Chapter 19

The United Kingdom

Rupert Brown, Hanna Zagefka and Linda Tip

[1] Sussex University, UK.

[2] Royal Holloway, University of London, UK.

Please direct all correspondence to this chapter to:

Rupert Brown, School of Psychology, Sussex University, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK

Word count: 8936 (text, refs and tables)

Chapter prepared for Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (Eds). *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology, 2nd Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

19.1 Introduction

In this chapter we provide an overview of contemporary policy and research developments in acculturation in the United Kingdom (UK). We begin by outlining the recent history of immigration to the UK, linking this to current intergroup attitudes and socio-economic inequalities. This provides the back drop to a review of two decades of acculturation research conducted in Britain, much of it done since the chapter in the first edition of this handbook (Robinson, 2006). The chapter starts with a descriptive summary of the kinds of acculturation attitudes observed among both minority and majority groups in the UK. The focus then shifts to a specifically minority group perspective, first to provide an account of the phenomenology of the minority group experience and then to explore the links between their acculturation attitudes and adaptation. Then, consistent with classic definitions of acculturation that stress its two-sided nature, we turn our attention to the reciprocal nature of acculturation attitudes held by both majority and minority groups. In reviewing that work, it will become apparent also how acculturation attitudes and more general intergroup attitudes are closely intertwined. The chapter concludes with some policy implications of our analysis.

19.2 Background to UK Society

The UK is a complex political entity comprising England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Britain has a long history of migration. Two immigration waves which have significantly shaped the current demographic makeup are immigration from former colonies and territories of the British Empire during modern times, and immigration from Central and Eastern Europe following the recent expansion of the EU.

According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2013), the population of England and Wales has become more diverse over the last 60 years. In 1951, some 4.3% (1.9 million) of the resident population of England and Wales were born outside the UK. This percentage has increased over the years, and especially over the first decade of the 21st Century: 5.0% in 1961, 6.4% in 1971, 6.7% in 1981, 7.3% in 1991, 8.9% in 2001, and 13.4% (7.5 million) in 2011 (ONS, 2013). The top ten non-UK countries of birth are India, Poland, Pakistan, Republic of Ireland, Germany, Bangladesh, Nigeria, South Africa, USA, and Jamaica. Immigration from different parts of the world has peaked at different times. For example, of the biggest foreign born groups in 2011, the Irish-born were the earliest group to arrive (before 1961), followed by the Jamaican- and Indian-born (1960s), Pakistani-born (1960s and 1970s), and Bangladeshi-born (1980s). Later arrivals included the South African-born (1990s), Nigerian-born (1990s and 2000s), US-born (2001-2011) and most recently Polish-born (2004-2011). Many of the German-born were children of UK service personnel stationed in Germany, and immigration by this group is more evenly distributed across time.

Of course, the proportion of the population affected by acculturation issues is substantially greater than that (current) 13% of first generation immigrants. Many of the groups which have entered the UK have settled for long enough to have produced children and, in some cases, grandchildren. These descendants, despite the fact that they mostly hold British citizenship, must also navigate between their family's original culture and that of British mainstream society. They can choose to endorse both, neither, or just one to varying degrees.

Navigating two (or more) cultural perspectives can be tempered by experiences of prejudice, and there is reason to assume that many people with a migration background are

vulnerable to such experiences. A report on Equality, Diversity and Prejudice in Britain (Abrams & Houston, 2006) found that 61% of majority respondents reported having negative feelings about illegal immigrants, 38% had negative feelings against asylum seekers, 19% had negative feelings against Muslims, and 17% - still a significant proportion – had negative feelings against *legal* immigrants. Other surveys find the majority's attitudes to be even more negative: a survey conducted by the BBC (2002) found that 44% of white British respondents believe that immigration has damaged Britain over the last 50 years, and one third said that they believe immigrants do not integrate or make a positive contribution to Britain. In nationally representative surveys conducted between 1983 and 2013, consistently high percentages of respondents, ranging between 25% and 38% of the population, described themselves as prejudiced (either "a little prejudiced" or "very prejudiced") (National Centre for Social Research, 2013).

