

## Host Acculturation Orientation: Some Preliminary Impressions of the French Students on Ethnic Minority Groups in Montpellier, S. France

Jyoti Verma  
Patna University, India

### Abstract

The **objective** was to study the host acculturation orientation of a sample of 100 French students of a S. France University. For this purpose a nine-items Host Acculturation Scale was used. **Observations** gave the impression that the students considered it significantly 'more important' that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture in their homes rather than doing so in general or at the workplace. Furthermore, it was considered only 'partially important' that the immigrants *adopted* the French norms, values and customs in general and at the workplace, and 'not important at all' that they did so in their homes. Ethnic groups were perceived as *threatening* to the extent of 'quite a bit' and, comparatively speaking, they were more *acceptable* than *liked*. The correlational observations suggested that those who *liked* the immigrant groups were also open to *accepting* them in their country and did not mind that these groups *maintained* their heritage culture. A modest degree of negative relationship was observed between the overall acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture by the immigrant groups and the perception that these groups were a *threat* to the mainstream French population. Regarding prediction of the host acculturation orientation, it appeared that *liking* the immigrants seemed to significantly facilitate the French hosts' *acceptance* for maintenance of the heritage culture at the workplace. Moreover, those who perceived the immigrants as a *threat* to the French people were also likely to expect that the immigrant groups adopted the French ways and customs.

**Authors' Note:** Jyoti Verma, Ph.D. is a university professor of Psychology and has taught at Patna University in India. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jyoti Verma, E-Mail: [jyotiverma\\_us@yahoo.com](mailto:jyotiverma_us@yahoo.com)

After completing two studies in the years 2000 and 2005, which mainly addressed the acculturation orientation and experiences of Indians living in Paris, the author felt that it was time to look at the host acculturation orientation, particularly in view of the popular acceptance of the bi-directional model of acculturation. By reason of logistical constraints, the present study had a very limited and focused concern. The purpose was to obtain a general impression of the French students' attitude towards the ethnic minority groups residing in their city, namely, Montpellier in S. France, with the help of a 'Host Acculturation Scale.'

## Acculturation

Taken as a 'culture level' phenomenon, acculturation refers to culture change resulting from the contact between two autonomous cultural groups (Redfield et al. 1936), while at the 'individual level' acculturation requires individual members of both the larger society and the various acculturating groups to engage in new behaviours and work out new forms of relationships in their daily lives (Graves, 1967). Apparently, acculturation occurs within the societal network of inter-group relations, and the nature and evolution of these inter-group relations are an essential part of the acculturation process.

According to Hutnik (1991), immigrant's ethnic identity is determined by the degree to which a person identifies with his/her own ethnic group and with that of the majority group. Consequently, four adaptation styles may be distinguished, namely, **acculturative**, where an individual identifies with his/her own minority group and with the majority group ("I am an Indian American or American Indian"), **assimilative**, where an individual identifies with the majority group but not or only weakly with the own minority group ("I am an American and not an Indian"), **dissociative**, where an individual identifies predominantly with the own minority group ("I am an Indian and not American"), and **marginal**, where an individual is indifferent to ethnic group identifications ("I am not an Indian but I am also not an American"). Hutnik (1991) contends that these ethnic identity patterns cannot be used as indices of acculturation orientations. Acculturation process includes not only these patterns of self-categorization but also patterns of change with respect to beliefs, attitudes, values, and behaviour.

## The Concept of Bi-Directional Models of Acculturation

In earlier researches, acculturation as a cultural change process was envisaged as occurring along a single dimension. The contention being that only the immigrants have to change and must choose to assimilate in the host culture or move along a continuum ranging from *maintenance* of their original culture to *adoption* of host society's culture (Gordon, 1964). It appeared that unidimensional models consider *assimilation* and *acculturation* as equivalent because assimilation (or giving up one's original cultural identity and obtaining a new identity in the host society) was considered the ultimate goal for the acculturating individual and a one-directional process that expected only the immigrants to change.

However, for many plural societies, the majority culture group also has to undergo a certain amount of changes when the distinctive ethnic minority groups become accepted as members of the host society, and the expectation that they would eventually assimilate with the mainstream culture does not hold true. Therefore, now the more comprehensive and useful bi-directional models of acculturation (Berry, 1980; Snauwaert, 2002) include two independent dimensions: (a) *maintenance* of the values, norms/customs and identity aspects coming from the heritage culture, and (b) *participation* in the host society, for studying acculturation orientation. Having said this, it may be added that host communities differ in how *accepting* they are on the *maintenance* dimension of acculturation; and how *demanding* they are that the ethnic minority groups take over elements from the dominant society and adapt to its culture.

