson and Yinger's (1953/1972) textbook on Racial and Cultural Minorities included a typology of minority acculturative orientations. Assimilationist [-F+C] describes "a minority desiring absorption into the larger society and treatment simply as individuals ... even in the face of majority opposition" (p. 14). Secessionist [+F-C] describes "a minority that seeks both cultural and political independence ... [when] they become discontented with cultural pluralism and antagonist to assimilation" (p. 15). Militant [+F-C] describes a minority that seeks intercultural dominance and "the complete reversal of statuses" (p. 15). Pluralist [+F+C] describes those who desire "peaceful existence side by side with the majority", which is a "precondition of a dynamic civilization, for it allows mutual exchange and stimulation" (p. 14). Ambivalent [-F-C] describes indecisiveness.

### **1954 Barnett, Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson**

A Social Science Research Council committee comprised of Homer Barnett, Leonard Broom, Bernard Siegel, Evon Vogt & James Watson (1954) reviewed acculturation research and noted that interest in acculturation grows out of concern to preserve "memory cultures", defined by mental constructs more than by material or economic relations. This explains "the predominate concern with the postcontact ethnography of 'receptor' cultures, while the 'donor' tacitly receives the status of an independent variable" (p. 973). They emphasized that it is not cultures that come into contact but individuals, and that individuals know only a portion of their culture. Progressive adjustment [-F+C] includes bilateral cultural fusion and assimilation by processes that allow flexibility, reinterpretation, and "prerogative of integrating what they want and rejecting the rest" (p. 986). Reactive

adaptation [+F-C] results from an attempt "to withdraw and to encyst native values" as a "response to threat when the pressure is less nearly overwhelming" (p. 987). Stabilized pluralism [+F+C] is "arrested fusion or incomplete assimilation" resulting from "the failure of two cultures in contact completely to lose their autonomy" (p. 990). Stabilization requires cultural institutions to "ameliorate the stresses of interethnic situations" and to "legitimize the status system of the ethnic community in which one may expect to find transplanted important aspects of the stratification criteria of the dominant society" (p. 990). Cultural disintegration [-F-C] results from mandatory elimination of minority traits and forced incorporation without allowance for selection, reinterpretation, or creativity.

### **1955 Spiro**

Anthropologist Melford Spiro (1955) reviewed ethnographic research on minority group acculturation in the United States and concluded that positive attitudes towards the dominant society derive from a desire for social mobility, which entails identification with one's social class en lieu of one's ethnic group. Assimilation [-F+C] is "the disappearance of group identity through nondifferential association and exogamy" (p. 1244). Solidarity [+F-C] entails a rejection of social mobility and its divisive threat to the cultural survival of the minority group. Acculturation [+F+C], like assimilation, is motivated by social mobility; however, minority group identification is retained, not by choice, but by the imposition of the majority group. Deculturation [-F-C] describes the loss or rejection of first-culture norms, beliefs, or behaviors, but without any compensating replacement practices from the dominant society. Spiro (1955, p. 1248) also found in the literature that all processes of acculturation "create severe problems of emotional adjustment".

### **1955 Antonovsky**

Aaron Antonovsky's (1955; 1956) sociology dissertation identified six kinds of marginality, based on interviews of Jewish men in Connecticut. By definition, the marginal situation is bicultural, yet there is usually a primary orientation towards the minority culture or toward the general society. The primary orientation may be actively, ideologically endorsed, or passively, circumstantially endured. The active general orientation [-F+C] describes "those who come as close to assimilation as possible without going so far as to hide intentionally or deny their Jewishness" (Antonovsky, 1956, p. 61). The active Jewish orientation [+F-C] is marked by strong identity with Jewishness, separated from the Gentile society. The passive Jewish orientation [+F-C] describes resigned minority membership, without an articulated ideology. The dual orientation [+F+C] describes an "attitude of moderate and unproblematic ... integration in a generally liberal society" (Antonovsky, 1956, p. 60). The ambivalent orientation [-F-C] "seems to embody the classic psychological attributes of marginality [in that] both Jewish and non-Jewish is fundamentally unsatisfactory, conflicted" (Antonovsky, 1956, p. 60). The passive general orientation [-F-C] describes those who are "indifferent to and drifting away from Jewish culture, but don't actually seek participation in non-Jewish life" (Antonovsky, 1956, p. 60). Antonovsky (1956)

concluded that marginality is necessarily a condition of being bicultural, but that only 14% of the sample exhibited such symptoms as instability, conflict, or uncertainty.

### **1956 Zubrzycki**

Jerzy Zubrzycki's 1956 sociology dissertation on Polish immigrants in Britain described three types of acculturation. Assimilation [-F+C] entails a predisposition to change behaviors, to learn those of the dominant society and to forego first-culture identity. Accommodation [+F+C] also entails learning the behaviors of the dominant society, but with retention of first-culture identity: "This readiness to accept institutions of the host society combined with special efforts to maintain ethnic identity and separateness of the Polish community constitutes the essence of accommodation" (p. 175). Conflict [-F-C] "is a state of personal disorganization on the part of the individual members of the immigrant group which alienates them from the host society and - in some cases - from the minority group itself" (p. 176).

### **1956 Cohen**

Bernard Cohen's 1956 psychological study of Holocaust survivors argued that the two acculturation alternatives of assimilation [-F+C] and minority culture survival [+F-C] are both forms of ethnocentrism since they entail anti-democratic, authoritarian tendencies to reject other cultures. Cohen's third alternative was indifference [-F-C] which entails no cultural assertiveness and entails a democratic acceptance of other people regardless of their culture. His data confirmed that assimilationists and survivalists had higher scores on the Fascism Scale than did the indifferent group.

### **1957 Richardson**

Alan Richardson's 1957 psychometric study of the assimilation of British migrants to Australia theorized that assimilation entails a progression from the minority person's isolation, to accommodation with the dominant society, to identification with the dominant society. Identification [-F+C] is the final stage of assimilation, entailing behavioral accommodation to the dominant society and identification with it. Isolation [+F-C] describes an immigrant "who remains aloof from the resident population and who in every way tries to cultivate his traditional way of life" (p. 159). Accommodation [+F+C] entails the immigrant conforming to the majority's behavior, dress, and other externalities, but not changing any deep lying attitudes. Isolation, and accommodation to some degree, entail dissonance between the migrant and the larger society.

### **1957 Dohrenwend and Smith**

Anthropologists Bruce Dohrenwend and Robert Smith (1957; 1962) theorized that acculturation entails two kinds of change, 1) away from traditional behavior, and 2)

towards the contact culture. The degree of acculturation depends on deviation from those important aspects of the culture that regulate cultural admission or exclusion. Reorientation [-F+C] is the process by which the abandoned rules of the old culture "are altered by processes of internalization to bring them into line with those of the other culture" resulting in assimilation (Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962, p. 34). Reaffirmation [+F-C] entails an "emphasis on preserving or reviving the rules of the cultural heritage" (p. 34), whether real or imagined. Reconstitution [-F-C] is an emergent mode of acculturation that entails "the creation, by one group, of rules which existed in neither culture prior to contact" (p. 35). Dohrenwend and Smith (1957; 1962) argued that there are several kinds of marginalization. Failed reorientation is called partial reorientation [+F+C] and is marginalization because of deviance from important aspects of culture. This describes the bicultural individual who "aspires to the economic goals of the other culture, for example, but strives to maintain his religious ties with his own group" (p. 36). Failed reaffirmation is nativistic [+F-C] marginalization if the individual affirms weak aspects of the traditional culture that have been supplanted or are now tangential to the first-culture and to the contact culture. Alienation [-F-C] is marginalization arising from the abandonment of aspects of the first-culture without any change towards adopting the contact culture, such that "the alienated individual is marginal to both groups" and "they may both 'disown' him" (p. 36).

### **1957 Horobin**

Gordon Horobin's (1957) sociology study of Estonian refugees in England described several forms of acculturative adjustment. Assimilation [-F+C] refers to complete, monistic assimilation "resulting in the complete elimination of difference" (p. 242). However, by this definition, most migrants do not assimilate. Rather, Horobin argued, there are various forms of adjustment that may retard assimilation but are not dysfunctional. Migrants who are backward looking [+F-C] have a nostalgic, romanticized focus on their past existence and dutifully maintain an ethnic community with shared goals of return. Those who have mastered the language, intermarried, changed citizenship and in every way appear assimilated are in fact only Anglicized [+F+C] at a superficial level if cultural goals and ambitions have not been fulfilled or renounced. Horobin used the word "rootless" [-F-C] to describe those who have renounced goals of return, who are dissatisfied and frustrated with their situation, but cannot change it.

### **1957 Taft**

Ronald Taft (1957) proposed a comprehensive model of seven stages of social assimilation, from Stage 1 cultural learning to Stage 7 congruence. Central to Taft's model is comparison of the migrant's internal, often imagined, complex of knowledge, attitudes, identity, etc., with the external reality of these in the migrant's own behavior and that of the social environment. Stage 1 cultural learning, especially language acquisition is facilitated by contact which is enhanced by multiple reference groups and by presumption of

knowledge even if incorrect. Stage 2 involves attitudes towards individuals from, norms of, and identity with the new culture. Contact does not predict positive attitudes but positive attitudes do predict contact. Stage 3 involves attitudes towards first-culture individuals, norms, and identity. Cultural norms conflict, and it will not be possible to have positive attitudes to all norms in both cultures, except by "compartmentalization" as a defence. Stage 4 is focused on conformity to the new culture's norms. Accommodation [+F+C] describes cultural conformity or role-playing, in Taft's words, "behavioral adaptation without any necessary ego-involvement" such as positive attitudes or self-identity (Taft, 1957, p. 148). Stage 5 involves perceived and actual acceptance into the new culture. Stage 6 involves group membership identity, as perceived by one's self, one's minority group, and the majority group. A person is marginal [-F-C] if self-identity is not confirmed by the external group, and this may vary from one social context to another. Stage 7 involves convergence of cultural norms. "Since the term 'norms' implies 'built-in' (ego-involving) standards, which members of a group use in judging their own behavior and that of others, changes in a person's norms involve a fundamental change in his cognitive habits" which predicts incongruence, resistance, and lack of insight (Taft, 1957, p. 151).

### **1958 Glaser**

Daniel Glaser (1958) presented a sociological theory that minority group acculturation is four locations on a progressive continuum of ethnic identity development. Ethnic identity begins as an ethnocentric segregating [+F-C] of oneself into the minority group and rejecting traits of the dominant culture. However, acculturative contact leads to bicultural competence, such that a person "favors a pluralistic society in which he can feel identified with several ethnic groups" (p. 34). A person in this state is called marginal [+F+C]:

He is likely to be frequently conscious of the problem of deciding which identity is the most appropriate to promote for himself in a given time and place, and he may have guilt feelings and fears of discovery as a result of duplicity and inconsistency in identifying himself to others (Glaser, 1958, p. 34).

Glaser's acculturative state of desegregating [-F-C] describes the person who is culturally autonomous and rejects all cultural identifications, as typified by Bohemian artists, religious cult groups, and cosmopolitan people generally. The assimilated [-F+C] state is rare since it requires that the dominant culture be so thoroughly adopted that there is unawareness of culture, to the degree that other people's overt cultural affiliations are seen to be pathological.

### **1958 Bennett, Passin and McKnight**

John Bennett, Herbert Passin and Robert McKnight (1958) used personality measures to define an acculturation typology for academic sojourners. The idealist [-F+C] is rebellious against first-culture identification and values, prefers those of the contact culture, and is

idealistic rather than instrumental in learning Western ways. Nevertheless, idealists have difficulty learning American ways, and also experience alienation and loss of identity when returning home. The constrictor [+F-C] conforms to first-culture identification and values, is generally inflexible, resistive to cultural change, introverted, and prefers superficial to deep learning. The adjustor [-F-C] is biculturally adaptive, free from "fluctuating or conflicting ideals, cultural identification, or strong national loyalties. ... and since his social habits permit him to engage in almost any activity without risk of emotional involvement, irreversible personal change is less of a reality" (p. 189).

### **1958 Thomas**

Cherokee anthropologist Robert K. Thomas (1958) described and theorized about the phenomena of "White Indians" and pan-Indianism. He argued that acculturation is on a continuum, beginning with the Conservative [+F-C] Indians, also called "Full-Bloods", who maintain traditional cultural lifestyles, language and religion. Some of them are marginalized. Generalized Indians [+F+C] are those who maintain a pan-Indian identity, who have lost tribal aspects of their culture, but who also identify themselves as Americans. They participate in the money economy, and may live in the Indian community or in a metropolitan area. Behaviorally, they are similar to the Conservative Indians, but no longer use the native language. Rural White Indians [-F-C] have inter-married with White families and in most ways have assimilated to White culture, but continue to live in the Indian community and to identify themselves as "Indian" but are not accepted by the rest of the community as such. They may play important roles in the Church. Middle class Indians [-F+C] have largely assimilated to mainstream American society and have Indian identity only to the extent of "noblesse oblige". Psychologically, they are like Generalized Indians, but more stable, secure, and sophisticated.

### **1959 Borrie**

Demographer Wilfred Borrie (1959), in his summary report on the 1956 UNESCO conference on immigration, noted that an effort had been made to focus on practical issues of economic and social adjustment, avoiding technical debates about the meanings of words. However, because words such as "assimilation" and "integration" are used in national policy statements and laws, it is important to give attention to their meanings (plural). Assimilation [-F+C] entails complete conformity by the immigrants to "the national way of life" and often has been accompanied by compulsion or by racist selection criteria to admit "assimilable types". However, by about 1914, it was clear in the USA that immigrants did not assimilate, and ideas of cultural pluralism were articulated in the 1920s. Integration [+F+C] "rests upon a belief in the importance of cultural differentiation within a framework of social unity" (p. 94). An association of NGOs defined integration to be "a dynamic process in which values are enriched through mutual acquaintance, accommodation and understanding" (p. 96). Such transculturation requires conformity in civil and economic matters, but laissez-faire policies in other domains. The lack of controls

required for integration allow the possibility of cultural isolation [+F-C] or segregation of minority groups, by social preferences rather than by legal mandate.