These attitudes do not go unnoticed by minority members. Abrams and Houston's (2006) report found that 22% of respondents reported having experienced prejudice against themselves on the basis of their ethnicity in the previous 12 months, and 16% reported having been discriminated against due to their religion. In the BBC survey (2002), 38% of Blacks and 40% of Asians in the UK reported having personally experienced racial abuse. What is clear is that Britain is by no means immune to problems of discrimination and racism. Although large sections of the population seem to manage to live together in reasonable harmony, this scene has been repeatedly punctuated with the flaring up of racial tensions such as the Brixton race riots in the 80s, the Bradford riots in 2001, and the Birmingham riots in 2005.

There are also notable economic disparities between different ethnic groups. According to the New Policy Institute (2007), the income poverty rate (defined as an income of less than 60% of the median household income) is 65% for Bangladeshis, 55% for Pakistanis, 45% for black Africans, 30% for Black Caribbeans, and 25% for Indians. This compares to only 20% among White British. This is matched by diverging levels of unemployment rates for different groups. In 2012, the unemployment rate was 8% for all people in the UK. The unemployment rate for people of white ethnic background was 7%, but for other ethnicities, it was higher. For example, for people of black ethnic background, it was 16% (Commons Library Standard Note, 2013).

Despite these economic and social challenges faced by ethnic minority groups in the UK, Britain remains a popular destination country for migrants from various parts of the world, and there is a general appreciation by the British population that multiculturalism is a desirable and enriching feature of British society (e.g., 62% of respondents felt that multiculturalism had benefitted Britain in another BBC survey conducted in 2005). In the next section, we will investigate what kinds of acculturation choices immigrants in the UK make, and how they choose to manage their cultural differences within British society.

19.3 UK research on acculturation

19.3.1 *Acculturation attitudes/strategies in UK*

Berry's (1997) schema combines attitudes towards culture maintenance (CM) of the minority culture with a desire for intergroup contact (DC) or culture adoption (CA) (Brown & Zagefka, 2011). These two dimensions, when combined, result in a preference for one of four acculturation options: integration, assimilation, separation, or marginalisation (see

Chapter 2). In Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder's (2006) large cross-national study, as in much early work in the acculturation field, these four acculturation attitudes were measured directly. In the UK sub-sample of that study (N = 120 adolescents with Indian heritage), Integration proved to be the most popular strategy (mean level 3.9 on a 1-5 scale), followed by Separation (mean ~2.5) and Assimilation (~2.2), with Marginalisation being little endorsed (~1.8).

For various reasons, in our own work, we have typically followed the procedure used by Donà and Berry (1994) in measuring acculturation attitudes via the two underlying dimensions, CM and DC (or CA), rather than the direct measures often employed (see Brown & Zagefka, 2011, and Chapter 6, this volume for discussion of measurement issues). In addition to some other isolated studies, eleven of our datasets readily lend themselves to analysis to show mean levels of endorsement for different acculturation strategies in the UK. Mean levels of endorsement for CM, DC and CA across different studies are summarised in Table 1.[1]

Zagefka et al. (2014) studied acculturation of minority and majority members in Europe longitudinally, and included a sample from the UK: 255 majority members who self-identified as white English, and 101 minority members (the biggest groups being Bangladeshis, Africans, Afro-Caribbeans, Pakistanis, and Indians) reported their desire for ethnic minorities in the UK to maintain their original culture and their desire for ethnic minorities adopting the majority culture. Desire for culture maintenance did not differ between minority and majority group in this study, but desire for culture adoption did, with majority members manifesting higher desire for this dimension. In Zagefka, Mohamed, and Mursi (under review), 250 Muslim women and 198 ethnic Somalis in the UK indicated their

desire for CM and CA. The mean level of CM was well above the scale midpoint for both

Muslim women and Somalis, but the mean level of CA was notably lower for both groups.