## Bi-Directional Models of Acculturation

### The Contact Model of Acculturation (Berry, 1980)

Berry's (1980) bi-directional model distinguishes between attitudes towards *maintenance* of the minority culture, and attitudes towards *contact* with the dominant culture in the host society. The latter dimension may be referred to as *adaptation* rather than *contact* as it addresses to the cultural adaptation of immigrants to the values, norms, and customs of the dominant society. Furthermore, across cultures, most immigrants combine positive attitudes towards *maintenance* and *adaptation* in so-called 'integration' orientation and, compared to the alternatives 'assimilation' (i.e., *adaptation* without *maintenance*), 'separation' (i.e., *maintenance* without *separation*) and 'marginalisation' (i.e., neither *maintenance* nor *adaptation*), the 'integration' orientation is the most adaptive orientation for psychological adjustment and competence (Berry & Sam, 1996; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001).

Hence, in parallel with the immigrant acculturation orientations, host orientations can fall into Berry's well-known categories of integration, assimilation, separation, and marginality. In the terminology of Bourhis et al. (1997), these are named integrationism, assimilationism, segregation, and exclusionism. Therefore, it follows that the immigrants who adopt the elements from the dominant society do not necessarily have to give up their original culture. It may be added that researches in various host societies suggest that the (perceived) acceptance by the host community of the immigrant cultures enhances immigrant integration (Horenczyck, 1996; Lalonde & Cameron, 1993; Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdrzalek, 2000).

### Culture Adoption Model of Acculturation (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997)

Bourhis et al. (1997) contend that the issue of *culture maintenance* relates to an attitude towards the culture of origin, whereas the issue of 'relations with the other group' measures a behavioural preference which could be replaced by the issue of *culture adoption*. The question now is, 'whether the immigrants do or do not want to adopt some part of the host culture' and, using the combination of the two issues, one could determine the four kinds of acculturation orientations as Berry's (1980). Vanbeselaere et al. (forthcoming) point out that adoption of norms and values from the majority culture is a more demanding task than just developing relations with the autochthons and that good and regular contact with the host group does not necessarily imply a profound change of the value pattern from the heritage culture.

## Relational Outcomes

One concern of the present study is the *relational outcomes* that refer to the friendly or hostile and inclusive or exclusive nature of intercultural attitudes and practices. It is argued that as a consequence of pervasive ethnocentric bias there is inbuilt ethnic tension between the immigrants' and the host's acculturation orientations in intercultural relations. In line with the social identity theory, both sides will be inclined to favour the in-group culture over the culture of an out-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In addition, intercultural relations between the immigrants and the host group are often unequal. In view of their dominant group position, the host group will demand some degree of *assimilation* from the immigrants while their acceptance of culture *maintenance* will vary depending on whether they perceive the minority culture as a 'threat' to their group dominance (Bobo & Hutching, 1987; Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001).

Conversely, the minority status of the immigrants is associated with a sense of heightened ethnic self-identification and could reinforce culture *maintenance*. At the same time, immigrants' attitude towards cross-cultural *adaptation* will vary depending upon whether they perceive the dominant culture as a 'threat' to their group survival (Berry et al., 1977). Some have indicated that on both sides of the ethnic divide, ethnocentrism and perceived threat will decline with increasing levels of education (Scheepers, Verbeck, & Coenders, 2001). The last three questions of the Host Acculturation Scale were aimed at assessing the state of these *relational outcome* variables with items such as these: Do you *like* the immigrant groups in general? Do you see the

immigrant groups as a *threat* to the group dominance of the French population? Do you find the immigrant communities *acceptable* in your country?

### **The Venue: Paul-Valery Montpellier Iii, University, South France**

The beautiful city of Montpellier is the Capital of the Languedoc Roussillon region of S. France. This region is famous for its wine-university city. The city is located between Provence, the Camargue, the Cevennes mountains, and the Pyrenees. Known to be a 1,000-year-old city, Montpellier is the home to modern universities and has the oldest medical school. Louisville and Montpellier are sister cities, and Université Paul-Valery de Montpellier 3 (<http://www.univ-mont3.fr>) was the venue for the small study done by the present researcher during her short visit in the third week of June 2006. The university offers courses along with research opportunities in the different academic and applied areas such as languages, fine arts, cinema and theatre, science, humanities, management and information technology, etc.

### **The Ethnic Groups in Montpellier**

It is well documented that France has received immigrants from many parts of the world, mostly from other European countries and a significant proportion from French colonies of North Africa. It appears that a significantly large ethnic minority group in Montpellier is that of people from North Africa (popularly called *Maghrebins*). It may be noted in this context that Montpellier's population increased dramatically during the 1960s, due in part to an influx of refugees from Algeria. The other ethnic minority groups in the city were Spanish or Espanola and some Chinese. On the other hand, people of Indian origin were conspicuous by their absence.