### 1960 Rothman

Jack Rothman (1960; 1961) reviewed Kurt Lewin's writings for application to social work within the Jewish community. Rothman emphasized Lewin's focus on minority group identification in order to avoid self-hatred: "Lewin based his theory solely on the psychological principle of the secure personality which results from relating well to the minority group" (Rothman, 1960, p. 88). Under-assertion [-F+C] of minority identity can cause self-hatred as well as distress because the boundary between the in-group and the out-group is ill defined and because the majority "will be suspicious of the individual who is not identified with his in-group" (Rothman, 1960, p. 85). Over-assertion [+F-C] of minority identity divides the minority community from the general society. Lewin advocated a moderate position [+F+C] with a dynamic balance between in-group and out-group orientations. Marginality [-F-C] describes "the non-identified individual who wishes desperately to leave the group but is held back by the rejection of the out-group" (Rothman, 1960, p. 89).

### 1960 Ausubel

Psychologist David Ausubel (1960a; b) used interviews and projective tests to study Maori acculturation in New Zealand. Assimilative [-F+C] acculturation entails the gradual and insidious introduction of an attractive new culture, resulting in its complete acceptance. Resistive [+F-C] acculturation entails physical withdrawal as well as "(a) a hard core of indigenous values, customs, and forms of social organization, (b) affectively charged repudiation of European values, and (c) such modification of the original culture as are conditioned or necessitated by apathy and demoralization" (Ausubel, 1960b, p. 221). Adaptive [+F+C] acculturation entails:

...perpetuating the existing culture on the basis of positive attractions, but not for emphasizing traditional cultural elements (and arbitrarily rejecting corresponding European elements) as ends in themselves apart from their inherent merit in particular circumstances. European cultural forms are voluntarily incorporated with more or less modification into the prevailing cultural pattern on the basis of their inherent compatibility ... The structure of traditional social and economic institutions remains essentially intact without any demoralization or breakdown in leadership. Physical, social, and psychological withdrawal are unnecessary for the preservation of traditional social structure. (Ausubel, 1960b, p. 221).

Disintegration [-F-C] follows when resistive acculturation fails, and in describing this, Ausubel (1960a, p. 617; 1960b, p. 223;) was among the first to use the expression "acculturative stress".



### **1961 Herman**

Simon Herman (1961) used psychometric data to develop a progression of stages in linguistic acculturation depending on the potency of the personal need to use first-language and on the potency of the background culture of the majority. Upon arrival in a new country, immigrants first engage in over-conformity [-F+C] because they are anxious to be accepted. Then comes a period of vacillation and frustration [-F-C] in which neither language has a predominant force and awareness of communicative incompetence causes frustration. At some point, the need to use the expressive power of the first-language causes a crisis involving retreat and withdrawal [+F-C]. Eventually a stage of adjustment and integration [+F+C] is reached, when immigrants feel secure enough "to use the two languages more freely in accord with the demands of the immediate situation" (p. 161).

### **1961 Wallace**

Anthropologist Anthony Wallace (1961) tried to develop a theory of a culture's modal personality structure, also called "national character". However, cultures are not closed systems: they contact and interact with other cultures, causing changes. If the number of changes exceeds a critical threshold, then a crisis will ensue experienced as individual stress and as cultural distortion or eventually cultural collapse in which social institutions cease functioning. Immobility [-F-C] describes the "marginal man" who is "unable to forsake the old culture, yet, because of experience in the new, unable to be happy in it either" (p. 162). One resolution to this dilemma is assimilation [-F+C], which requires abandonment of the old culture. Another resolution is nativism or nationalism [+F-C], which entails a sometimes military or violent retreat to the old culture, "motivated by a desire to rid the group of the presence of members of the dominant group who are a source of constant shame-producing reminders of cultural inferiority" (p. 163). A third resolution process can be found in revitalization [+F+C] of the old culture as a "deliberate syncretic cultural reorganization within a definably bounded social group" (p. 163). Revitalization is not a congenial blending of cultures, but may entail prophetic leaders and group hysteria, leading to cultural reorganization and the groups capability to withstand intercultural contact.

### **1962 Baily and Kelman**

Psychologists Lotte Baily and Herbert Kelman (1962) proposed a fourfold acculturation model based on whether or not the self-image is internally structured or externally anchored in the social system, and whether the self-image is changed or maintained as a result of the acculturative contact. Identification [-F+C] entails an externally anchored self-image changing to fit the immediate social environment, such that "the individual adopts new patterns of behavior because they meet the expectations of certain new groups or persons" (pp. 33-34). Resistance [+F-C] "occurs when an individual maintains his self-

image through a focus on its social anchorage" (p. 34). In an acculturative context, this would require minimizing contact with other cultural groups and separating oneself into a culturally contained minority context. Confirmation [+F+C] means that "an individual focuses on the internal structure of the self-image, but maintains that image essentially in its original form" (p. 34). Such individuals have a secure identity that allows them to engage in new experiences and interact with other cultural systems because these confirm and strengthen, rather than threaten, self-image. Internalization [-F-C] refers to a self-actualizing process in which the acculturative experience results in change, making the individual ever more self-referent and independent of external cultural norms and expectations. "The individual accepts the challenge of new experiences and re-examines his self-image in the light of the new information they provide" (p. 33).

### **1962 Roy**

Sociologist Prodipto Roy (1962) proposed a three-stage model of how "the smaller American Indian society will be assimilated into the larger white American society with practically no perceptible impact on the culture of the latter" (p. 542). Acculturation is defined as the process of the minority culture adopting traits of the majority culture. Social segregation [+F-C] describes the situation of minimal but increasing acculturation, when there is still physical separation and when the minority has yet to adopt traits that give social prestige. Social integration [+F+C] occurs when the minority participates in the formal organizations of the majority and is resident among them. Amalgamation [-F+C] marks the complete assimilation of a minority, as indicated by the degree of intermarriage.

### **1963 Johnston**

Ruth Johnston (1963) used a psychometric study of Polish immigrants to Australia to argue that there are two kinds of assimilation. Subjective assimilation [-F+C] means that the immigrant has internally identified with the new society in addition to adopting the external behaviors of language use, dress, and leisure activities. External assimilation [+F+C] means that the immigrant adopted the external behaviors of the new society but has not identified with it.

### **1963 Nash & Shaw**

Dennison Nash and Louis Shaw (1963) developed an organizational management acculturation typology based on humanistic theories of the Self, especially the idea of emotional attachment. The traditional [+F-C] types lack the emotional flexibility to engage changing situations in the larger society, such that they "are the most conflicted, have the lowest energy level, and probably are more prone to psychosomatic disorders" (p. 257). The transitional [+F+C] types are capable of an emotional repertoire suitable to either culture because they share core personality traits with the contact culture. Thus, they have broad social affiliations, high achievement motivations, and can "cut through social

dealings with a minimum of conflict" (p. 259), however, at the cost of being dependent on forces outside of themselves. The autonomous types [-F-C] have secure self-identity uncomplicated by cultural loyalties. Thus, they can "maintain an identity in a changing situation with a minimum expenditure of energy on psychological defensive measures" (p. 260). The transitional and the autonomous types are both culturally adaptive, but "the autonomous man is multidirectional while the transitional carries a bridge which extends in the direction of one cultural mode" (p. 262).

### **1963 Glazer and Moynihan**

Historians Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (1963) described three kinds of acculturation in the history of ethnic groups in New York City. Melting-pot assimilation [-F+C] and cultural pluralism [+F-C] are unlikely since immigrant "language and culture are very largely lost in the first and second generations" (p. 13) while ethnic identity nevertheless persists in the form of ethnic interest groups [+F+C] such that "links of interest, family and fellowfeeling bind the ethnic group" (p. 18) even though people "go through a good part of their lives with no special consciousness of the fact" (p 19).

### **1963 Vander Zandan**

James Vander Zanden's (1963) sociology textbook concisely defined and illustrated many forms of minority reaction to acculturative pressures and subordinate status. "Assimilation [-F+C] may be accomplished through one group more or less completely taking (sic) the culture of another, in the process relinquishing its own unique beliefs and behavior patterns ... Assimilation [-F-C] may also be accomplished through a bilateral, reciprocal fusion in which a genuine third culture appears through the merger of two or more cultures" (Vander Zanden, 1963, p. 269). Avoidance [+F-C], aggression [+F-C], obsessive sensitivity [+F-C], and ego enhancement [+F-C] are all mechanisms of minority defensiveness. Accommodation [+F+C] means that "Minority-group members may more or less come to accept their deprived position" (p. 303). Self-hatred [-F-C] and flight from reality [-F-C] entail pathological processes denying minority status without alternative identities or cultural communities.

### **1963 Linton**

Anthropologist Ralph Linton (1963) described three generic types of acculturation. Assimilation, he argued, is a misnomer, since "practically all cases of the so-called assimilation of one group by another group could be more accurately classed as examples of fusion, since the culture of the assimilating group is usually modified by the introduction of elements from that of the assimilated" (p. 502). Thus, social-cultural fusion [-F+C] describes "those situations in which two originally distinct cultures and societies fuse to produce a single homogeneous culture and society" (p. 502). Nativistic movements [+F-C] refers to "cases in which a society not only glorifies past or passing phases of its culture

but also makes a conscious attempt to re-establish them" (p. 502). Directed culture change [+F+C] refers to "those situations in which one of the groups in contact interferes actively and purposefully with the culture of the other [and] may take the form of stimulating the acceptance of new culture elements, inhibiting the exercise of preexisting culture patterns, or, as seems to be most frequently the case, doing both simultaneously" (p. 502). Because most cultural contact is between a dominating culture and a dominated culture, directed culture change usually occurs first, followed by nativistic movements in reaction, or lacking that cultural fusion. But this sequence has many exceptions, such that, "on the whole, there appears to be no constant or intrinsic relationship between the phenomena of these three orders" (p. 503). Finally, Linton (1963) emphasized that acculturation entails inhibition processes which are too often overlooked.

### **1964 Gordon**

Milton Gordon (1964) reviewed theories of immigrant acculturation in the USA and interviewed the staff of migrant support agencies. Assimilation [-F+C] falls into two broad types of either Anglo-conformity or melting-pot, but both entail loss of minority group attitudes, behaviors, identification, marriages, and social structures. Structural pluralism [+F-C] entails each ethnic group maintaining separate social institutions, for example, places of worship, such that "the existence of separate subsocieties keeps primary group relations among persons of different ethnic backgrounds at a minimum" (p. 159). Structural pluralism describes US society and explains its racism and other inter-ethnic problems. Cultural pluralism [+F+C] "seeks to maintain enough subsocietal separation to guarantee the continuance of the ethnic cultural tradition and the existence of the group ... while cooperating with other groups and individuals in the secondary relations areas of political action, economic life, and civic responsibility" (p. 158). Marginality [-F-C] describes the bicultural individual "who engages in frequent and sustained primary contacts across ethnic group lines ... who stands on the borders or margins of two cultural worlds but is fully a member of neither" (p. 56).

### **1965 Fong**

Stanley Fong's 1965 psychometric study of Chinese-descendent students in the USA was based on attitudes toward assimilation and on internalization of emotional schema. Fong did not label his four acculturation types, but did describe them. Achieved assimilation [-F+C] describes those who were positive towards assimilation and who responded like Americans when identifying the emotional state of ambiguous figures. Achieved separation [+F-C] describes those who rejected assimilation and who showed no signs that they had internalized American schema. Colonial biculturalism [+F+C] describes the Hong Kong subjects who rejected assimilation but who responded like assimilated persons. Semi-acculturated marginalism [-F-C] describes subjects who "may consist of semiacculturated second-generation members who are in conflict with their immigrant parents and have

rejected, in a compulsive manner, their ethnic identity for the marginal American one" (p. 273).

### **1966 Keesing**

According to Felix Keesing's anthropology textbook, "Where contact and diffusion occur with some continuity, the transfer process is called acculturation" (Keesing, 1966, pp. 27-28). Assimilation [-F+C] is "the process by which introduced elements become totally accepted into a new cultural milieu [as] occurs where members of one ethnic group are fully integrated culturally and socially into another ethnic group" (p. 287). However, sometimes after a period of rapid acculturation, a minority group may try to selectively revive aspects of the traditional culture in a contra-acculturative movement [+F-C]. Keesing described three kinds of biculturalism. A folk society [+F+C] maintains its distinctive cultural identity and integrity by selectively adopting and reinterpreting cultural elements from outside. When this process is happening bilaterally, with two racially distinct groups selectively adopting from each other yet maintaining cultural identity and integrity, it is called symbiotic [+F+C]. Cultural fusion [-F-C] describes the situation when two cultures merge to form a third culture that is completely distinct from the original two.

### **1967 London**

American political scientist Herbert London (1967; 1970) advocated that Australia adopt acculturation policies of integration similar to those in the USA. London argued that assimilation [-F+C] policies are difficult because they require of the minority "rejection of old values and the adoption of new ones" (p. 339), but also require of the majority acceptance of interracial marriages. With policies of cultural pluralism [+F-C] "each group, anxious to preserve its traditional ways, endeavors to create a subculture of its own" (p. 341), but this requires separation from the other cultural groups, which imperils national unity and social order. Integration [+F+C] "implies interaction between the migrant community and the host society with a resultant change in the cultural amalgam, but without the migrant's loss of cultural identity" (p. 340) and without the need for interracial marriages. Integration presupposes the possibility of "cultural differentiation within a framework of social unity" (p. 340), with the United States standing as the best example of a society based on cultural integration. London (1967) is the origin for the concept of bicultural integration now widely used within acculturation research (Sommerlad & Berry, 1970).