Tip, Brown, and Bond (under review) also surveyed 209 Muslims in the UK. Following

Arends-Toth and Van de Vijver (2003), they distinguished between acculturation

preferences in the private (i.e., inside the home) and the public domains (i.e., outside the

home). Their participants reported more desire for CM in private than in public domains,

but more DC in public than in private domains. In these studies, Muslim respondents

showed some variability in their acculturation attitudes. This variability was extended in

three recent studies, one with 91 British Muslims (Fernandes & Brown, 2012), one with 194

African immigrants to the UK, many of whom will also have been Muslim (Okoh & Brown,

2014), and one with 40 refugees and voluntary migrants (Dimond & Brown, 2012). Brown et

al. (2013) studied acculturation preferences of about 200 South Asian children in the UK

aged 5-11 years. Overall, levels of CM and DC were high. A similar preference pattern was

also observed by Cordeu (2012) in her study of a small group of 40 immigrant children (aged

5 – 17 years), with a strong representation from Latin America.

Several trends become apparent when perusing Table 1. Although endorsement of

the dimensions varies between different ethnic groups and age groups, it seems that overall

among minority members in the UK there is a strong desire for culture maintenance –

means are above the scale midpoint of 3 for all samples. There is considerably less

enthusiasm for culture adoption among minority members, with means falling below the

scale midpoint in three out of the six studies which measured culture adoption. Minority

support for contact is higher than for culture adoption, and was well above the scale

midpoint for those samples which included a measure of desire for contact. The

acculturation preferences for majority members in the UK show reasonable levels of enthusiasm for all three dimensions: culture maintenance, culture adoption, and contact.

For the purposes of the present analysis, scale midpoint splits were used to allocate participants to groups preferring one of the four Berry acculturation strategies. A value above the scale midpoint indicated endorsement of the dimension, a value on or below the midpoint indicated lack of endorsement. Results are displayed in Table 2.

Again, the most obvious feature of Table 2 is its heterogeneity. Support for integration, which has been associated with the most favourable psycho-social and intergroup outcomes (Brown & Zagefka, 2011), is far from being the consistently modal choice. Two obvious factors affecting these preferences would seem to be, first, the way they are calculated – that is, whether based on the traditional DC dimension or the more recent CA dimension. In general, samples in which CA is assessed rather than DC, result in lower percentages of respondents being classified as 'integrationists', as has been noted elsewhere (Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Snauwaert, Soenens, Vanbeselaere, & Boen, 2003; Van de Vijver, 2008). The difference becomes particularly apparent when looking at the two studies which measured both CA and DC, giving us an opportunity to compare the distributions depending on whether CA or DC was used to calculate acculturation attitudes (Okoh & Brown, 2014; Tip, Brown, Collyer, & Morrice, in preparation). Second, whether attitudes are applied in the public or the private domain is important. As noted in other countries (Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2004), support for integration is typically lower in private than it is in public. Finally, the nature of the group and the corresponding intergroup climate it faces may be an important factor. For example, the two samples with very high proportions of respondents endorsing Separation were both Muslims (Zagefka et al., under

review). The last decade has seen an increase in Islamophobia in the UK and elsewhere in Europe (Pew, 2008), and it may be that Muslims have responded by lowering their interest in engaging with the majority culture and increasing their affiliation with their religion. The association between Muslim identity and Separation is far from perfect however (cf. Tip, Brown & Bond, under review), and it may be that particular intersectionalities – e.g., Muslim-Women, Muslim-Somali - attract specially high levels of discrimination.

19.3.2 *The acculturation experiences of minority groups in the UK*

Quantitative approaches to the study of acculturation provide useful 'snap-shots' of the prevailing attitudes in different groups, as we have just seen. They also permit the exploration of statistical relationships between acculturation attitudes and other variables, as we shall see shortly. Yet, the phenomenology of acculturation is missing from such quantitative research. To investigate the subjective experience of the group members actually doing the acculturating, qualitative methods are more useful, as others have suggested (Doná & Berry, 1994; Strang & Ager, 2010).