The Arabic word *Maghreb* (Arabic, Berber, Tamazgha), also rendered *Maghrib*, refers to the five countries constituting North Africa, and literally means "the place of sunset" or "the west" (from an Arabian perspective). It is the term now generally used, mainly by the Arabs, to refer collectively to the African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, and Mauritania. *Beur* is a colloquial term to designate French-born folks whose parents are immigrants from North Africa and have their origin in the countries of the *Maghreb*. The colloquial term is, however, slightly derogatory and not advised in formal speech with respect to etiquette, and actually sends the message that descendants of North Africa immigrants are not recognized as mainstream French people. *Beur* are still suffering discrimination in access to employment or to lease a dwelling. It may be noted that partially isolated from the rest of the continent by the Atlas Mountains and the Sahara desert, inhabitants of the northern parts of the *Maghreb* have long been tied in to the inhabitants of the Mediterranean countries, Southern Europe and Western Asia ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arab\\_culture\\_in\\_France](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arab_culture_in_France)).

### **Jewish Population in Montpellier**

The city of Montpellier came into prominence in the 10th century as a trading centre, with trading links across the Mediterranean world, a rich Jewish cultural life, and traditions of tolerance of its Muslims, Jews, and later of its Protestant believers. Montpellier's Jewish population arrived from the former French colonies of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia, situated just a few hundred miles further to the south but on the opposite side of the Mediterranean.

The Jews of Montpellier first gained prominence in the 13<sup>th</sup> century when the city began to win a reputation as one of the great *studia* of Europe, the University coming under Jewish influence through the emphasis of the secular studies of law and medicine. Due to persecution and wars, many Spanish Jews arrived in continuous waves of immigration. They tended to specialize in the translation of Islamic philosophical and medical texts, in addition to the works of Jewish scientists, poets, and thinkers written in Arabic. In Montpellier, the Jews lived peacefully during the 13<sup>th</sup> century, during the period of royal tolerance, and it was during this period that the Jewish life flourished, and the community felt confident enough to settle in the heart of the city with a synagogue and its outbuildings. However, the annexation of the entire Languedoc region to the French crown resulted in an increasingly harsh attitude towards their status, and the community was finally banished from the entire province in 1394.

Although in Montpellier the Jewish place of residence and worship has long since been demolished, one fascinating relic of Jewish medieval life, namely, Mikvah (*Mikvé* in French) or ritual baths, has survived throughout the centuries (main web site of the freelance writer [www.jeremyjosephs.com](http://www.jeremyjosephs.com)).

### Chinese Diaspora

Chinese immigration in France has a long history. However, talking of contemporary times, the expulsions of ethnic Chinese from Vietnam in the 1970s led to a wave of immigration of Chinese all around the world and also to France in Europe. Nevertheless, the number of Chinese immigrants in Montpellier is difficult to find. Chinese Diaspora in France consists of people of Chinese ancestry who were born in or immigrated to France. The population estimates for the Chinese vary, ranging from 200,000 to 300,000 as of 2006 (Smith, 2006).

### Migrants from the South of Europe

More often than not, most migration flows into France during the 19th century involved migrants from neighbouring countries like Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Poland, etc., who were attracted by the opportunities in manufacturing, construction work, and agriculture. There was, however, considerable regional variation in the South; Italian and Spanish immigrants were attracted by the agricultural work available. It may be argued that mass immigration into France does not really begin until the 1850s when the Second Empire's (1852-1870) economic expansion and industrial growth created a demand for labour that could not be met nationally.

### Conspicuous Absence of Indian Ethnic Minority Groups in Montpellier

The researcher was under the impression that it would be possible to find a significant number of Indian immigrants in Montpellier, although not as many as in Paris. However, surprisingly the presence of Indian ethnic minority group was between insignificant to almost negligible in the city. According to an Indian origin immigrant in the Restaurant business (who said he arrived in 1960s), only a handful of Indians were living in Montpellier, and if he was right, their number would be hardly 50. There were a few Indian Restaurants run by the people of Indian origin and the researcher saw some of those restaurants in the heart of the city. The researcher's own experience tells that if there is a significant presence of a minority community in a country/city, one would easily find them walking on the streets, on markets, at entertainment spots, and enrolled as students. This was not to be the case in Montpellier. It was decided that the students would respond to the questions, keeping in mind the significantly present immigrants in the city of Montpellier which, by and large, included people from North Africa who were popularly known as *Maghrebins*, Spanish people or *Espanola*, Jews, and some Chinese. It appeared reasonable to ask for the students' view 'in general' about the ethnic groups they are used to seeing and that they recognized. This seemed better by far compared to asking them about a group that was not in their frame of reference.

### Purpose

The purpose was to have a preliminary impression of the acculturation orientation of the French students towards the notably present ethnic minority groups in the city of Montpellier and to take note of whether they *liked* and *accepted* these groups, or found them as a *threat* to their group dominance?

### Method

#### Sample

The data were collected on 100 college students, 50 male and 50 female, of the Paul-Valery University of Montpellier III in S. France. The average age of the students was 22.5 years (S.D. = 3.30). The students were enrolled in the courses for learning languages (Spanish, German, English, Italian, Chinese, etc), performing arts, painting, cinema and media, humanities

(psychology, sociology, economics, history, geography, etc), management, and information technology.