### **1967 Nash**

Dennison Nash (1967) used psychological theories of the stranger, as well as interview data from American expatriots in Spain, to develop a typology to explain sojourner acculturation in the context in which assimilation is not a possibility. The unadapted [+F-C] are unwilling to change, are anomic and anxious, and "tend to reject the hosts and

emphasize identification with home" (p. 160). Rapprochement [+F+C] requires that sojourners have compatriot friends who can confirm the old sense of self, and have host society friends who can reduce ethnocentric constriction. The Bohemian [-F-C] group actively reject their home society, yet remain on the margins of their host society.

### **1967 Lambert**

Social psychologist Wallace Lambert (1967) suggested an acculturation typology based on empirical studies of linguistic acculturation by French Canadians in the USA. One group rejected [-F+C] French, preferred English, but were anxious about their linguistic competence. A second group identified [+F-C] with French and preferred it to English. A third group was nonethnocentric [+F+C] in that they were open-minded and were fully and comfortably bilingual. A fourth group was ambivalent [-F-C] about their cultural identity, in conflict over linguistic allegiance, and weak in their command of either language.

### **1968 Marden and Meyer**

The sociology textbook by Charles Marden and Gladys Meyer (1968) on minority acculturation included an acculturation typology. Acculturation [-F+C] is "the process whereby minorities are incorporated into the dominant culture" (p. 35). External acculturation entails adopting the material culture, language, and secular roles necessary for participation in the public spheres of life in the dominant society, while keeping first-culture norms for private spheres of life. Internal acculturation entails adopting the values and attitudes of the dominant society. Nativism [+F-C] consists of ethnocentrism by either the dominant group or the minority, in reaction against acculturative changes. In fact, however, nativism is covertly bicultural: "The marginal character of adherents to such movements is clear as the image of the idealized past which they project is to include the benefits of the contemporary society, thus indicating the duality of the reference groups" (p. 47). Stabilized acculturation [+F+C], also called structural pluralism, requires a) external acculturation, b) enhanced minority group "respectability" by public recognition of their achievements, and c) adaptation by minority institutions to become coherent with dominant norms, such that "within this frame of acculturation there persists a preference for intimate associations with people whose cultural and/or religious and racial heritage is like one's own" (p. 49). Marginality [-F-C] occurs when an individual has abandoned first-culture norms and behaviors but is not accepted by the dominant society, which "usually makes him to a greater or lesser degree, an 'outsider' to both groups" (p. 45). When the whole group tries to acculturate but is not accepted, then such marginality causes them "to take on a double identity, illustrated by the self-designation of hyphenated status: 'I am an Italian-American' " (p. 44).

### **1969 Comeau**

Paul-André Comeau's 1969 political science study presented an acculturation typology based on two dimensions. First, people have [+C] or lack [-C] an educated interest in arts, news, and other forms of cultural media which allow objectivity and conscious control of the acculturation process. Second, people have contact with cultural media in the minority language [+F] or the majority language [-F]. Minimum acculturation [+F+C] results when people are engaged with culture and use the minority language. Possible acculturation [+F-C] results when people use the minority language but are not culturally engaged. Probable acculturation [-F-C] results when people use the majority language but are not culturally engaged. Advanced acculturation [-F+C] results when people are culturally engaged using the majority language. Comeau argued that minimum acculturation was most satisfactory because it allowed an harmonious integration of the minority culture in its own milieu. In contrast, possible acculturation can cause anxiety because the minority culture is not well integrated and is thus open to acculturative change. Probable acculturation is also stressful because of pressure from the majority culture and because cultural values and semiotics are disjoint from the individual's personality.

### **1969 Rabushka**

Alvin Rabushka's (1969) political science study of students at a multi-ethnic university criticized acculturation research, arguing "if attitudes are used both as a measure of integration and one of the causes of integration, then circular measurement results" (pp. 54-55). Instead, he compared a) attitudes of cultural preference and hypothetical willingness for specific inter-ethnic relationships with b) behavioral reports of recent multi-ethnic interactions. Of the hypothetical behaviors, acceptance of inter-marriage [-F+C] is most strongly assimilative. Ethnocentrism [+F-C] was indicated by non-mixing with other groups, by preference for one's own culture, and by rejection of marital, residential, cuisine, and employment relationships with other groups. Integration [+F+C] was indicated by mixing with other groups, reduced preference for one's own cultures, and by willingness to have relationships with other ethnic groups.

### **1969 Barth**

Fredrik Barth's 1969 review of largely Scandinavian anthropological literature challenged the underlying assumptions of most acculturation research. He argued that cultures are not defined by practices, norms, and values but by the boundaries they maintain with other cultures, and these boundaries persist despite, or maybe because of, their permeability. Thus, there are no distinct cultures, "each organized in a society which can be legitimately isolated for description as an island to itself" (p. 11). Barth also argued that cultural leaders choose for themselves acculturation options that have different consequences for their community:

(i) they may attempt to pass and become incorporated in the pre-established industrial society and cultural group; (ii) they may accept a 'minority' status, accommodate to and seek to reduce their minority disabilities by encapsulating all cultural differentiae in sectors of non-articulation, while participating in the larger system of the industrialized group in the other sectors of activity; (iii) they may choose to emphasize ethnic identity, using it to develop new positions and patterns to organize activities in those sectors formerly not found in their society (p. 33).

If the leaders choose to assimilate, then the minority group loses internal diversity and remains ends up culturally conservative, inarticulate, as a low-rank minority [-F-C]. If the leaders choose the second strategy of bicultural integration, they cause the loss of "clearly dichotomizing poly-ethnic organization" (p. 33), resulting in the group's eventual assimilation [-F+C]. The third strategy of ethnic assertiveness results in dynamic, cultural evolution [+F-C].

### **1970 Saruk and Gulutsan**

Alec Saruk and Metro Gulutsan (1970) examined the attitudes of Ukrainian-descent parents in Canada towards Ukrainian culture and towards English culture in order to challenge the belief that children from assimilationist families have an advantage in school. A 2X2 crossing of attitudes to Ukrainian and to English cultures defined a fourfold acculturation typology: majority orientation [-F+C], minority orientation [+F-C], bicultural orientation [+F+C], and apathetic orientation [-F-C]. The data showed that children from families in these fourfold categories were undifferentiated in their school performance, all above provincial average, demonstrating that all four acculturation orientation are adequately adaptive and that there is no factual basis for educators to recommend assimilationist or integrationist policies for minority children.

### **1970 Rees**

Sociologist T. B. Rees (1970) examined acculturation in light of equilibrium theories of society. If society is "the product of a consensus about norms and values" based on "an elaborate hierarchy of deeply rooted, unspoken, unwritten, and frequently semi-conscious customs and traditions" and "if the war of all against all is only prevented by the unifying bonds of a common value system" (p. 482), then the assimilation [-F+C] of cultural minorities, including their positive acceptance by the majority group, is the only stable form of acculturation. Forms of cultural pluralism, either as accommodation [+F-C] in which the minority makes minimal adjustments to the majority or as integration [+F+C] in which there is cooperation and interdependence between the minority and majority, are inherently unstable because of power inequalities, as exemplified by continuing inter-ethnic political struggles in Belgium, Canada, and Northern Ireland.



### **1970 Born**

David Born (1970) reviewed anthropological literature to propose a theory of "Psychological Adaptation and Development Under Acculturative Stress". Limiting the discussion to minority or traditional cultures in contact with dominant cultures, Born argued that new cultural traits introduce dissonance and deprivation of possessions, status, behaviors, and worth, which compound to a distressing situation that requires actions to cope with the distress. There are four modes of adaptation to this acculturative stress: Innovation [-F+C] entails "as complete as possible an acceptance of the new patterns of behavior with a conscious rejection of tradition;" Retreatism [+F-C] is "a return to, or a conscious preservation of, the traditional patterns of behavior with a corresponding resistance to new patterns;" Reconciliation [+F+C] is "a combination of the traditional and the new, an attempt to 'co-exist' or to 'strike a happy medium';" Withdrawal [-F-C] entails "an overt rejection of both the traditional and the new; tradition continues to influence behavior, but there will be little value placed on such influence and it will generally be denied as much as possible" (Born, 1970, p. 538). Born (1970) argues that the reconciliation is a likely mode of adaptation because it is the passive acquiescent response and offers the prospect of synthesis and revitalization.

### **1970 Sommerlad and Berry**

Elizabeth Sommerlad and John Berry (1970) used psychometrics to study the ethnic identity and cultural attitudes of Australian Aboriginals. Assimilation [-F+C] means "identification whereby the minority group develops a sense of people-hood based exclusively on the host society" (p. 23). Integration [+F+C] means retention of minority identity and limited bilateral behavioral change: "when many individuals identify with their own group, as in integration, and there are many of these groups oriented towards, or contributing to, society, each group maintains its integrity by contributing its own values and beliefs to the host society" (pp. 24-25). Following the conceptualization of Glaser (1958), marginal [+F+C] describes "those who identify with both the host society and their own group" (p. 24). This kind of bicultural identity was not operationalized as a measure because it is an acquiescence response and because it is characteristic of both integration and transition to assimilation.

### **1970 Berry**

John Berry (1970) reported a second psychometric study of Australian Aboriginals using the scales developed by Sommerlad (1968). Assimilation [-F+C] was defined as " 'passing' or mixing, leading to a loss of separate identity" (Berry, 1970, p. 242). Integration [+F+C] was defined as "moving, as a group, into the dominant society while retaining a separate group identity" (p. 242). Rejection [+F-C] was defined as not assimilation and not integration: "rejection of either of these two forms of positive relationship, and affirming one's own cultural values" (p. 242). Marginality was presented as having two meanings. At

the society level, marginal [+F+C] means community biculturalism: "the marginal area exists where there is overlap (not merely contact) so that two cultural systems are mixed" (p. 240). At the psychological level, marginality refers to a psychopathological state of "aggression, suspicion, uncertainty, victimization-rejection, anxiety, and a lack of solidarity" (p. 241).

### **1971 Sue and Sue**

Derald Sue and Stanley Sue (1971) used counseling case studies to articulate an acculturation typology based on self-worth. The traditionalist [+F-C] has "strongly internalized Chinese values" (p. 38) and tends to "resist assimilation by maintaining traditional values and by associating predominantly with other Chinese" (Sue & Sue, 1972, p. 638). However, Chinese traditionally find self-worth in obedience to parents and meeting their expectations of educational and occupational success. However, "conflict occurs because the Traditionalist must interact with the dominant society. Despite his attempts to confine his social life to the Chinese subculture, he is unable to fully isolate himself from members of the host society" (Sue & Sue, 1971, p. 39), resulting in involuntary integration. The Asian American [+F+C] is a realist who sees that self-worth cannot come from parents nor from a racist society, and thus seeks a synthesis of two cultural worlds "in an attempt to preserve certain Chinese values in the formation of a new identity (p. 42). Society must be changed, which requires political activism, which requires solidarity with other Asian groups, which results in distance from traditional Chinese culture. The marginal man [-F-C] "attempts to assimilate and acculturate into the majority society", tends to "reject traditional Chinese ways by becoming over-Westernized" and "finds his self worth defined in terms of acceptance by Caucasians" (p. 40). Lack of acceptance due to racism results in self-hatred.

### **1972 Gaarder**

Birgit Gaarder's (1972) psychological study of Sami-Norwegian bilingualism described a fourfold typology of linguistic acculturation based on the observation that the language of the minority Sami was seen by many to have low status compared to the dominant society's Norwegian dialects. Thus, high status unilingualism [-F+C] refers to adopting Norwegian and losing Sami. Low status unilingualism [+F-C] means maintaining Sami and rejecting Norwegian. Coordinate bilingualism [+F+C] refers to fluent use of either language in contexts in which they are appropriate. Double demi-lingualism [-F-C] means that neither the minority nor the dominant language is fully or fluently learned.

### **1972 Berry, Evans, and Rawlinson**

John Berry, Catherine Evans and Heather Rawlinson (1972) prepared a policy advisement paper on Native education in Ontario which included a taxonomy of acculturation options. Different kinds of acculturation were conceived to depend on whether or not 1) the minority

wants to retain first-culture identity, 2) wants to contribute to larger society, and 3) controls its own social institutions. Assimilation [-F+C] arises when the minority decides not to retain identity, is expected to contribute to the larger society, and lacks control of its institutions. Rejection [+F-C] arises when the minority wants to retain identity, does not want to contribute to the larger society, and controls its own institutions. If this is imposed on the minority, then it is called Segregation [+F-C]. Integration [+F+C] arises when the minority wants to retain identity, wants to contribute to the larger society, and controls its institutions. The historic Canadian treatment of Native people describes a kind of acculturation that might be called colonialism [+F+C] because the Native minority lacks control of its own institutions and is being forced by the dominant society, with good intentions, into bicultural integration. Deculturated [-F-C] describes the situation when the minority does not retain identity, is not allowed to contribute to the larger society, and this is imposed by institutions not under minority control. Because integration and rejection are under minority group control, they are hypothesized to entail less distress than assimilation and deculturation. The remaining two conditions of not wanting to retain first-culture identity, but having control of institutions, were dismissed as "inherently contradictory" (p. 29) since loss of group identity precludes the possibility of a group having control of institutions.

### **1973 Zak**

Itai Zak's (1973) psychometric study of Jewish identity in the USA, and his 1976 study of Arab-Israeli identity, showed that identity with the minority group is independent of identity with the dominant society. Thus, "a person may classify himself positively on both identity dimensions [+F+C], or negatively on both dimensions [-F-C], or positively on one dimension and negatively on the other [+F-C], and vice versa [-F+C]" (p. 898). Zak was atheoretically descriptive of these identity patterns, did not label them, and did not declare apriori expectations of their relative advantages or difficulties.