Prokopiou, Cline, and De Abreu (2012) conducted a qualitative case study with two British-born teenage brothers of Pakistani background (ages 13 and 18). From the analyses of the interviews it became clear that both of the boys constantly positioned and re-positioned their identities within their communities. They negotiated about differences and similarities between the cultures, about belonging within majority and minority communities, and about living in a multicultural society. Issues such as racism and religious discrimination would influence these negotiations and could make them quite a struggle. Prokopiou and colleagues argue that the constant shifting of various identities by their participants indicates that their acculturation process cannot be fully understood in terms of

the two classic acculturation dimensions of CM or CA (or DC), because these concepts are too static. Instead, they argue that the acculturation process should be contextualised - placed within its cultural time and space - as people struggle to negotiate their multiple identities within mainstream contexts. In the UK, this is likely to be particularly relevant for Muslims, because Muslims experience relatively high amounts of discrimination, perhaps due to the British media's propensity to manufacture associations between Islam and terrorism (Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010).

Tip (2013) investigated why minority members prefer certain acculturation strategies over others by interviewing 14 Muslims in the UK (aged 21-37 years). In general, and consistent with quantitative data, these respondents claimed to maintain their Islamic culture more at home than in public, the main influence on this was that the English environment would sometimes make it difficult to maintain their culture in public. For example, a lack of facilities or time to pray at work or school, or the necessity of interacting with people of the opposite sex, and restaurants playing loud music, serving alcohol, or not serving halal food. Because of the lack of facilities or opportunities in public spaces to practise their religion, respondents found it easier to maintain their Islamic traditions at home. Family and the local Muslim community had an influence on culture maintenance too, but to a lesser extent. For instance, one woman in her neighbourhood. Another example is the influence of family members, although most people did not feel that family influence was the reason why they maintained their culture; instead, they indicated that they would not want to change their current level of culture maintenance even in the absence of immediate family. This again highlights the importance of taking the acculturation context into account.

In that same study, Muslims indicated that they typically adopted the British culture more in public than in private. Even though they mentioned British people or society as having the most influence on why they adopted the majority culture more in public, most of them simply believed that there was nothing wrong with adopting those aspects of British culture which do not clash with their beliefs. Finally, they reported that they had more contact with British people in public than in private. Most of them indicated that when deciding who to be friends with, their religion was irrelevant. One exception that socialising for non-Muslims often involves the drinking of alcohol, and this was pointed out as a possible barrier against intergroup contact. A further, and perhaps more important, reason for the difference in public and private contact opportunities was that many participants lived with their parents, limiting their freedom regarding who they could invite into their home.

Similar themes emerged from an interview study of 32 British Punjabi children (Hossain et al., 2007). The goal of this study was to investigate these children's social capital (Putnam, 2000). In Putnam's theory, social capital can be categorised as 'bonding' – the development and maintenance of social ties *within* a community – or 'bridging' – social ties that transcend community lines. These two concepts bear more than a passing resemblance to wishes for culture maintenance and intergroup contact in Berry's framework. What emerged from Hossain and colleagues' study was the existence and importance of large extended family networks for these Bengali children, networks that seemed greatly to facilitate their bonding capital through heritage language learning and use, religious observance and family celebrations. Bridging capital, on the other hand, seemed to be sustained primarily at school, an interesting confluence of domains of acculturation and

acculturation attitudes; CM in mainly private spaces, DC in more public arenas. Interestingly, these children spontaneously reported very few instances of discrimination targeted at them (or their group), despite the fact that, in a larger sample from which these interviewees were drawn, there was clear evidence of such discrimination in a quantitative self-report measure (mean level ~1.5 on a 0-4 scale). A prevailing theme from the interviews was the practical difficulty in developing cross-group friendships rather than any overt social exclusion. Of course, such data should not be taken uncritically at face value given the common finding that people tend to downplay the level of discrimination *personally* experienced, while maintaining that their group is still greatly disadvantaged (Crosby, 1982; Operario & Fiske, 2001).