## Instrument

### The Host Acculturation Orientation Scale

In the present study, a nine-itemed three-point Host Acculturation Rating scale was used with modification in the formulation of the questions put to the host group. The Scale was inspired by the Immigrant Acculturation Scale used by Phalet and Swyngedouw (2004). In their work, Phalet and Swyngedouw tried to assess acculturation attitudes among Turkish and Moroccan minorities by asking symmetrical *maintenance* and *adaptation* questions.

Accordingly, while addressing to the culture *maintenance* and *adaptation* domains, the questions were put in the following way:

'Is it considered of value to maintain the Turkish or Moroccan culture?'

'Is it considered of value to adapt to the Dutch host culture?'

The participants indicated their attitudes on three-point scale from 3 = Maintain completely, over 2 = In part, to 1 = Not at all.

Phalet and Swyngedouw (2004) asked their respondents to rate both questions first in private context ('home' and 'family life') and next in the public context ('school' and 'work'). They also used a parallel measure of acculturation attitudes in the Belgian comparison group, which referred to the host expectations from immigrants in private and public contexts in the following form:

'Are they expected to maintain the Turkish and Moroccan minority culture?' from 3 = Maintain completely, over 2 = In part, to 1 = Not at all.

'Are they expected to adapt to the Belgian host culture?' from 3 = Adapt completely, over 2 = In part, to 1 = Not at all.

In the present study, the questions were also rated for general as well as both the private and the public contexts, but with slightly different wordings. For example, the questions were formulated in the following manner for the *maintenance* and *adaptation* domains, respectively:

How acceptable it is for you that the immigrants maintain their own culture? Response options from Totally Acceptable (3), to Partially Acceptable (2), and Not Acceptable at All (1)

How important it is for you that the immigrants adapt to your cultural norms, values and customs? Response options from Very Important (3), to Partially Important (2), and Not Important at All (1).

The items of the Host Acculturation Scale were translated into the French language from English by one of the senior French colleagues of the researcher. The first three items of the scale were meant to measure the degree of 'acceptance' that the French students considered giving to the immigrants for *maintaining* their heritage culture in general, at home, and at the workplace. Similarly, the next three items examined the 'importance' that the students gave to *adopting* the French cultural norm, values, and customs in general, in family life, and at the workplace, while the last three items of the scale tried to measure the '*relational outcome variables*'. Accordingly, the respondents were asked whether the immigrant groups were *liked* and *accepted* by them or considered as a *threat* to the mainstream French population (see Appendix 1).

As already mentioned, a total number of only nine questions comprised the Host Acculturation Scale and there were never more than three questions for measuring a particular acculturation dimension and one question each for the general, public, and private domains

within them. Similarly, the *relational outcome* variables were measured with the help of a total number of three questions only or one question each for one *relational outcome*.

The researcher realized that analysis based on a very limited number of questions or just one per variable, as in the case of *relational outcome* variables, lessens the result's reliability. It may be reiterated that the researcher stayed with putting simple straight questions, since the study had a very limited focus and had the purpose of giving only a preliminary impression of the acculturation orientation of the French students towards the ethnic minority groups in the city of Montpellier. The reliability of the scale items used by Phalet and Swyngedouw (2004) was not reported from where the researcher drew the idea to formulate her measure.

## Procedure

During the day, the researcher stood on the university campus near the library, close to the students' cafeteria, or in outdoor places like a patch of green grass or under the trees, where students prefer to spend their free time. She carefully looked for a lone student or a small group of them and approached them with the request to fill in the questionnaire. After a lone student or the small group of students agreed to help the researcher, the first question put to them was whether they were French nationals in order to assure that they belonged to the majority group. Most of them were; the ones who were not French nationals were not included. Since it was a short questionnaire and the researcher was a foreigner, she could get the students' cooperation without any noticeable difficulty. The questionnaire needed only a few minutes to be completed, but data collection would have been very difficult had it not been in the French language. Although the majority of the students had basic knowledge of the English language (and some had a fairly good knowledge of the language), French was their language in use for all practical purposes.

## Analysis

1. Mean and Standard Deviations were computed for:

(a) The *maintenance* and *adaptation* dimensions of the French students' acculturation attitude towards the immigrants, and (b) the *relational outcomes*, that is, the students' positive or negative perception about the ethnic groups.

2. An intercorrelation matrix was computed for all the above mentioned variables.

3. A paired comparison *t-test* was used for observing the significant differences between the Means for *maintenance* and *adaptation* dimensions of the host acculturation orientation and the *relational outcome* variables.

4. Host acculturation orientation dimensions were predicted by using the *relational outcome* variables.

5. One way ANOVA was applied to see the role of gender on the variables of the study.

## Results

**Table 1**

*Mean, S.D. and Intercorrelations between the Maintenance and Adaptation Dimensions of the French Students' Host Acculturation Orientation*

Maintenance of the heritage culture	Mean	S.D.	Maintenance of the heritage culture by the immigrants			Adopting the norms, values, and customs of the host group by the immigrants		
			In general	At home	At work-place	In general	At home	At work-place
(a) In general	2.67	.47			.22* (.03)	-.20* (.05)		
(b) At home and family	2.92	.27						
(c) At work	1.96	.54						-.28** (.00)
Adopting the French culture								
(d) In general	2.19	.61					.35** (.00)	.49** (.00)
(e) At home and family	1.28	.49						.20* (.05)
(f) At workplace	2.30	.58						

Note: N = 100 French college students (50 male, 50 female), \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$  Only significant coefficients are reported.