### **1974 Hunt and Walker**

Chester Hunt's and Lewis Walker's 1974 sociology textbook described a fourfold acculturation typology. Cultural assimilation [-F+C] entails the minority acculturating to, and adopting, the attitudes and values of the "host" society, thus threatening ethnic identity. Cultural pluralism [+F-C] entails each group remaining relatively protected in its own territory, fearful of its survival and alert to economic inequalities vis-a-vis other groups. Structural assimilation [+F+C] entails maintenance of ethnic identities, as well as "widespread patterns of face-to-face relationships in clubs, organizations, and institutions of the 'host society' " (p. 9). Integration [-F-C] entails "denial of any social obligation to preserve ethnic distinctions" (p. 8) such that "salient attachment to the ethnic group has disappeared" (p. 9).

### **1974 Pettigrew**

Thomas Pettigrew (1974) theorized a typology of race-relations arising from a dimension of groups being racially together or separate and from a dimension of minority group autonomy or lack of it. True integration [+F+C] is the biracial situation "where there is cross-racial friendship, racial interdependence, and a strong measure of personal and group autonomy" (p. 16). Mere desegregation [+F-C] is a biracial situation without autonomy and thus "involves little cross-racial acceptance and, often, patronizing legacies of White supremacy" (p. 17). The "Black Power" ghetto [+F-C] is a non-existent but hypothetically theorized Black separatist community, "relatively independent of the larger society and far more viable than is commonly the case now" (p. 16). The typical urban ghetto [-F-C] has highly separated racial communities with little autonomy.

### **1974 Berry**

In 1974, John Berry re-articulated his earlier 1972 taxonomy of acculturation. Eight acculturation possibilities are defined by three questions: does the minority 1) retain ethnic identity? 2) have positive intergroup relations? 3) have choice in these matters? NO/YES/YES defines assimilation as a melting pot [-F+C]. NO/YES/NO defines assimilation as a pressure cooker [-F+C]. YES/NO/YES defines rejection [+F-C], which was also called "self-segregation". YES/NO/NO defines segregation [+F-C]. YES/YES/YES defines integration [+F+C], which was also called "democratic pluralism". YES/YES/NO defines paternal integration [+F+C], which was also called "inclusive segregation". NO/NO/YES defines marginality [-F-C]. NO/NO/NO defines deculturation [-F-C].

### **1975 Woods**

Clyde Woods' (1975) anthropology textbook's chapter on acculturation is focused on Mexican and Central American contexts. Because social categories are race-based, Native Americans cannot assimilate. Rather, they can go through a process of progressive loss of first-culture, starting with the condition of traditional [+F-C] Indian community. The modified [+F-C] Indian community has lost or weakened some of its cultural traits and in response tries to crystalize Native culture and identity around a different set of traits. The Ladinoize [+F+C] Indian community has lost its native language most of its traditional cultural traits, except for gender roles, perhaps, and some cooking traditions. The Ladino [-F-C] has lost all traditional cultural traits including a territorial community. They are still considered Indian and share their poverty with other Ladinos.

### **1976 Berry**

John Berry (1976) summarized earlier studies of acculturation and cognitive style, and developed an overarching framework based on theories of human ecology. Four

acculturation constructs were defined by whether the traditional culture was of value and to be retained, and whether positive relations with the larger society were to be sought. Assimilation [-F+C] entails no preference for maintenance of traditional culture, but positive relations with the larger society. Rejection [+F-C] entails preference for maintenance of traditional culture but rejection of the larger society. Integration [+F+C] entails preference and positive attitudes for both cultures. Deculturation [-F-C] entails no preference for either culture. Psychometric scales for the first three of the acculturation constructs were adopted from the earlier Australian studies (Sommerlad & Berry, 1970). However, deculturation was not operationalized as a psychometric scale:

The fourth combination (deculturation) is not given expression in the scales, since both common sense and pilot work indicated that such an outcome was not to be chosen by anyone; however, some features of the concept of marginality are related to feelings in that combination (Berry, 1976, p. 180).

### **1976 Schumann**

Psycholinguist John Schumann (1976a; b) developed a typology for explaining the linguistic acculturation of a second-language-learning group (2LL) to a target-language group (TL):

In terms of cultural patterns involving life-style and values, there are three general integration strategies which the 2LL group might adopt: assimilation, acculturation, or preservation. If the 2LL group decides to assimilate [-F+C], then it gives up its own life-style and values and adopts those of the TL group. If it chooses to acculturate [+F+C], then its members adapt to the life-style and values of the TL group, but at the same time maintain their own cultural patterns for use in intragroup relations. Preservation [+F-C], as defined here, is a strategy in which the 2LL group completely rejects the life-style and values of the TL group and attempts to maintain its own cultural pattern as much as possible (Schumann, 1976a, pp. 136-137).

Furthermore, Schumann (1976b) theorized that which of these strategies the 2LL group desires for itself needs separate consideration from which strategy the TL group desires for the 2LL group. Finally, positive and negative attitudes of the 2LL group towards the TL group, and of the TL group towards the 2LL group, are distinct issues from each group's strategy preference.

### **1976 Clark, Kaufman and Pierce**

Anthropologists Margaret Clark, Sharon Kaufman and psychologist Robert Pierce (1976) derived a six-fold typology from three measures of acculturation. The first was a measure of attitudes towards and participation in the first-culture vs. contact culture, the second was

a measure behaviors in the first-culture, and the third a measure of "feelings of belonging to and participating in the majority culture" (p. 233). Data from Spanish and Japanese heritage minority groups in California clustered into six types. Types 2, 3, and 6 [-F+C] all had high self-identification and self-presentation as Anglo, even though Types 2 & 3 still had some attitudes and behaviors linking them to the traditional culture. Type 5 [+F-C] were third-generation people who "show a remarkable efflorescence of 'ethnic face', coupled with a lack of much information about the culture of origin and little if any ability to speak or read the language of their grandparents" (p. 235). A Type 5 is "striving to get back to the roots of the culture" (p. 235) and "advocates ethnic group segregation" (p. 236). Type 4 [+F+C] are bicultural, bilingual second-generation people living in culturally mixed neighborhoods, who "can modulate the strength of their overall ethnic identity through face behavior" (p. 235). Type 1 [-F-C] are isolated first-generation migrants who want to assimilate but lack the skills and attitudes to function in the larger society.

### **1976 Driedger**

Leo Driedger's 1976 sociological questionnaire study defined three acculturation types based on dimensions of ethnic status, ethnic institutional control, ethnic affirmation, ethnic denial, and marginality. This last dimension was defined as "discrepancy at the psychological level between ingroup members's real and ideal identifications", thus "experiencing two cultures but identifying with neither" (p. 133). Majority assimilators [-F+C] had medium or high status, low institutional completeness, low ethnic affirmation, low ethnic denial, and low marginality. Ethnic identifiers [+F-C] have high status, high institutional control, high affirmation, low denial, and low marginality, such that "the result is maintenance of group boundaries and control over systematic linkage" (p. 132). Cultural marginals [-F-C] have low status, medium institutional control, medium affirmation, high ethnic denial, and medium marginality. Of these three types, the first two "should have greater individual adjustment because of identification with either the majority or ethnic cultures" (p. 134).

### **1976 Wagner**

Anthropologist Jean Wagner's (1976) study of inter-cultural marriage among urban American Indian women found three categories of respondents. Tradition-oriented [+F-C] women all had Indian husbands. Those who were transitional [+F+C] were partially acculturated, and more than 90% of them had a White husband. The American Middle-Class [+F+C] group all had taken White husbands. But they were not assimilationist and expressed an ideal of engaging in both cultures.

### **1977 Driedger**

In 1977, Leo Driedger proposed another acculturation typology. Assimilation and amalgamation [-F+C] represented unilinear, deterministic, acculturation outcomes in

contrast to multilinear pluralistic outcomes. Enclavic pluralism [+F-C] is "characterized by extensive boundary maintenance and controlled systematic linkage with outsiders" (p. 79) and entails territorial segregation, institutional completeness, cultural identity, and social distance. Regenerational pluralism [+F+C] is more suited to urban society because it does not rely on physical separation, but on "ideological vision, a historical identity, charismatic leadership, and social sophistication" (p. 86). "As minorities are able to retain a commitment to the minority ethnos, alienation will, presumably, be diminished" (p. 92).

### **1977 Berry, Kalin and Taylor**

John Berry, Rudolf Kalin and Donald Taylor (1977) reported a large scale psychometric study of Canadian multiculturalism. Following Berry's (1976) earlier work, four acculturation constructs were defined as minority group attitudes towards first-culture [ F ] and towards the larger society [ C ]: assimilation [-F+C], rejection [+F-C], integration [+F+C] and deculturation [-F-C]. As before (Berry, 1976), development of a psychometric scale for deculturation was not pursued:

It should be noted that attitude items for the deculturation response are almost never accepted in a population; thus no scale has been developed (p. 132).

Because integration [+F+C] is defined as preference for both cultures, and because assimilation [-F+C] and rejection [+F-C] are each defined as rejection of one of the cultures, the constructs are mutually exclusive such that assimilation items and rejection items could be used as negatively-keyed questions about integration. Thus a single 9-item Likert scale was created comprised of four positively-keyed items and five negatively-keyed items. This measure was labeled multicultural ideology [+F+C] but it can be conceived to be a measure of integration:

The option which was designated 'integration' in Table 6.1 is virtually identical to the values expressed in a multicultural policy, and so this combination was emphasized in the development of the new multicultural ideology scale. Many statements were prepared and pre-tested, and nine were eventually incorporated in the multicultural ideology scale. Of these, four are positive and five are negative. Of the negative five, two express 'assimilation' values, one expresses a 'rejection' (or segregation) value, and two are negations of an 'integration' value (Berry et al., 1977, p. 132).

### **1977 Spindler**

Anthropologist Louise Spindler (1977, p. 33) argued that acculturation is not a process leading to assimilation, but should be defined as "adaptive strategies used by people who have to cope with the economic, social and political disadvantages of their positions as minorities ... including reaffirmation [+F-C] of seemingly traditional values and behavior

patterns, biculturalism [+F+C], cultural synthesis [+F+C] of conflicting cultural elements, and managed identities [+F+C]." Emulation [-F+C] is like assimilation, but the success of a whole society adopting the ways of a foreign culture revives a sense of competence, pride and cultural identity. Boundary maintenance [+F-C] includes strategies such as extreme ethnocentrism, sorcery, and religious rituals, all serving to preserve cultural integrity.

### **1978 Pierce, Clark and Kaufman**

Robert Pierce, Margaret Clark and Sharon Kaufman (1978) used empirical methods to discover six types of acculturation in the responses of adult Mexican and Japanese heritage Americans, including geriatric respondents. Using factor analytic methods, two acculturation scales were devised: 1) Traditional Orientation, and 2) Anglo Face, meaning doing the behaviors of the dominant culture. A third scale was the Acculturative Balance Scale, for which a high score indicates more knowledge of the dominant culture than the minority culture, and a low score more knowledge of the minority culture than the dominant. Cluster analysis of these three measures yielded six tight clusters, which represent empirically defined types of acculturation. None of the types represented assimilation, which would have entailed more knowledge of Anglo culture than traditional as well as high participation in Anglo culture and low participation in traditional culture. Type 5 [+F-C] entails greater knowledge of Anglo culture than traditional, but a very high level of traditional behavior and a very low level of Anglo behavior. If voluntary, Type 5 might represent a revivalist form of cultural separation. If imposed, Type 5 might be the consequence of racial discrimination. This empirical method of defining types of acculturation identified four different kinds of biculturalism. Type 2 [+F+C] entails much more knowledge of traditional culture than Anglo, but moderately high and balanced participation in both cultures. Type 3 [+F+C] entails balanced knowledge of the two cultures and slightly more participation in Anglo than traditional culture. Type 4 [+F+C] entails balanced knowledge of the two cultures, but slightly less Anglo participation. Type 6 [+F+C] entails greater knowledge of Anglo culture than traditional, but very high and equal levels of participation in both cultures. Without longitudinal data, it is not known whether or not these different types of biculturalism are transitional stages. Type 1 [-F-C] entails an incompatibility of knowledge and behavior, with much more knowledge of traditional culture than Anglo but much higher Anglo behaviors than traditional. This kind of inauthenticity perhaps makes Type 1 a kind of marginalism. The six types of acculturation discovered and defined in this study are different from those reported by Clark, Kaufman and Pierce in 1976 based on a different sample.

### **1979 Camilleri**

French psychologist Carmel Camilleri (1979) studies of Westernization in North African Tunisian Maghrebians led to the observation that there are three types of acculturative responses. Type 2 [+F-C] is comprised of the traditional Arab middle class who consciously maintain traditional Islamic values and culture. Type 3 [+F+C] is comprised of



the Western educated, economic elite, who strive for a "synthesis" of cultures by adopting those aspects of Western culture that promote social and economic development. Type 1 [-F-C] consists of rural peoples who have migrated to cities, who are economically impoverished, and who reject new ideas but who have also lost or disavowed their traditional culture.

### **1979 Cohen-Emerique**

Psychologist Margalit Cohen-Emerique (1979) used the T.A.T. projective paradigm to examine the acculturative identity of Jewish Moroccans in France. T.A.T. responses were classified into three large categories. About half of the respondents were classified as Modern [-F+C], of which there were two sub-categories: a) those who completely rejected the traditional life and b) those who sought to maintain some link to their ancient way of life. About a quarter of the respondents were classified as Traditional [+F-C], most of whom had modernized to the degree that they were marginalized. Other sub-categories included 2 respondents who never mentioned modernity, 2 respondents who mentioned the need to change, 3 respondents who wanted their children to become modern, and 2 respondents who affirmed traditional values only to keep connections with their parents. Finally, about one quarter of the respondents were Unclear [-F-C] and ambivalent, and tried to alternate between cultures resulting in a marginal situation.