19.3.3 *Acculturation and adaptation of minority groups in the UK*

In an earlier section, we presented findings from several studies that investigated the acculturation attitudes of (mostly) minority groups in the UK. As we saw, there was considerable heterogeneity in the modal preferences of different ethnic and religious groups. We turn now to a classic question that has long preoccupied researchers in this field: what is the relationship between those acculturation attitudes and adaptation? (Berry, 1997). 'Adaptation' is often differentiated into *psychological* adaptation (e.g., subjective well-being, acculturative stress) and *socio-cultural* adaptation (e.g., educational achievement, employment success) (Ward, 1996). In addition to these two forms of adaptation, a third form - intercultural adaptation - was introduced in Chapter 2. This form of adaptation involves intercultural relations, which we will consider in section 19.3. Here, we shall only be concerned with the former kind, focussing primarily on well-being.

As a point of departure, we recall findings from Berry et al.'s (2006) international project, which included 120 minority group members in the UK. The main correlates of psychological adaptation in that study (in the whole sample) were, in order of size of beta weights: perceived discrimination (-.24), Ethnic Orientation, a form of CM (+.17), number of co-ethnic contacts (+.11) and Integration (+.06). Three features of these results are noteworthy. First, the largest single correlate of adaptation was perceived discrimination and not an acculturation attitude. Second, two proxies of CM (Ethnic Orientation and Ethnic Contacts) were positive correlates of adaptation. And third, Integration, although positively related to psychological adaptation as predicted by Berry's model, had the weakest association with it compared to the other three predictors, although it was somewhat more strongly related to sociocultural adaptation (though still less strongly than perceived discrimination).

We have conducted several studies with diverse minority groups in the UK, employing opportunistic samples. Although these samples are far from being representative, it is worth noting that none of them relied on university students as respondents. In that limited sense, they may be considered a little more representative of minority groups in the UK than the usual participants in psychological research. In most of the studies reviewed below, associations are reported from multiple regression models with the underlying acculturation dimensions (CM, DC/CA, and their interactions) as predictors; in some studies, other predictors were also included, and this is noted in those cases.

Dimond and Brown (2012) surveyed a very small (N=40) and heterogeneous sample of immigrants, approximately half of whom were refugees. Neither CM nor CA was independently associated with well-being, once the other acculturation dimension was

controlled for, but the interaction between them was. Respondents scoring high on both CM and CA ('integrationists') had the highest well-being, while those scoring high on CM but low on CA ('separatists') had the lowest. Adopting a similar research design with a sample of African migrants to the UK, Okoh and Brown (2014) added 'private' acculturation attitudes to the potential predictors of well-being (Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2004). In the event, the only reliable correlates of subjective well-being were 'public' CM (+), private CA (+) and perceived discrimination by the majority group (-). Effects of DC, whether in public or private, and interactions between acculturation dimensions were conspicuous by their absence.

The sample in Okoh and Brown's study probably contained many Muslims. The social environment for Muslims in most European countries has been distinctly unfriendly in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the USA in 2001, Madrid in 2004 and London in 2005. Given this antipathetic cultural climate, one might expect that acculturation preferences involving CM would be more closely related to well-being than those involving CA or DC, as Muslims seek to draw more heavily on their own culture than the majority's for psychological sustenance. Fernandes and Brown (2012) explored this hypothesis in a modest sample (N = 91) of Muslims living in Britain. They found that both CM and DC were independent correlates of self-esteem and of approximately equal magnitude. However, the two measures interacted, but *negatively*, so that those with the highest self-esteem were those low on DC but high on CM ('separatists'). For those endorsing DC, CM was not reliably related to self-esteem.

Moreover, for Zagefka et al.'s study (under review) female Muslims and Somalis in the UK, CM desire was unrelated to self-reported levels of stress, while CA was positively

related to stress, again underlying the heterogeneous pattern of correlates of acculturation preferences across different samples. Clearly, then, CM is related to adaptation in some situations or for some people, but less so for others.

These studies all used single time-point correlational designs with all their obvious methodological limitations. One way to address these limitations is to adopt a longitudinal design. This was one of the motivations behind Tip, Brown and Bond's (under review) recent online survey of British Muslims. Cross-sectionally, the only reliable correlates of well-being were CM in public (+) and DC in private (+). Although perceived discrimination was not associated with well-being on its own, it interacted with public CM – those expressing a wish to maintain their Muslim culture (high public CM) were 'protected' from the otherwise adverse effects of discrimination. For those low in public CM, perceived discrimination was clearly and negatively related to well-being. The pattern emerging from the longitudinal analysis was different however. Now, the only reliable predictor of well-being was public CM. Importantly, a model in which the direction of the cross-lagged analysis was reversed (well-being predicting CM) proved to be unreliable.