*Maintenance* dimension of the host cultural orientation referred to the acceptance given by the French students towards: (a) The *maintenance* of the heritage culture *in general*, (b) *maintenance* of the heritage culture at *home*, and (c) *maintenance* of the heritage culture at the *workplace* by the ethnic minority groups. *Adaptation* dimension of the host cultural orientation referred to the importance given by the French students to the proposition that:

(d) The immigrants *adopted* the French cultural norms, values, and customs *in general*.

(e) The immigrants *adopted* the French cultural norms, values, and customs in their *home*.

(f) The immigrants *adopted* the French cultural norms, values, and customs at the *workplace*.

Table 1 has the details for the host acculturation orientation measured in terms of *maintenance* and *adaptation* dimensions. It may be recalled that the data were collected on a 3-point rating scale for both the dimensions. For the *maintenance* dimension the scores are: 3 = Totally Acceptable, 2 = Partially Acceptable, and 1 = Not Acceptable at All. Similarly, in the case of the *adaptation* dimension, the scores are: 3 = Very Important, 2 = Partially Important, and 1 = Not Important at All.

Accordingly, it appeared that the French students almost completely accepted that the immigrants *maintained* their own culture *in general* (Mean = 2.67, S.D. = .47). Similarly it was highly accepted among them that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture in their *homes* and family life (Mean = 2.92, S.D. = .27). However, there seemed to be only partial acceptance to the proposition that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture at the *workplace* (Mean = 1.96, S.D. = .54).

Furthermore, regarding how important it was that the immigrant groups *adopted* the French norms, values and customs, the students had to say that it was partially important *in general* (Mean = 2.19, S.D. = .61), but a little more than partially important for the *workplace* (Mean = 2.30, S.D. = .58). However, it did not matter to them much whether the immigrant groups *adopted* the French norms, values, and customs into their *homes* or family life (Mean = 1.28, S.D. = .49).



Coming to the intercorrelations in Table 1, it may be noted that a pattern emerged in the host acculturation orientation around the *workplace*. For example, the students who thought that it was 'important' for the ethnic minority groups to *adopt* the French cultural norms and customs etc. *in general*, also considered that it was important for them to *adopt* the French ways in their *homes* and at the *workplace* ( $r = .35$  and  $.49$  respectively,  $p < .01$  in both cases). Further, although the relation was of modest degree, it appeared that the students who thought that it was 'important' for the immigrants to *adopt* the French norms, values, and customs in their *homes* believed that it ought to be the same way at the *workplace* ( $r = .20$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

At the instance of the correlational findings for the *maintenance* dimension of the host acculturation orientation, a negative association was observed between the host group's acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture at the *workplace* and the importance they gave to *adopting* the French norms, values, and customs at the *workplace*. This seemed to be a consistent finding. There was one more significant finding that referred to the *workplace*. Accordingly, acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture *in general* was positively associated with acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture at the *workplace* ( $r = .22$ ,  $p < .03$ ). In other words, the French students who accepted that the ethnic minority groups *maintained* their heritage culture *in general*, also agreed that they could do so at the *workplace*.

A moderately significant but negative association was observed between acceptance given to *maintaining* the heritage culture *in general* and the importance given to *adopting* the French cultural norms, values, and customs *in general* ( $r = -.20$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Looking at this finding in a totality, however, it appeared that the French students who considered that it was important to *adopt* the French norms, values, and customs *in general*, did not think that *maintaining* the heritage culture *in general* was acceptable to them in the same way.

**Table 2**

*Paired Samples t-test between the Maintenance Dimensions of the Host Acculturation Orientation*

Acceptance for <i>Maintaining the Heritage Culture by the Immigrants</i>	Mean	S.D	Paired Differences (Mean)	S.D.	t	df	Sig. Level
<b>Pair 1</b>							
In General	2.67	.47					
At Home	2.92	.27	-.25	.52	-4.01**	99	.00
<b>Pair 2</b>							
In General	2.67	.47					
At Workplace	1.96	.54	.71	.64	11.09**	99	.00
<b>Pair 3</b>							
At Home	2.92	.27	.96	.62	15.53**	99	.00
At Workplace	1.96	.54					

Note: N = 100 French college students (50 male, 50 female), \*\*  $p < .01$

Tables 2 and 3 contain the findings of the paired comparison *t-test* between the different questions from the *maintenance* and *adaptation* domains of the host acculturation orientation. The analysis aimed at examining whether the students made a significant difference in their attitude as regards to acceptance for *maintenance* of the heritage culture by the ethnic groups in different domains (i.e., *in general*, *in their home*, and at the *workplace*). The observations indicated that it was significantly more acceptable for the students that the ethnic groups *maintained* their heritage culture at *home* in comparison to doing so *in general* (Means = 2.92 and 2.67 respectively,  $t = -4.01$ ,  $df = 99$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