### **1980 Cang**

Ruth Cang's (1980) psychology dissertation extended and operationalized the acculturation typology developed by Sue and Sue (1971). Assimilation [-F+C] "is used specifically in this paper with a racist connotation" because it "involves loss of the distinctiveness of one's original culture (p. 7). The traditionalist [+F-C] is a conformist who "attempts to adhere to traditional Chinese values and these are strongly internalized" (p.10). People classified Asian American [+F+C] "are those who see their identity as a synthesis of both "Asian and American aspects --- something different from identifying solely with a specific Asian group and different from identifying oneself as American" (p.8). The Asian American has "awareness and sensitivity to racial prejudice" and thus has "a militant or political activist commitment" (p. 9). The marginal man [-F-C], as a form of rebellion against parental values, "completely rejects everything that is Chinese and attempts to identify with the dominant host culture" (p. 10), but because of racism cannot assimilate. All acculturation types were found to have problems and conflicts.

### **1980 Fishman**

Social psychologist Joshua Fishman (1980) proposed a 2X2 acculturation typology defined by a unilingual or bilingual person in a context of societal uniglossia or diglossia. Uniglossia and unilingualism [-F+C] describes the completely assimilated condition of a person speaking one language in a country that only institutionalizes one language.

Diglossia and unilingualism [+F-C] is "based upon the territoriality principle" (p. 12) since keeping the languages separated requires compartmentalization. Diglossia and bilingualism [+F+C] means that two languages are considered as "our own", neither of them foreign, and that each language has its complementary functions, but still compartmentalized and with restricted access. Uniglossia and bilingualism [-F-C] describes an inevitable transition of the minority language being displaced by the majority language, generally within three generations. Generalizing this analysis from language to culture, then di-ethnia is the counter-part of di-glossia, and biculturalism is the counter-part of bilingualism. However, di-ethnia is much more rare than diglossia because "fluidity across role and network boundaries and, indeed, the weakening and overcoming of boundaries, is both a goal and a result of most modern behavior and its emphasis on efficiency and reciprocity / solidarity in social behavior" (p. 12), such that "stable societal multiculturalism (di-ethnia) depends on institutionally protected ethnocultural compartmentalization" (p. 13). In other words, modernity threatens biculturalism.

### **1980 Szapocznik, Kurtines & Fernandez**

Psychologists José Szapocznik, William Kurtines and Tatjana Fernandez (1980) devised two acculturation measures that were then used to identify four kinds of acculturation. Bicultural Involvement items inquired how comfortable the respondent was with language use and in cultural contexts, independently for each culture. Bicultural Involvement was computed as the difference of these two scales, such that 0 indicates biculturalism, a positive score indicates preference for minority culture and a negative score preference for dominant culture. Cultural Involvement was computed by summing these two scales, such that a high score meant cultural involvement and a low score meant marginality. Using a median split, Szapocznik et al. (1980) psychometrically defined those who are monoculturally involved [+F-C] [-F+C], or biculturally involved [+F+C], or mono- or biculturally uninvolved [-F-C], which is also called marginality.

### **1980 Berry**

John Berry (1980) theorized an acculturation taxonomy that emphasized the political issues of minority rights and freedoms. As before (Berry, 1976; Berry et al., 1977), the two issues of retaining cultural identity and of positive relations with the dominant society defined four varieties of acculturation: assimilation [-F+C], rejection [+F-C], integration [+F+C] and deculturation [-F-C]. But if further consideration is made of the minority's right [+R] or freedom to choose among these options or not [-R], then eight types of acculturation are defined: assimilation by melting pot [-F+C+R] or by pressure cooker [-F+C-R], rejection by withdrawal [+F-C+R] or segregation [+F-C-R], integration by multiculturalism [+F+C+R] or by pluralism [+F+C-R], and deculturation by marginality [-F-C+R] or by ethnocide [-F-C-R].

### **1980 Padilla**

Amado Padilla (1980) proposed a multidimensional psychological theory based on cultural awareness (knowledge) and on ethnic loyalty (preference), as well as on the amount inter-ethnic interaction and on the degree of inter-ethnic distance. Using data from Mexican-Americans, acculturation constructs were sought, not by apriori cross-referencing of these dimensions, but by factor analyzing empirical measures of these dimensions, resulting in four cultural awareness constructs (i. Respondent's Cultural Heritage, ii. Spouse's Cultural Heritage, iii. Parent's Cultural Heritage, iv. Perceived Discrimination) and four ethnic loyalty constructs (i. Language Preference and Use, ii. Cultural Pride and Affiliation, iii. Cultural Identification and Preference, iv. Social Behavior Orientation). Scales were devised for each of these eight constructs, and second-ordering factoring revealed two factors, corresponding to Cultural Awareness and Ethnic Loyalty. Clustering respondents in the two-dimensional space created by these factors revealed five types of acculturation. Those extremely low in awareness and low in loyalty are Anglicized [-F+C]. Those high in awareness and in loyalty are unacculturated [+F-C]. Most respondents were moderate [+F+C] in awareness and loyalty. Those high in awareness and moderate in loyalty and those mildly low in awareness and loyalty do not fit the four categorizations in Table 2.

### **1980 Abramson**

Sociologist Harold Abramson's (1980) article on "Assimilation and Pluralism" in the Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups not only reviewed the history of acculturation theory, but also presented an original taxonomy of ethnic identity change. The traditionalist [+F-C] enjoys a surety of ethnic identity because personal networks defined by the culture are present, as well as the structure of cultural symbols. The convert [-F+C] is the person who has assimilated into the dominant culture, such that there is no ethnic structure or symbolism, only a network of relationships and bonds within the new community.

What is different for the convert is the uncertainty of the symbols of the new culture. There is always some degree of confusion between the old and the new, between the ethnic culture taken for granted by those born and raised in it, and the assumptions about that culture made by those who come to it from outside. As with religious change, the convert has probably learned the extrinsic aspects of the new culture, but the intrinsic forms may pose some problems. The distinction between the traditionalist and the convert is the difference between being and becoming (Abramson, 1980, p. 155).

For the exilic [+F+C], the ethnic symbols and beliefs exist only in memory, as an ethnic identity without a primary network of personal relationships, without any cultural structures. The fourth form of ethnicity was unlabeled, but described as the null condition, here labeled missing [-F-C] because the ethnic symbols and beliefs are missing as are the

ethnic structures: "there are no memories of a history and no ongoing personal relationships" (p. 156).

### **1981 Taft**

Psychologist Ronald Taft (1981) defined several types of bicultural marginality, presuming "the common element in all marginal situations is that the person is in contact with two (or more) distinguishable groups (or societies)" (p. 59). Marginality by assimilation [-F+C] means "complete loss of the former identity" (p. 60). Marginality by pluralistic separation [+F-C] "describes the form of cultural and structural pluralism (apartheid) in which communities are in physical contact with each other but psychologically separate" (p. 60). Marginality by mediation [+F+C] "represents the true bicultural person, who has dual membership and little difficulty in moving freely in either group, but still retains membership in group A when he is participating in group B, and vice versa" (pp. 60-61). Marginality by pluralistic integration [+F+C] means that "the person has moved into the majority group, but he has also become a member of a subgroup within it consisting of persons with similar background to his own" (p. 61). Isolation [-F-C] is a state of alienation "in which the person does not participate in either of the groups" such that "life in such an isolated state would be very difficult, if not impossible" (p. 59).

### **1981 Trosper**

Native American Ronald Trosper's (1981) history of pan-Indian nationalism proposes four different types of acculturation policies, that arise in sequence, one from the other, with the end results that Native people in America now see themselves as having a common aboriginal identity. In the earliest period of contact [+F+C] the populations and the military power of the Native groups and the immigrant settler groups are equal, and disputes are settled by negotiation. However, the stereotypes emphasized cultural differences. That and the population growth of the settlers lead to the period of removal [-F+C] during which Native groups are dispossessed of their land and often killed by military force or disease and poverty. Stereotypes were of Native inferiority. But the poverty and suffering caused concern, leading to a period of welfare [-F-C] during which Natives were maintained in a limbo of oscillation between extermination and assimilation. Stereotypes emphasized Native inferiority. But this degraded condition politically mobilized the Native groups to ally themselves in a struggle for autonomy [+F-C] and a revival of Native nationalism and political self-control.

### **1981 Banton**

Sociologist Michael Banton (1981) defined four acculturation constructs based on the immigrant group's attraction to the sending society and to the receiving society. Conformist [-F+C] describes "a situation in which the rewards offered by the majority (or receiving society) for conforming behavior by members of the immigrant group were so much

greater than the rewards an immigrant could receive for loyalty to his traditional culture" (p. 37). Since "colony" refers to a settlement of people in a foreign country, colonial [+F-C] describes the situation when the immigrant group is oriented towards their country of origin and are unattracted by the locally dominant culture. If the immigrants are equally attracted by both cultures, such that they cannot decide in which country they would be happier, that is called transilient [+F+C]:

Some Europeans who settle in North America decide after a while that they would be happier in the countries of their birth but when they return there they compare them unfavorably with North America. They have difficulty settling in either society because they become so conscious of the attractions of the other. Since they are ready to move between them they may appropriately be called transilient (p. 39).

When people migrate in order to escape their first culture in order to develop a subculture, usually based on religious principles, then they are isolationist [-F-C].

### **1982 Bochner**

Social psychologist Stephen Bochner (1982) theorized two acculturation typologies, one for outcomes at the societal level and one at the individual level. Assimilation [-F+C] means the minority culture's gradual but eventual disappearance. At the individual level, this entails the minority passing [-F+C] themselves as members of the dominant group, which often requires self-denigration. Segregation [+F-C], whether enforced or self-imposed, entails hostility and siege mentality, such that it is both unhealthy and unlikely to endure. Self-segregation means that minority individuals be chauvinistic [+F-C]. At the societal level, integration [+F+C] is cultural pluralism, in which "different groups maintain their cultural identity in some respects, but merge into a superordinate group in other respects ... within a frame work of equal opportunity and mutual tolerance" (p. 26). However, "it remains an empirical question whether such societies exist or can be created" (p. 27). At the individual level, biculturalism means that "norms of both cultures are salient", making people marginal [+F+C] if the norms are "perceived to be mutually incompatible" or making them mediating [+F+C] if the norms are "perceived as capable of being integrated" (p. 27).

### **1982 Smither**

Psychologist Robert Smither (1982) argued: "In human history, relations toward the minority have taken five forms: elimination, segregation, fusion, assimilation, and pluralism" (p. 58). Elimination [-F+C] of an ethnic minority, for example, by genocide or expulsion, is an acculturative response. Assimilation [-F+C] entails high valuation of the majority culture and low valuation of the minority culture, such that the minority is effectively eliminated as an ethnic group. Segregation [+F-C] entails high valuation of the minority culture and low valuation of the majority culture. Segregation of the minority is

often a symbiotic relationship, in which the minority and the majority each have economic roles. Pluralism [+F+C] entails high valuation on both cultures, such that the minority retains its culture while also acculturating to the majority. Fusion [-F-C] results in the creation of a new culture, that is neither minority culture nor majority culture. Smither (1982, p. 60) illustrates marginality [-F-C] as a condition of being low in both cultures, but then describes the marginal man [+F+C] as the bicultural person in the pluralistic society who is weakly bicultural due to personal reasons:

Hypothetically, in the pluralist society, the marginal man is not the product of the tolerance of the majority, but rather of his or her ability or willingness to learn. This is why the study of individual differences is indispensable in understanding the process of acculturation in modern, pluralistic societies (Smither, 1982, p. 66).

### **1983 Berry**

In 1983, John Berry elaborated and refined his fourfold acculturation constructs. As before, assimilation [-F+C] means "relinquishing cultural identity and moving into the larger society" (p. 68). Rejection [+F-C] can refer to "self-imposed withdrawal [+F-C] from the larger society" (p. 69) but may also refer to resistance [+F-C] "to the power exercised by the larger society to keep people in 'their place' (as in slavery or 'apartheid' situation)" (p. 69). As before, integration [+F+C] "implies maintenance of cultural integrity as well as the movement to become an integral part of a larger societal framework" (p. 69). The definitions of deculturation and marginality were modified from previous formulations:

Finally, there is an option which is difficult to define precisely, possibly because it is accompanied by a good deal of collective and individual confusion and anxiety. It is characterized by striking out against the larger society and by feelings of alienation, loss of identity, and what has been termed acculturative stress. This option is Deculturation [-F-C], in which groups are out of cultural and psychological contact with either their traditional culture or the larger society... When stabilized in a non-dominant group, it constitutes the classical situation of 'marginality' [-F-C] (p. 69).

### **1984 Berry, Kim, Power, Young and Bujaki**

John Berry, Uichol Kim, S. Power, Marta Young and Merridee Bujaki (1984) presented a conference paper, subsequently published (Berry et al., 1989), summarizing their acculturation studies. The assimilation [-F+C] and integration [+F+C] constructs were defined as in all previous reports by Berry and his colleagues, and separation [+F-C] was the label for what had been the rejection construct in earlier studies. However, the deculturation construct was replaced by marginalisation [-F-C], and its operationalization "was approximated by the scale of Marginality constructed by Mann (1958)" (p. 187) rather than by items asking about rejection or loss both cultures.

### **1986 Schumann**

Robert Schumann's 1986 report of research based on his 1976 acculturation model of second-language learning included some changes in his taxonomy. "Integration" seems to refer to phenomena that most contemporary scholars call "acculturation":

The second social factor affecting second language learning involves three integration strategies: assimilation [-F+C], preservation [+F-C], and adaptation [+F+C]. Schumann (1976a, b, 1978a, b) used the term acculturation instead of adaptation. However, in this paper adaptation is used to refer to the integration strategy and acculturation is used in the broader sense to refer to social and psychological contact with speakers of the TL [target language]. If the 2LL [2nd language learning] group assimilates then it gives up its own life style and values and adopts those of the target language group. This strategy maximises contact between the two groups and enhances acquisition of the target language. If the 2LL group chooses preservation as its integration strategy then it maintains its own life style and values and rejects those of the TL group. If the 2LL group chooses adaptation as its integration strategy then it adapts to the life style and values of the TL group, but maintains its own life style and values for intra-group use. This particular integration strategy yields varying degrees of contact between the two groups (Schumann, 1986, p. 381).