Brown and colleagues extended this type of longitudinal design to include a third testing point in a 12-month prospective study of young South Asian (mostly of Indian origin) in the UK (Brown et al., 2013). Using specially designed child-friendly measures of acculturation attitudes, they observed that only those children high on both CM and DC ('integrationists') manifested an increase in self-esteem over time; the other three groups showed little or no change. However, such an integrationist outlook also proved to be somewhat of a two-edged sword for those children. Another measure of adaptation, teachers' ratings of the children's negative emotional symptoms, also proved to be

longitudinally – but *positively* – related to an integrationist attitude. In other words, at the same time that those children endorsing both CM and DC felt better about themselves, from the teachers' perspective they appeared to be exhibiting somewhat maladaptive behaviours. One explanation for these apparently contradictory findings is that the additional efforts that the integrationist children might have had to expend in engaging with both their own and the majority culture might have exposed them to more opportunities for teasing and name-calling patterned along ethnic lines. Other research, conducted among Turkish immigrants in Belgium, has also unearthed evidence for such ambivalent consequences of integration (Baysu, Phalet & Brown, 2011).

Of course, children's acculturation attitudes do not exist in a vacuum; their parents' views will undoubtedly play some role in shaping them. This issue was the focus of the final two studies we report in this section. Cordeu (2012) surveyed a small (N = 40) sample of immigrant children aged 5-17 years (mean age = 8.3), of whom those of Latin American origin comprised the largest single group (together with a diversity of other nationalities). As far as the children's own attitudes were concerned, the only correlates of self-esteem were DC (+) and perceived discrimination (-). However, Cordeu also asked the children what acculturation attitudes they thought their parents endorsed. These perceived parental acculturation attitudes proved more powerfully related to the children's self-esteem than had their own attitudes. Here, perceived parental DC (+) and perceived parental CM (-) were both related to the children's self-esteem. Moreover, the former relationship was moderated by the child's own level of DC: self-esteem was highest when both the child and the (perceived) parental levels of DC were high; in all other combinations it was noticeably lower. A rather different pattern emerged from Atzaba-Poria, Pike, and Barrett's (2004)

study of children (aged 7-10) and parents of Indian origin living in Britain (N = 66). These researchers investigated the link between acculturation preferences of parents and problem behaviour of children. They found that the more the parents maintained their cultural heritage, and the more they used Indian languages in interactions with their children, the fewer problem behaviours their children exhibited. It seems likely that the more homogeneous and culturally distinctive nature of the sample may account for the more prominent role of parental CM in this study. Also, note that these researchers studied *actual* parental acculturation attitudes rather than those as perceived by the child.

In summary, then, just as there is much variety in the modal acculturation attitudes to be found amongst ethnic minorities in Britain, so too is there variability in the correlations between those acculturation attitudes and psychological adaptation. In the methodological approach we have adopted, in which CM and DC (or CA) are separately assessed, it is possible to estimate their independent and combined associations with well-being. In some intergroup contexts, a positive interaction between the two dimensions proved to be the decisive predictor of well-being (Brown et al., 2013; Dimond & Brown, 2012); in others, CM alone was a more powerful correlate of well-being, perhaps because of the contemporary hostile climate faced by the minority group concerned (Muslims) (Okoh & Brown, 2014; Tip, Brown & Bond, under review). In one study, 'separatists' had the highest well-being (Fernandes & Brown, 2012), and in two further samples CM was unrelated to adaptation, whereas CA was a negative correlate (Zagefka et al., under review). Most of these effects were observed in public rather than private domains. As yet, the evidence is still too fragmentary to be able to attempt a convincing integration of these different results, but our guess is that eventually such an integration will reveal how the relationship

between acculturation attitudes and well-being will critically depend on the prevailing micro- and macro-climate confronting minority groups, much as Berry (1997) suggested some years ago (Brown & Zagefka, 2011).