Also, it was much more acceptable for the students that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture *in general* rather than that at the *workplace* (Means = 2.67 and 1.96 respectively,  $t = 11.09$ ,  $df = 99$ ,  $p < .00$ ). The findings indicated that the French students were ready to accept almost completely that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture *in general*. However,

their acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture at the *workplace* was only partial at best. Similarly, a highly significant difference was observed between the Means indicating the French students' acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture at *home* in comparison to that at the *workplace* (Means = 2.92 and 1.96 respectively,  $t = 15.53$ ,  $df = 99$ ,  $p < .00$ ). In other words, it was almost completely acceptable to the French students that the immigrants *maintained* their heritage culture at *home* but only partially acceptable that they did so at the *workplace*.

**Table 3**

*Paired Samples t-test between the Adaptation Dimensions of the Host Acculturation*

Importance of <b>Adopting</b> French cultural norms, values, and customs by the ethnic groups	M	S.D	Paired Difference s (Mean)	S.D.	t	df	Sig. Level
<b>Pair 1</b>					14.28**	99	.000
In General	2.19	.61	.91	.64			
At Home	1.28	.49					
<b>Pair 2</b>							
In General	2.19	.61	-.11	.60	-1.83 n.s.	99	.070
At Workplace	2.30	.58					
<b>Pair 3</b>							
At Home	1.28	.49	-1.02	.68	-14.97**	99	.000
At Workplace	2.30	.58					

Note: N = 100 French college students (50 male and 50 female), \*\*  $p < .01$

**Pair 1:** Do you *like* the immigrant groups in general?

Do you see the immigrant groups as a *threat* to the dominance of the French population?

**Pair 2:** Do you *like* the immigrant groups in general?

Do you regard the immigrant groups as *acceptable* in your country?

**Pair 3:** Do you see the immigrant groups as a *threat* to the dominance of the French population?

Do you regard the immigrant groups as *acceptable* in your country?

Concerning the significant differences between the French students' point of view on the *adaptation* dimension of the host acculturation orientation in the three domains, the results (in Table 3) suggested the following: First, the French students gave significantly more importance to the position that the immigrants *adopted* the French norms, customs, and values *in general* in comparison to doing so in their personal or *home life* (Means = 2.19 and 1.28 respectively,  $t = 14.28$ ,  $df = 99$ ,  $p < .00$ ). Second, it was significantly more important for them that the immigrants *adopted* the French norms and ways at the *workplace* rather than in their *homes* and family life (Means = 2.30 and 1.28 respectively,  $t = -14.97$ ,  $df = 99$ ,  $p < .00$ ). Finally, for the French students it was not significantly important that the ethnic groups *adopted* the French norms, values and customs *in general* in comparison to doing so at the *workplace*. It may be said that the French students' had the expectation that the ethnic minority groups *generally adopted* their norms and ways, and it was important to do so at the *workplace*.

Table 4 contains the Means and standard deviations for the *relational outcome* variables (i.e., the host group's positive or negative attitude and perception towards the ethnic minority groups in their city), along with the coefficients of correlation among the same. Additionally, the table also contains paired samples t-test observations for the *relational outcome* variables.

It may be recalled that the *relational outcome* variable was measured with the help of three questions also mentioned in Table 4. It appeared that the French students *liked* the ethnic minority groups 'Quite a bit' (Mean = 4.00, S.D. = .83), found them *acceptable* somewhere

between 'Very much' and 'Quite a bit' (Mean = 4.48, S.D. = 2.01), but also perceived them as a *threat* to the extent of 'Very much' and 'Quite a bit' (Mean = 1.51, S.D. = .67).

The findings further indicated that *liking* and *acceptance* for the immigrant groups lessened the possibility of perceiving the ethnic minority groups as a *threat* to the mainstream French population ( $r = -.25, p < .01$  in both instances).

**Table 4**

*Mean, S.D., Intercorrelations between the Relational Outcome Variables and the Composite Score for the Maintenance Domain of the Host Acculturation Orientation along with the Paired Samples t-test observations for the Items of the Relational Outcome Variables*

	Mean	S.D.	Like	Threat	Acceptable	Maintaining	t	df	p
<b>Like</b>	4.00	.83							
				-.25** (.01)		.33** (.00)	20.86**	99	.00
<b>Threat</b>	1.51	.67							
					-.25** (.01)	-.19* (.05)	-2.25**	99	.02
<b>Acceptable</b>	4.48	2.01							
							-13.05**	99	.00

Note: N = 100 French college students (50 male and 50 female), \*\* $p < .01$

**Like:** Do you *like* the immigrant communities in general

**Threat:** Do you regard the immigrant communities as a *threat* to the French?

**Acceptable:** Do you regard the immigrant communities as *acceptable* in your country?

**Maintaining:** Overall *Acceptance* for *maintaining* the heritage culture

Moreover, a composite score for the maintenance dimension representing the host group's overall acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture by the ethnic groups (derived by combining the scores of the three *maintenance* domain questions), showed a highly significant positive association with *liking* for the immigrants ( $r = .33, p < .01$ ). This observation indicated that a *liking* for the immigrant groups was likely to enhance the students' *acceptance* for *maintenance* of heritage culture by the ethnic groups.