Schumann (1986) argued that anxiety and disorientation experienced when encountering a foreign culture arise because behaviors and coping mechanisms from the first-culture do not work well in the new context. "This situation can cause disorientation, stress, anxiety and fear [and ] the learner, in attempting to find a cause for his disorientation, may reject himself, his own culture, the organization for which he is working and the people of the host country" (p. 383). In other words, Schumann (1986) argues that acculturative stress causes marginality, rather than marginality causing stress. In reviewing empirical studies using his model, Schumann cited studies that found 2nd language proficiency to be unrelated to, or to be inversely related to acculturation.

### **1986 Triandis, Kashima, Shimada and Villareal**

Social psychologists Harry Triandis, Yoshihisa Kashima, Emiko Shimada and Marcelo Villareal (1986) empirically identified three types of acculturation by examining cultural behaviors, roles, and role stereotypes in order to determine to what degree the minority is adopting the cultural norms of the dominant majority culture. Accommodation [-F+C] means that the minority norms are in the process of moving towards the norms of the contact culture. Triandis et al. (1986) discuss the possibility that the majority group might also accommodate towards the minority, representing the classic condition of melting pot acculturation. Overshooting [-F+C] describes the situation in which acculturating individuals adopt the norms of the contact culture more strongly than even individuals in

that culture. Ethnic affirmation [+F-C] describes the situation in which acculturating individuals over-emphasize norms of their heritage culture and thus move away from accommodation with the contact culture.

### **1987 Nelde**

Belgian linguist Peter Nelde (1987) theorized about some of the issues involved in political language conflict, especially in multicultural contexts in which there are acculturative imbalances of demographic or political power. He noted that "numerically weak or psychologically weakened language groups tend towards assimilation [-F+C]" (p. 35). However, for "numerically stronger, more homogeneous language groups having traditional values, such as their own history and culture, prefer political resistance [+F-C]" (p. 35). Linguistic integration [+F+C] describes the type of conflict "when it occurs between population groups of differing socio-economic structures (urban/rural, poor/wealthy, indigenous/immigrant) and the dominant group requires that the minority adopts the majority language" (p. 35). Nelde noted that intercultural language conflict is often the focus for cultural and political struggles that are much wider than language. Nelde argued that the term "minority" should no longer be used in reference to smaller ethnic groups because it has a negative connotation, implies less prestige, and has no universal definition.

### **1988 Moghaddam**

Iranian social psychologist Fathali Moghaddam (1988) argued that minority group acculturation strategies arise from social mobility motivations to improve economic and social standing. He proposed a fourfold acculturation taxonomy that defined constructs on the two dimensions of 1) assimilation vs. heritage culture maintenance and 2) whether or not the means were normative for the dominant group or not. Thus, normative assimilation [-F+C] is the classical case of the minority adopting behavioral norms of the dominant group and becoming like them as much as possible. Non-normative heritage maintenance [+F-C] entails behaviors from the first-culture being used to maintain the first-culture. Of course, from the dominant group's perspective, this appears quite foreign and maybe hostile. Normative heritage maintenance [+F+C] entails the minority maintaining their heritage culture by using behaviors recognized and approved by the dominant majority, as in the classic examples of accommodation and integration. Non-normative assimilation [-F-C] entails the minority person striving for social and economic advancement but by means that are not approved by the dominant group.

### **1988 Sadowsky and Carey**

Educational psychologists Gargi Sadowsky and John Carey (1988) used acculturation questionnaire data to empirically identify the acculturative identities of first-generation Indian immigrants to the USA. Mostly American and Very American [-F+C] describe those



who strongly or completely self-identified themselves as American. Provincial [+F-C] describes those who identified themselves by their regional state in India. Very Indian [+F-C] describes those who strongly self-identified themselves as Indian. Bicultural [+F+C] describes those who reported a balanced dual identity. Clothing and language preferences confirmed the Very American, Very Indian, and Bicultural classification categories.

### **1991 Hutnik**

Social psychologist Nimmi Hutnik (1991) developed acculturation constructs and measurement scales based on self-categorization that arises from internal cognitive representations of cultural groups based on social knowledge and on personal experiences. Assimilative [-F+C] describes those who identify themselves with the majority group but not with the ethnic minority group. This self-identification pattern would arise "when the negative connotations of minority group membership far outweigh the positive benefits, and when the internal representations of the majority are highly favorable" (p. 163). In contrast, dissociative [+F-C] describes those who identify themselves with ethnic minority group but not with the majority culture. Acculturative [+F+C] describes those who identify with both their minority group and with the majority. Marginal [-F-C] describes those who do not categorize themselves as a member of either the minority or the majority.

### **1993 LaFromboise, Coleman and Gerton**

Teresa LaFromboise, Hardin Coleman and Jennifer Gerton (1993) reviewed literature on the psychological impact of biculturalism. To organize this review, they identified five kinds of bicultural acculturation. "Assimilation [-F+C] is the process by which an individual develops a new cultural identity [which] involves some loss of awareness and loyalty to one's culture of origin" (p. 397). The alternation [+F+C] model of biculturalism presumes people can learn, practice, and identify with two cultures independently of one another, and that the two cultures and the participants have equal status. "The multiculturalism [+F+C] model generates the hypothesis that an individual can maintain a positive identity as a member of his or her culture of origin while simultaneously developing a positive identity by engaging in complex institutional sharing with the larger political entity comprised of other cultural groups" (p. 401). The fusion [+F+C] model argues "cultures sharing an economic, political, or geographic space will fuse together until they are indistinguishable to form a new culture" (p. 401). Finally, "the acculturation [+F+C] model implies that the individual, while becoming a competent participant in the majority culture, will always be identified as a member of the minority culture" (p. 397). Acculturation is usually forced, involuntary, and distressing.

### 1993 Sayegh and Lasry

Liliane Sayegh and Jean-Claude Lasry (1993) proposed a fourfold acculturation typology defined by two orthogonal dimensions of minority group identification and national identification. Thus, "assimilation [-F+C] is a style characterized by a strong identification to the host society and a weaker identification to the heritage culture (the immigrant seeks to be accepted into the host culture and to reject the heritage culture)" (p. 106). "Ethnocentrism [-F+C] is the converse of assimilation (the individual overvalues everything associated with the community of origin, while denigrating and rejecting the host society)" (pp. 106-107). Integration [+F+C] means that "identification towards both the heritage and host cultures is strong" (p. 106). Sayegh and Lasry further explain that integration refers to a biculturalism of compatible aspects of the two cultures: "the immigrant adopts new attitudes and behaviors compatible with the attitudes and behaviors acquired in the heritage culture" (p. 106). Marginalization [-F-C] results when the individual feels weakly identified with both of the two cultures in question.

### 1995 Coleman

Hardin Coleman (1995) used his clinical case experience to refine and illustrate the acculturation taxonomy proposed earlier by LaFromboise, Coleman and Gerton (1993). The intention is to describe the perceptions, focus, mental set and predispositions that arise from strategies for coping within a multicultural context. The monoculturation [-F+C] strategy entails obliviousness to culture and cultural differences, as happens with people who live within the culture of origin or are fully assimilated.

This individual's strategy for coping with cultural diversity would involve not perceiving the differences and assuming that everyone he or she meet shares the individual's values and beliefs. An individual using the monocultural strategy would emphasize the universal qualities of human nature (p. 730).

The acculturation [-F+C] strategy is more pragmatic and functional, motivated by the benefits of learning competence in a second culture, but not expecting to be fully accepted. Acculturated individuals will be alert to discrimination and prejudice but are generally positive to the new culture. The separation [+F-C] strategy is exemplified by those who prefer to remove themselves from intercultural contact. They focus on cultural incompatibilities and on the importance of improving intercultural relations. The alternation [+F+C] strategy describes the functional biculturalism of the person who is positive towards both cultures and strives to be competent in both and to maintain interpersonal networks in both. The integration [+F+C] strategy entails maintaining first-cultural identity while developing second culture competence. The integration strategy entails a focus on political equality and harmony. The fusion [-F-C] strategy entails an effort to devise new cultural structures and beliefs, and is most functional when operating in specific contexts.

### **1995 De Vos**

Psychologist and anthropologist George De Vos (1995) argued that ethnicity is essentially subjective and symbolic, and that ethnic identity is in competition with other identities depending on the contextual and temporal focus of the individual. A present-oriented, functional [-F+C] identity entails "loyalty to a state, regardless of personal or family origins" (p. 27). Past-oriented, familial-cultural [+F-C] identity entail "a sense of belonging to a particular ancestry and origin and of sharing a specific religion or language" (p. 28). In specific contexts, occupational [+F+C] identity predominates over national or ethnic identity. Finally, a future-oriented, ideological [-F-C] identity entails a focus on what is not ethnic culture from the past and is not national culture from the present, but is an idealization often in reaction against injustices in the present.

### **1995 De Vos**

De Vos (1995), in the same essay just presented, also described a taxonomy of the five modes of acculturation, all of them distressing, that can follow in a sequential time course of alienation [-F-C], passing [-F+C], withdrawal or expulsion [-F-C], and accommodation [+F+C].

The alienation felt by some successful upwardly mobile individuals may be the result of their having cut so many ties with the past that they have lost a deeper sense of meaning, although the loss may not be apparent to them at the time... When occupational success moves a person into an alien group, what is alien is often the change in ethnic behavior required, rather than the new status behavior as such (p. 32).

Passing [-F+C] describes the inauthentic presentation of a facade of oneself as assimilated, both for its social and economic advantages but also for self-esteem. But a facade is self-conscious manipulation, involving an internal duality, which may entail self-hate. The distress of this assimilative effort maybe results in withdrawal [-F-C] from the minority culture, or the apparent success of the assimilative effort may result in expulsion [-F-C] from the minority community. The stabilized bicultural situation requires some form of accommodation [+F+C], but this requires acceptance of a stratified social system, with the minority person in an inferior position, which will necessarily entail internalizing a negative self-image that explains one's social and occupational inferiority. De Vos concludes by emphasizing that ethnic identity is a social construction that is often created for economic and social expediency, usually within the context of control and exploitation.

### **1997 Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault and Senécal**

Social psychologists Richard Bourhis, Léna Moïse, Stéphane Perreault and Sacha Senécal (1997) proposed a most comprehensive model of acculturation that

simultaneously considers the political ideologies underlying the state's acculturation policies, and the acculturative preference attitudes of the majority population, and the acculturation preference attitudes of the minority. Four generic acculturation policies can be conceived. The assimilation [-F+C] ideology requires the minority to adopt the behaviors and values of the dominant society, at least in the public sphere of commercial and legal relations. The minority culture is expected, though not required, to disappear voluntarily over time. The dominant group may misconceive that their own culture is universal. The ethnist [-F+C] ideology conceives that the state has a right to require the minority to abandon their heritage culture and adopt the dominant culture, even if there is no intention to accept the new comers as fully equal citizens. The pluralism [+F+C] ideology, like the other ideologies, expects minority groups to conform to the behavior and values necessary for the efficient functioning within the public sphere. However, following liberal theory, pluralism conceives that the state has no right to intrude in private affairs, that the state's function is to maximize individual freedom of choice, and that all citizens are to equally benefit from government actions and monies. Thus, pluralism entails government support of ethnic activities to the degree that they are the voluntary activities of the participants. Civic [-F-C] ideology emphasizes that the state should not promote private activities, such as minority cultural activities, and strives to be culture blind.

### **1997 Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault and Senécal**

In the same article just described, Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senécal (1997) presented a revision of the acculturation taxonomy articulated by Berry et al. (1984; 1989). Two similar taxonomies of different kinds of acculturation were described, one from the minority group's perspective and one from the majority group's perspective. These are all defined by whether or not it is of value to maintain the minority culture and whether or not it is of value for the minority to maintain relationships with other ethnic groups, especially the dominant group. From the minority's perspective, Assimilation [-F+C] means preference for giving up minority cultural heritage and identity and for positive intergroup relations. Separation [+F-C] means the opposite, preference for maintaining minority cultural heritage and identity and for giving up engagement with other cultural groups. Integration [+F+C] means preference for both minority cultural heritage and for engagement with other groups. Bourhis et al. (1997) proposed two kinds of marginalization. Anomie [-F-C] describes those who reject both cultures and experience cultural alienation or culturelessness. Individualism [-F-C] also entails rejection of cultural identities and labels, but as a way to identify themselves as cosmopolitan and culture-free. From the majority group's perspective, these kinds of acculturation are similar, except separation, once it is imposed on the minority by the majority should be called segregation [+F-C], and the loss of both cultures experience by the minority as anomie, if imposed by the majority, is exclusion [-F-C].

### **1999 Yamada and Singelis**

Psychologists Ann-Marie Yamada, and Theodore Singelis (1999, p. 699) proposed an acculturation typology based on self-construal of independence and inter-dependence. Western [-F+C] describes persons with "a strong independent self-construal and a weak inter-dependent self-construal". Traditional [+F-C] describes those with "a weak independent self-construal and a strong interdependent self-construal". Bicultural [+F+C] describes those with "a well-developed independent and a well-developed interdependent self-construal". Culturally-Alienated [-F-C] are those with "a poorly developed independent and a poorly developed interdependent self-construal".

### **2000 Faist**

Thomas Faist (2000) proposed a theory of transnationalization of social space, which means that acculturative options are not limited to the boundaries of a nation state. Thus, there are three types of positive acculturative adaptation. Assimilation [-F+C] entails goals of citizenship in a unitary national state, and the "full-scale adaptation of values and behavior to the nation state's core" (p. 201). Ethnic pluralism [+F+C] entails goals of citizenship in a multicultural state and the maintenance of established cultural practices transplanted to the new socio-political context. Border-crossing [+F+C] entails an expansion of the social space by transnationalization, such that the goal is dual state membership and a syncretic creation of new types of mixed identity.

### **2001 Rudmin and Ahmadzadeh**

Social psychologists Floyd Rudmin and Vali Ahmadzadeh (2001) also proposed refinements on the taxonomy articulated by Berry et al. (1984; 1989). Assimilation [-F+C] describes the acculturative situation when the minority is positive towards the behaviors, values, and identity of the dominant group and is negative towards the own minority culture. Separation [+F-C] describes the situation when the minority is positive towards the minority culture and negative towards the dominant. Integration [+F+C] describes the situation when the minority is positive towards both cultures and strives to be bicultural. But such integration can only apply to surface aspects of culture, such as choice of languages, cuisine, or music, but not to many aspects of culture for which cultural code switching is not possible. Integration cannot apply to deeper aspects of culture, such as religion, gender roles, or child rearing, because cultural practices in these domains entail enduring commitments that preclude the possibility of code switching. Nor can integration apply to behaviors regulated by law, such as traffic laws, professional standards in medicine, or laws of assault, because choice in these matters is simply forbidden. Marginalization [-F+C], [+F-C], [+F+C] describes the situation when an individual prefers to be a participating and acknowledged member of the dominant cultural community, or the minority community, or both, but fails. Individuals who have no preference to belong to either of these communities cannot be marginalized from them. Multiculturalism [-F-C]

describes the situation when the minority has a preference for cultural practices that are neither from the minority culture nor from the dominant culture, for example, preferences for a sub-culture, or a third culture, or for freedom from cultural constraints and labels.

### **2001 Berry**

John Berry (2001) revived and refined earlier proposals (Berry et al., 1972; Berry, 1974; 1980) that conceived of eight kinds of acculturation, based on whether or not heritage culture and identity are maintained, on whether or not relationships with other groups are sought, and on whether or not these are the choices of the minority or of the larger society. Preference for loss of heritage culture but for relationships with other groups is assimilation [-F+C] if chosen by a minority group and melting pot [-F+C] if decided by the larger society. Preference for maintenance of heritage culture and identity but for minimal relationships with other groups is separation [+F-C] if chosen by a minority group and segregation [+F-C] if decided by the larger society. Preference for maintenance of heritage culture and identity is integration [+F+C] if chosen by a minority group and multiculturalism [+F+C] if decided by the larger society. Preference for loss of heritage culture and for minimal relationships with other groups is marginalization [-F-C] if chosen by a minority group and exclusion [-F-C] if decided by the larger society.

### **2001 Montreuil and Bourhis**

Annie Montreuil and Richard Bourhis (2001) used the acculturation constructs defined by Bourhis et al. (1997) and used the personality research findings of Bourhis and Bougie (1998) to operationalize measures of dominant group individuals towards immigrant minorities. Assimilationists [-F+C] tend to feel culturally threatened by immigrant outgroups and thus prefer that minorities give up their cultures and join the dominant culture. Segregationists [+F-C] tend to have insecure social identities, low self-esteem, and high authoritarianism and ethnocentrism. They feel threatened by immigrant outgroups and prefer that minorities not mix with them. Integrationists [+F+C] tend to have positive social identity as the dominant group, to be low in authoritarianism and ethnocentrism, and to be positive towards immigrants regardless of their origins. Exclusionists [-F-C] tend to be most fearful of minority outgroups and to be highest in authoritarianism and ethnocentrism. They prefer that there be less immigration, and that minority groups neither maintain their culture nor join the dominant group. Individualists [-F-C] have personality characteristics like integrationists, but have less coherent and less valued majority group cultural identity. They consider cultural identity to be a private matter that is not an important concern.

### **2001 van Oudenhoven, van der Zee and van Kooten**

Psychologists Jan Pieter van Oudenhoven, Karen van der Zee, and Mariska van Kooten (2001) considered acculturative preferences in the global business context, exemplified by the situation of an expatriate from the parent firm sojourning in a branch local firm. They

identified four acculturative constructs, which were elaborated by personality data. Going native expatriates [-F+C] are the empathetic and extroverted types who have high allegiance to the local firm and low allegiance to the parent firm back home. Hearts-at-the-parent-company-expatriates [+F-C] are those with commitment and perseverant personalities who have low allegiance to the branch firm in the local posting and high allegiance to the parent firm. The dual citizens [+F+C] are the open-minded and action-oriented types who are able to maintain high allegiance to both the parent and its local branch firms. The free agents [-F-C] are the flexible and adventurous types who have low allegiance to the parent firm back home and its local branch firm.

### **2001 Brubaker**

Sociologist Rogers Brubaker's (2001) provocative article on "The Return to Assimilation?" argues that multiculturalism, generically labeled as "differentialist", arose as a reaction to coercive and oppressive policies of assimilation, but that there is now a trend away from differentialist multiculturalism towards assimilation, but a softer form, defined as an intransitive process of becoming similar. "As a normatively charged concept, assimilation, in this sense, is opposed not to difference but to segregation, ghettoization, and marginalization" (p. 543). Using France, Germany and the USA as case examples, Brubaker (2001) identified and labeled several types of acculturation. Differentialist [+F+C] policies are those that promote multiculturalism, with an emphasis on minorities maintaining their cultural differences and identities while engaging in the economic and socio-political life of the nation. In France, a reaction to this was labeled *droit à la différence* [-F+C], meaning that France and French national culture also had a right to be different from other cultures in the world and to therefore be reinforced by policies that protect and promote French national culture. One variation on French anti-differentialist politics was called *droit à l'indifférence* [-F-C], which implies indifference to cultures, but in the context of a national state, means in effect support of French national culture. *Ausländerpolitik* [+F-C] refers to the paternalistic, pseudo-egalitarian policies that kept foreigners in Germany in a kind of institutionalized separateness or apartheid.

### **2002 Unger, Gallaher, Shakib, Ritt\_Olson, Palmer and Johnson**

Jennifer Unger, Peggy Gallaher, Sohaila Shakib, Anamara Ritt\_Olson, Paula Palmer, C. Anderson Johnson (2002) developed a forced-choice acculturation scale for adolescents of foreign heritage in the United States. The four sub-scales measure United States Orientation [-F+C], Other Country Orientation [+F-C], Both Country Orientation [+F+C], and Neither Country Orientation [-F-C].

### **2003 Rudmin**

Floyd Rudmin (2003) has argued that Euler logic and Boolean logic both show that the common fourfold categorization used thus far in this catalog of constructs is in error. A

choice of two cultures, or two identities, or two languages results in 16 preference possibilities not 4 as is commonly believed. This common error in thinking about acculturation comes from 1) presuming that the 2 cultures in question cannot share overlapping cultural traits, 2) presuming that cultural choice is limited to those 2 cultures, and 3) forgetting that preferences can be expressed using NOT and OR. The 16 logical types of cultural preference will here be defined in Boolean notation using AND for intersection, OR for union, and minus sign - for negation (NOT). Illustrative examples will consider the cultural preference of an American [ A ] in France [ F ] choosing American Coke, or French cognac, or coffee which is common to both cultures, when asked, "What is your cultural preference for drink?". Type a prefers [+A AND -F] and answers "Coke." Type b prefers [-A AND +F] and answers "Cognac." Type c prefers [+A AND +F] and answers "Coffee." Type d prefers [-A AND -F] and answers "Not Coke, cognac, or coffee" (i. e. vodka, green tea, etc.). Type e prefers [(+A AND -F) OR (-A AND +F)] and answers "Coke or cognac." Type f prefers [+A] and answers "Coke or coffee." Type g prefers [-F] and answers "Not cognac or coffee." Type h prefers [+F] and answers "Cognac or coffee." Type i prefers [-A] and answers "Not Coke or coffee." Type j prefers [(+A AND +F) OR (-A AND -F)] and answers "Not Coke or cognac." Type k prefers [+A OR +F] and answers "Coke, cognac, or coffee." Type l prefers [-A OR -F] and answers "Not coffee." Type m prefers [+A OR -F] and answers "Not cognac." Type n prefers [-A OR +F] and answers "Not Coke." Type o prefers the universal set and answers "Anything" (i. e. Coke, cognac, coffee, vodka, green tea, etc.) Type p prefers the null set and answers "Nothing." These 16 cultural preference possibilities have multiple and overlapping fit with the fourfold taxonomy in Table 2.

### References

- Abramson, H. D. (1980). Assimilation and pluralism. In S. Thernstrom (Ed.), *Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups* (pp. 150--160). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Antonovsky, A. (1955). *The ideologies of American Jews: A study in definitions of a marginal situation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Antonovsky, A. (1956). Toward a refinement of the "marginal man" concept. *Social Forces*, 35, 57-62.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1960a). Acculturative stress in modern Maori adolescence. *Child Development*, 31, 617-631.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1960b). The Maori: A study in resistive acculturation. *Social Forces*, 39, 218-227.
- Bailyn, L., & Kelman, H. C. (1962). The effects of a year's experience in America on the self-image of Scandinavians: A preliminary analysis of reactions to a new environment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18, 30-40.
- Banton, M. (1981). The direction and speed of ethnic change. In C. F. Keyes (1981). *Ethnic change* (pp. 32-52). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.



- Barth, F. (1969). Introduction. In F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference* (pp. 9-38). London: Allen & Unwin.
- Barnett, H. G., Broom, L., Siegel, B. J., Vogt, E. Z., & Watson, J. B. (1954). Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. *American Anthropologist*, *56*, 973-1002.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1970). *Psychology and primitive culture*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. (Original work published 1923.)
- Beals, R. (1953). Acculturation. In A. L. Kroeber (Ed.), *Anthropology today: An encyclopedic inventory* (pp. 621-641). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennett, H., Passin, H., & McKnight, R. (1958). *In search of identity: The Japanese overseas scholar in America*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Berkson, I. B. (1969). *Theories of acculturation: A critical study*. New York: Arno Press. (Original work published in 1920.)
- Berry, B. (1965). *Race and ethnic relation* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. (Original work published in 1951.)
- Berry, J. W. (1970). Marginality, stress, and ethnic identification in an acculturated Aboriginal community. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*, 17-22.
- Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism: Unity and identity reconsidered. *Topics in Cultural Learning*, *2*, 17-22.
- Berry, J. W. (1976). *Human ecology and cognitive style*. New York: John Wiley.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9-25). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Berry, J. W. (1983). Acculturation: A comparative analysis of alternative forms. In R. J. Samuda, & S. L. Woods (Eds.), *Perspectives in immigrant and minority education* (pp. 65-78). New York: University Press of America.
- Berry, J. W. (1984). Cultural relations in plural societies: Alternatives to segregation and their sociopsychological implications. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 11-27). Toronto, Canada: Academic Press.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 615-631.
- Berry, J. W., Evans, C., & Rawlinson, H. (1972). *Post-secondary educational opportunity for the Ontario Indian population*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Government Bookstore.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1984, October). *Acculturation attitudes in plural societies*. Paper presented at Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *38*, 185- 206.
- Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 5-44). Oxford: Pergamon.

- Bogardus, E. W. (1949). Cultural pluralism and acculturation. *Sociology and Social Research, 34*, 125-129.
- Born, D. O. (1970). Psychological adaptation and development under acculturative stress. *Social Science and Medicine, 3*, 529-547.
- Borrie, W. D. (1959). *The cultural integration of immigrants: A survey based upon the papers and proceedings of the UNESCO Conference held in Havana, April 1956*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boski, P., & Rudmin, F. W. (1989). Ichheiser's theories of personality and person perception: A classic that still inspires. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 19*, 263-296.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïese, L. A., Perrault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32*, 369-386.
- Bourhis, R. Y., & Bougie, E. (1998). Le modèle d'acculturation interactif: Une étude exploratoire [The interactive acculturation model: An exploratory study]. *Revue Québécoise de Psychologie, 19*, 75-114.
- Brown, W. O. (1934). Culture contact and race conflict. In E. B. Reuter (Ed.), *Race and culture contacts* (pp. 34-37). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return to assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24*, 531-548.
- Campisi, P. J. (1947). *A scale for the measurement of acculturation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Camilleri, C. (1979). Socio-cultural and identity crisis in the societies of the Third World: The example of Maghrebian society. *Psychologie française, 24*, 259-268.
- Cang, R. (1980). *Cultural adaptive styles and mental health attitudes of Chinese-American Christians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rosemead Graduate School of Professional Psychology, LaMirada, California.
- Child, I .L. (1939). *A psychological study of second-generation Italians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Child, I .L. (1970). *Italian or American? The second generation in conflict*. New York: Russell & Russell. (Original work published 1943.)
- Clark, M., Kaufman, S., & Pierce, R. C. (1976). Explorations of acculturation: Toward a model of ethnic identity. *Human Organization, 35*, 231-238.
- Cohen, B. B. (1956). *Psychological factors associated with acculturation: A study of the relationship between survivalist, assimilationist, and indifferent attitudes among members of an ethnic community and certain psychological factors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Cohen-Emerique, M. (1979). Study of identity change as shown by the T.A.T. *Psychologie française, 24*, 249-257.
- Coleman, H. K. (1995). Strategies for coping with cultural diversity. *Counseling Psychologist, 23*, 722-740.