Further, a modest degree of negative relation was observed between an *overall acceptance* for the *maintenance* dimension and the perception that the immigrant groups were a *threat* to the French mainstream population ( $r = -.19, p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, the observation suggested that those who *accepted* that the immigrant groups could *maintain* their heritage culture in their country or city also felt that such groups could be a *threat* to the mainstream French population.

Considering the observations of paired samples t-test between the *relational outcome* variables, it appeared that *liking* for the immigrant groups was expressed relatively strongly as indicated by a significantly larger Mean, suggesting a positive attitude of the French students towards the ethnic minority groups (the groups were *liked* 'Quite a bit'). On the other hand, a Mean of 1.51 for the question whether the ethnic groups were perceived as a *threat* indicated that this was true to the extent of 'very much' to 'quite a bit'. It may be said that the students held a significantly different attitude about the question of *liking* for the ethnic groups and finding them as a *threat*. It appeared that the students seemed to report *liking* for the ethnic groups but that did not rule out perceiving them as a *threat* to the French mainstream population (Means = 4.00 and 1.51 respectively,  $t = 20.86, df = 99, p < .00$ ).

While comparing the Means for the French students' *acceptance* for the ethnic minority groups on the one hand, and their *liking* for the same on the other, a significantly larger Mean was observed for the former case (Means = 4.48 and 4.00 respectively,  $t = -2.25, df = 99, p < .02$ ).

The finding suggested that a higher *acceptance* for immigrants could be found in the country among the French students. However, on the question of *liking* them, the students responded with certain reservations. Lastly, a significant difference was observed between the Means for the *relational outcome* variable *acceptance* for the ethnic minority groups and that for considering them as a *threat* (Means = 4.48 and 1.51 respectively,  $t = -13.05, p < .00$ ). This finding indicated that for the present sample of students of the Paul Valéry Montpellier III University, although the ethnic groups were close to 'very much' accepted, they were still perceived as 'quite a bit' of *threat* to the members of the mainstream host community.

### Predicting the Host Acculturation Orientation

Simple multiple regression analysis was used to predict the acculturation orientation of the French students (i.e., *maintenance* and *adaptation* dimensions of the host acculturation orientation) by using the *relational outcome variables* and the demographic variables of age and gender. The findings had little to say in this regard, and the only significant finding was observed for the criterion *maintenance* of heritage culture at the *workplace*. Accordingly, *liking* for the immigrants seemed to significantly facilitate the French students' *acceptance* for *maintaining* the heritage culture by the ethnic groups at the *workplace* (Standardized Beta = .28,  $t = 2.79, p < .01, F = 2.88, df = 99, p < .02, R^2 = .13$ ).

In another case, perceiving the immigrant groups as a *threat* to the mainstream French population appeared as a significant predictor for the importance that the host group gave to *adoption* of French norms, values, and customs *in general*. It may be mentioned here that *threat* (a *relational outcome* variable) was used as the lone predictor variable after finding out that it was the only one with a significant  $t$  ( $t = 2.31, p < .02, F = 5.32, df = 99, p < .01$ ) out of the rest of the predictor variables for the *adaptation* dimension of the host acculturation orientation. The findings, when interpreted, seem to suggest that if the immigrants were perceived as a *threat* to the host group then the French students were likely to put more emphasis (i.e., give more importance) on the *adoption* of the French ways and culture by the ethnic groups.

### Main Observations

1. The observations indicated that it was significantly more acceptable (close to completely acceptable) for the French students that the ethnic groups *maintained* their heritage culture in their *home*, as well as family life, relative to doing so *in general*. It was, however, partially acceptable that the ethnic groups *maintained* their culture at the *workplace*.

2. It appeared that the host had some expectation that the ethnic minority groups *adopted* their norms and ways. More specifically, it was either partially important or a little more than partially important for them that the ethnic minority groups *adopted* the French cultural ways *in general* and in the *workplace*. However, the French students did not consider it important at all that the ethnic minority groups adopted the French norms, values, and customs in their *homes*.

3. Regarding the *relational outcomes*, the findings indicated that a *liking* for the immigrant groups was expressed in a significantly stronger way along with the perception that these groups were a *threat* to the mainstream French population. On the other hand, *acceptance* for the immigrants in their country was, comparatively speaking, expressed more strongly than the *liking* for them. Looking at the findings in totality, it appeared that the ethnic groups were perceived as a *threat* to the extent of 'quite a bit' by the French students of the Paul Valéry Montpellier III University despite the indication that the ethnic groups were generally *liked* and said to be *acceptable*.