- Comeau, P.-A. (1969). Acculturation ou assimilation: Technique d'analyse et tentative de mesure chez les Franco-ontariens [Acculturation or assimilation: Method of analysis and tentative measures of Franco-Ontarians]. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 2, 158-172.
- Devereux, G., & Loeb, E. M. (1943). Antagonistic acculturation. *American Sociological Review*, 8, 133-147.
- DeTocqueville, A. (1945). *Democracy in America, Vol. 1* (P. Bradley, Ed.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1835.)
- De Vos, G. A. (1995). Ethnic pluralism: Conflict and accommodation. In L. Romanucci-Ross & G. A. De Vos (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Creation, conflict and accommodation* (3rd ed., pp. 15-47). London: Altamira.
- Dohrenwend, B. P., & Smith, R. J. (1957). A suggested framework for the study of acculturation. In V. F. Ray (Ed.), *Cultural stability and cultural change: Proceedings of the 1957 annual spring meeting of the American Ethnological Society* (pp. 76-84). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Dohrenwend, B. P., & Smith, R. J. (1962). Toward a theory of acculturation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 18, 30-39.
- Driedger, L. (1976). Ethnic self-identity: A comparison of ingroup evaluations. *Sociometry*, 39, 131-141.
- Driedger, L. (1977). Toward a perspective on Canadian pluralism: Ethnic identity in Winnipeg. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 2, 77-95.
- Eaton, J. W. (1952). Controlled acculturation: A survival technique of the Hutterites. *American Sociological Review*, 17, 331-340.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1952a). The process of absorption of new immigrants in Israel. *Human Relations*, 5, 223-246.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1952b). Institutionalization of immigrant behavior. *Human Relations*, 5, 373-395.
- Faist, T. (2000). Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 189-222
- Fishman, J. A. (1980). Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and as societal phenomena. *Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1, 3-15.
- Fong, S. L. M. (1965). Assimilation of Chinese in America: Changes in orientation and social perception. *American Journal of Sociology*, 71, 265-273.
- Gaarder, B. (1972). Spesielle psykologiske virkninger av tospråkligheit [Special psychological effects of bilingualism]. *Nordisk Psykologi*, 24, 321-330.
- Glaser, D. (1958). Dynamics of ethnic identification. *American Sociological Review*, 23, 31-40.
- Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1963). *Beyond the melting pot*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press & Harvard University Press.
- Gold, D. (1967). Psychological changes associated with acculturation of Saskatchewan Indians. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 71, 177-184.
- Gordon, A. I. (1949). *Jews in transition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Herman, S. N. (1961). Explorations in the social psychology of language choice. *Human Relations, 14*, 149-164.
- Hoffman, M. N. H. (1934). *The measurement of bilingual background*. New York: Columbia University. (Republished 1977, New York: AMS Press.)
- Horobin, G. W. (1957). Adjustment and assimilation: The displaced person. *Sociological Review, 5*, 239-254.
- Hunt, C. L., & Walker, L. (1974). *Ethnic dynamics: Patterns of intergroup relations in various societies*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ichheiser, G. (1949). Misunderstandings in human relations: A study of false social perception. *American Journal of Sociology, 55*, i-69.
- Johnston, R. (1963). A new approach to the meaning of assimilation. *Human Relations, 16*, 295-298.
- Keesing, F. M. (1966). *Cultural anthropology*. Toronto, Canada: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 395-412.
- Lee, R. (1952). Acculturation of Chinese Americans. *Sociology and Social Research, 36*, 319-321.
- Lambert, W. E. (1967). A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues, 13*, 91-109.
- Linton, R. (1963). The distinctive aspects of acculturation. In R. Linton (Ed.), *Acculturation in seven American tribes* (pp. 501-520). Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.
- London, H. I. (1967). Liberalising the White Australia Policy: Integration, assimilation, or cultural pluralism. *Australian Outlook, 21*, 338-346.
- London, H. I. (1970). *Non-white immigration and the "White Australia" Policy*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mann, J. (1958). Group relations and the marginal personality. *Human Relations, 11*, 77-91.
- Marden, C. F., & Meyer, G. (1968). *Minorities in American society* (3rd ed.). New York: American Book Company.
- McGee, W. J. (1898). Piratical acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 11*, 243-249.
- Miller, H. A. (1924). *Races, nations and classes: The psychology of domination and freedom*. Chicago, IL: Lippincott.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (1988). Individualistic and collective integration strategies among immigrants: Towards a mobility model of cultural integration. In J. W. Berry & R. C. Annis (Eds.), *Ethnic psychology* (pp. 69-71). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 698-719.

- Nash, D. (1967). The fate of Americans in a Spanish setting: A study in adaptation. *Human Organization*, 26, 157-163.
- Nash, D., & Shaw, L. C. (1963). Personality and adaptation in an overseas enclave. *Human Organization*, 21, 252-263.
- Nelde, P. H. (1987). Language contact means language conflict. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 8, 33-42.
- Oxford English Dictionary* (1989). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Padilla, A. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 47-84). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology*, 33, 881-893.
- Persons, S. (1987). *Ethnic studies at Chicago, 1905-1945*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1974). Introduction: Racially separate or together? In E.G. Epps (Eds.), *Cultural pluralism* (pp. 1-33). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1988). Integration and pluralism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 19-30). London: Plenum.
- Pierce, R. C., Clark, M., & Kaufman, S. (1978). Generational and ethnic identity: A typological analysis. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 9, 19-29.
- Plato (1892). Laws. In B. Jowett (Trans.), *The dialogues of Plato* (3rd ed., vol 5). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work written 348 BC.)
- Powell, J. W. (1880). *Introduction to the study of Indian languages* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Powell, J. W. (1883). Human evolution: Annual address of the President, J. W. Powell, Delivered November 6, 1883. *Transactions of the Anthropological Society of Washington*, 2, 176-208.
- Powell, J. W. (1900). Report of the director. *Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, 19, xi-xxxiii.
- Rabushka, A. (1969). Integration in a multi-racial institution: Ethnic attitudes among Chinese and Malay students at the University of Malaya. *Race*, 11, 53-63.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149-152.
- Rees, T. B. (1970). Accommodation, integration, cultural pluralism, and assimilation: Their place in equilibrium theories of society. *Race*, 11, 481-490.
- Richardson, A. (1957). The assimilation of British immigrants in Australia. *Human Relations*, 10, 157-166.
- Ross, E. A. (1920). *The principles of sociology*. New York: Century.
- Rothman, J. (1960). In-group identification and out-group association: A theoretical and experimental study. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 37, 81-93.
- Rothman, J. (1961). *Minority group relations and intergroup relations*. Unpublished dissertation, Columbia University.

- Roy, P. (1962). The measurement of assimilation: The Spokane Indians. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 541-551.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 3-37.
- Rudmin, F. W., & Ahmadzadeh, V. (2001). Psychometric critique of acculturation psychology: The case of Iranian migrants in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 41-56.
- Rudmin, F. W., Trimpop, R., Kryl, I., & Boski, P. (1987). Gustav Ichheiser in the history of social psychology: An early phenomenology of social attribution. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 165-180.
- Saruk, A., & Gulutsan, M. (1970). Academic performance of students and the cultural orientation of their parents. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 16, 189-195.
- Sayegh, L., & Lasry, J.-C. (1993). Immigrants' adaptation in Canada: Assimilation, acculturation, and orthogonal identification. *Canadian Psychology*, 34, 98-109.
- Schumann, J. H. (1976a). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 26, 135-143.
- Schumann, J. H. (1976b). Second language acquisition: The pidginization hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 26, 391-408.
- Schumann, J. H. (1978a). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (pp. 27-50). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Schumann, J. (1978b). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. New York: Newbury House.
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model of second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 379-392.
- Senter, D. (1945). Acculturation among New Mexico villagers in comparison to adjustment patterns of other Spanish-speaking Americans. *Rural Sociology*, 10, 31-47.
- Simons, S. (1901-1902). Social assimilation. Parts I, II, III, IV & V. *American Journal of Sociology*, 6, 790-822; 7, 53-79, 234-248, 386-404, 539-556. (Note: Part III was mislabeled by the journal as Part VII.)
- Simpson, G. E., & Yinger, J. M. (1972). *Racial and cultural minorities* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published in 1953).
- Slotkin, J. S. (1940). *Jewish intermarriage in Chicago*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Slotkin, J. S. (1942). Jewish-Gentile intermarriage in Chicago. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 34-39.
- Smither, R. (1982). Human migration and the acculturation of minorities. *Human Relations*, 35, 57-68.
- Sodowsky, G. R., & Carey, J. C. (1988). Relationships between acculturation related demographics and cultural attitudes of an Asian-Indian immigrant group. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 16, 117-136.

- Sommerlad, E. A. (1968). *The importance of ethnic identification for assimilation and integration: A study of Australian Aborigines' attitudes*. Unpublished BA thesis, University of Sydney, Australia.
- Sommerlad, E. A., & Berry, J. W. (1970). The role of ethnic identification in distinguishing between attitudes towards assimilation and integration of a minority racial group. *Human Relations, 23*, 23-29.
- Spindler, G., & Goldschmidt, W. (1952). Experimental design in the study of culture change. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 8*, 68-83.
- Spindler, L. S. (1977). *Culture change and modernization*. Montreal, Canada: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Spindler, L. S., & Spindler, G. (1958). Male and female adaptation in culture change. *American Anthropologist, 60*, 217-233.
- Spiro, M. E. (1955). The acculturation of American ethnic groups. *American Anthropologist, 57*, 1240-1252.
- Srole, L. (1940). *Ethnic groups and American society: A study in the dynamics of social assimilation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1972). Counseling Chinese-Americans. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50*, 637-644.
- Sue, S., & Sue, D. W. (1971). Chinese American personality and mental health. *Amerasia Journal, 1*, 36-50.
- Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 139-159). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Taft, R. (1953). The shared frame of reference concept applied to the assimilation of immigrants. *Human Relations, 6*, 45-56.
- Taft, R. (1957). A psychological model for the study of social assimilation. *Human Relations, 10*, 141-156.
- Taft, R. (1963). The assimilation orientation of immigrants and Australians. *Human Relations, 16*, 279-293.
- Taft, R. (1981). The role and personality of the mediator. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *The mediating person: Bridges between cultures* (pp. 53-88). Boston, MA: G. K. Hall.
- Thomas, R. K. (1958). *Eastern Cherokee acculturation*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Chicago.
- Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1958). *The Polish peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Dover. (Original work published 1918.)
- Thurnwald, R. (1932). The psychology of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 34*, 557-569.
- Triandis, H. C., Kashima, Y., Shimada, E., & Villareal, M. (1986). Acculturation indices as a means of confirming cultural differences. *International Journal of Psychology, 21*, 43-70.
- Trosper, R. L. (1981). American Indian nationalism and frontier expansion. In C. F. Keyes (1981). *Ethnic change* (pp. 247-270). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

- Unger, J. B., Gallaher, P., Shakib, S., Ritt-Olson, A., Palmer, P. H., & Johnson, C. A. (2002). The AHIMSA Acculturation Scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 22*, 225-251.
- Vander Zandan, J. W. (1963). *American minority relations*. New York: Ronald Press.
- van Oudenhoven, J. P., van der Zee, K. I., & van Kooten, M. (2001). Successful adaptation strategies according to expatriates. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*, 467-482.
- Voget, F. (1951). Acculturation at Caughnawaga: A note on the native-modified group. *American Anthropologist, 53*, 220-231.
- Voget, F. (1956). The American Indian in transition: Reformation and accommodation. *American Anthropologist, 58*, 249-263.
- Voget, F. (1967). Crow socio-cultural groups. In S. Tax (Ed.), *Acculturation in the Americas: Proceedings and selected papers of the XXIX International Congress of Americanists* (pp. 88-93) New York: Cooper Square Publishers. (Original work published in 1952.)
- Wagner, J. K. (1976). The role of intermarriage in the acculturation of selected urban American Indian women. *Anthropologica, 18*, 215-229.
- Wallace, A. F. C. (1961). *Culture and personality*. New York: Random House.
- Weinstock, S. A. (1964). Some factors that retard or accelerate the rate of acculturation. *Human Relations, 17*, 321-340.
- Willey, G. R. (1953). A pattern of diffusion-acculturation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 9*, 36-384.
- Wirth, L. (1945). The problem of minority groups. In R. Linton (Ed.), *The science of man in the world crisis* (pp. 347-372). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Woods, C. M. (1975). *Culture change*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Yamada, A.-M., & Singelis, T. M. (1999). Biculturalism and self-construal. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*, 697-709.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1952). Aggressive attitudes of the "stranger" as a function of conformity pressures. *Human Relations, 5*, 205-216.
- Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. *Psychological Reports, 33*, 891-900.
- Zubrzycki, J. (1956). *Polish immigrants in Britain: A study of adjustment*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

### About the Author

**Floyd Rudmin** majored in philosophy at Bowdoin College in Maine, then worked in the Philippine Malaria Eradication service as a U.S. Peace Corps Volunteer. After two years teaching ESL in Japan and two years studying audiology at the University of Buffalo, he emigrated to Canada, going first to British Columbia and then moving to Montreal. In 1982, he began doctoral studies at Queen's University, under the supervision of John Berry, and in 1988 completed his dissertation on "Ownership as Interpersonal Dominance: A History and Three Studies of the Social Psychology of Property". After 7 years of soft-money



positions in faculties of law and business, he accepted a professorship in social and community psychology at the University of Tromso in Norway, where he also teaches in the Master's Program in Peace and Conflict Transformation.

### Questions for Discussion

- 1) What proportion of acculturation theories arise from outside the Anglo-Saxon cultural context, and what might be the consequences of that?
- 2) What proportion of acculturation theories explain how majority groups adopt cultural practices from the minorities in their midst?
- 3) Explain the role of reference groups in classifying modes of acculturation as "marginal" or "marginalization".
- 4) What proportion of acculturation theories are apriori and what proportion aposteriori? Give an example of each.
- 5) How are the theories of David Born and John Berry similar and how are they different?
- 6) American Blacks appear relatively infrequently in acculturation theory and research. Why might that be so?
- 7) Explain why [+F+C] and [-F-C] are both forms of biculturalism, giving some illustrative examples.
- 8) Thomas and Znaniecki and many others conceived that people acculturate to modernity. Explain how that is different from acculturating to a dominant culture.
- 9) Most of the references in this catalogue have been uncited in standard acculturation research. Why might that be so?
- 10) Is it true that American acculturation theorists have been advocates of assimilation policies?
- 11) Identify someone in your family history (for example, through genealogical records or talking with parents and grandparents) who was involved in an "acculturation" experience. Explain his/her dynamics and how researchers would categorize this experience in light of research theorizing about the phenomenon of acculturation.