4. The correlational observations in this regard indicated that those who *liked* the immigrant groups *in general* were open to *accepting* them in their country, but at the same time perceived them as a *threat* to the mainstream French population.

5. *Liking* for the immigrants was significantly and positively associated with the overall acceptance given to them for *maintaining* their heritage culture. However, a modest degree of a

negative relation was observed between the overall acceptance given for *maintaining* the heritage culture and the perception that the ethnic groups were a *threat* to the mainstream French population.

6. Coming to the observations regarding prediction of the host acculturation orientation, it appeared that *liking* for the immigrants seemed to significantly facilitate the French hosts' acceptance for *maintaining* the heritage culture by the ethnic groups at the *workplace*.

Finally, the French students who perceived the immigrants as a *threat* to the mainstream French population were likely to give more importance to the contention that the immigrants *adopted* the French ways and culture.

### Shortcomings of the Study

Having stated the major observations from this small study and reiterating that the study had an extremely limited focus, the author humbly admits that the analysis based on only a few questions or just one per variable lessens the result's reliability. In addition to using the Host Acculturation Scale, an interview with the students on the questions asked, especially as to 'why' they feel towards the ethnic minority groups the way they do, would have been a better strategy for data collection. However, the results of a study, as well as the choice of a data collection method, are likely to have limitations regardless of the researcher's enthusiasm when external circumstances such as time, money, and language barrier imposes constraints on that study.

### References

- Berry, J. W. (1980). Social and cultural change. In H. C. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 211-280). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada*. The Ministry of Supply and Services, Ottawa.
- Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (1996). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol.3, pp. 291-326). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bobo, L., & Hutchings, V. L. (1987). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multi-racial social context. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 951-972.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perrault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturative model: A social-psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369-386.
- Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Graves, T. (1967). Psychological acculturation in a tri-ethnic community. *South Western Journal of Anthropology*, 23, 337-350.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in crisis: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities* (pp. 241-250). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Cameron, J. E. (1993). An inter-group perspective on immigrant acculturation with a focus on collective strategies. *International Journal of Psychology*, 16, 23-49.
- Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations towards valued and devalued immigrants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 698-719.
- Phalet, K., & Swyngedouw, M. (2004). A cross-cultural analysis of immigrant and host acculturation value orientation. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters & P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures: Dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp.185-212). Leiden: Brill.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., & Holkar, P., & Obdrzalek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant group. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 1-26.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovit, M. J. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149-152.

- Scheepers, P., Verberck, G., & Coenders, M. (2001). Recent Dutch research on ethnocentrism in an international perspective. In K. Phalet & A. Orkeny (Eds.), *Ethnic minorities and inter-ethnic relations in context* (pp. 59-84). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Smith, C. S. (2006, November 2). If it's Tuesday, the Chinese must be in Paris. *International Herald Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Snauwaert, B. (2002). *A social psychological study on acculturation orientations of ethnic minority members and autochthons* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). K.U. Leuven, Belgium.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of inter-group relations* (pp 7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Vanbeselaere, N., Snauwaert, B., & Soenens, B. (2005). *Acculturation: How integration can become separation*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. F. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. London: Routledge.

## Appendix 1

### The English version of the Host Acculturation Scale

**Instructions:** Please read each of the following questions one by one and respond by choosing (checking out) one of the numbers which represents your view most closely. The meaning presented by respective numbers is provided.

**How acceptable it is for you that the immigrants maintain their own culture?**

3-----2-----1  
 Totally Acceptable                      Partially Acceptable                      Not Acceptable at all

**How acceptable it is for you that the immigrants maintain their own culture at home and in family life?**

3-----2-----1  
 Totally Acceptable                      Partially Acceptable                      Not Acceptable at all

**How acceptable it is for you that the immigrants maintain their own culture at their workplace or job?**

3-----2-----1  
 Totally Acceptable                      Partially Acceptable                      Not Acceptable at all

**How important it is for you that the immigrants adapt to your cultural norm, values, and customs?**

3-----2-----1  
 Very important                      Partially important                      Not important at all

**How important it is for you that the immigrants adapt to your cultural norms, values and customs at home/in family life?**

3-----2-----1  
 Very important                      Partially important                      Not important at all

**How important it is for you that the immigrants adapt to your cultural norms, values and customs at their workplace/job?**

3-----2-----1  
 Very important                      Partially important                      Not important at all

#### Items for Measuring the Relational Outcome Variables

**Do you like the immigrant groups in general?**

Very much      Quite a bit      Somewhat      No                      Not at all  
 5                      4                      3                      2                      1

**Do you see the immigrant groups as a threat to the group dominance of the French population?**

Very much      Quite a bit      Somewhat                      No                      Not at all  
 1                      2                      3                      4                      5

**Do you regard the immigrant community as an acceptable ethnic minority group for your country?**

Very much      Quite a bit      Somewhat                      No                      Not at all  
 5                      4                      3                      2                      1