19.3.4 *Acculturation and intergroup relations*

In the previous section, we noted how adaptation outcomes associated with different minority group acculturation orientations might depend on the intergroup context in which those minority groups were located. The concept of intercultural adaptation (see chapter 2) draws our attention to this important feature and outcome of acculturation. This brings to mind the classic definition of acculturation by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovitz (1936) which has served as a point of departure for many researchers in this field (see Chapter 2).

As that definition makes clear, acculturation is a process that has the potential to bring about change in *both* minority and majority groups. In chapter 2, the role of the larger society in promoting or constraining the acculturation strategies of non-dominant groups was emphasised (see Berry, 1980); do groups have the power to pursue their preferred way of acculturating? In this section, we investigate some of the implications of this intergroup perspective on acculturation. We begin with research which has examined how perceptions of the outgroup's acculturation orientation influence the acculturation attitudes of the ingroup. In that research we have also investigated relationships between perceived outgroup acculturation attitudes and the *intergroup* attitudes held by the ingroup. Finally, we show how own acculturation attitudes and intergroup attitudes are reciprocally linked.

In an era of mass communication, the opinions of different groups in society are widely available. For members of minority groups, learning of the acculturation attitudes of the majority via opinion polls or the speeches of politicians is likely to constrain the expression of their own acculturation preferences if these are at variance with their perceptions of the prevailing consensus in society. Given majority-minority power disparities, it may not be easy for minority group members to espouse integration (say) if they perceive the majority to hold an assimilationist outlook. In turn, majority group acculturation attitudes may be influenced by what they believe minority groups endorse, since the latter convey messages about current or future intergroup relationships. If the prevalent discourse in society is that minority groups prefer separation, this may provoke some reactance in the majority since they themselves may well prefer those groups to opt for assimilation or integration. There is more research on the influence of perceived minority acculturation preferences on the majority than vice versa.

In three studies involving white British participants, Tip and colleagues (2012) surveyed their perceptions of what acculturation strategies ethnic minority groups in Britain endorsed. In two studies, the minority was specified as Pakistani (a prominent and mainly Muslim group in Britain); in the third, the outgroup was more generically described ('ethnic minority members in Britain'). The majority perceptions of levels of CM endorsed by the minority were always significantly above the mid-point of the 5 point scale used; their perceptions of of DC and CA, on the other hand, were *below* the mid-point, although not always significantly. In other words, these majority members believed that ethnic minorities preferred separation as an acculturation strategy. Reference back to Table 2 reveals that, in fact, this was the modal strategy of minority groups in the UK in only two or three of the

nine studies. When those perceptions were correlated with the majority group members'

own multiculturalism attitudes, several significant associations were observed: perceived

CM was always negatively correlated with with own multiculturalism, while perceived DC

and CA were *positively* correlated. All these relationships appeared to be mediated by

perceived threat (a combination of symbolic and realistic threat – Stephan & Stephan,

2000). That is, the more majority members believed minority groups endorsed CM the more

threatened they felt; perceptions of minority group DC and CA were associated with less

threat.

Such correlational studies are silent on causality. To address that issue,

experimentation is necessary. Zagefka and colleagues (2012) presented white British

participants with one of four videos in which British Pakistani people discussed either their

acculturation preferences (Integration, Assimilation or Separation) or some neutral topic

(Control). Subsequently, the participants' own acculturation attitudes were assessed, along

with their levels of prejudice. Exposure to the videos had predictable effects on the

participants' acculturation attitudes: those who saw the Integration discussion showed

highest levels of support for integration themselves; those who watched the Separation

video showed the lowest levels of integration endorsement; while Assimilation and Control

participants occupied an intermediate position. This pattern was particularly clearly in

evidence for low prejudice participants and not visible at all among high prejudice people.

A similar experimental paradigm was devised by Tip, Brown, and Zagefka (under

review). White British participants were presented with a brief (fake, but apparently real)

web-site download in which two British Muslims were interviewed about their public

acculturation preferences (these were experimentally varied). The participants' own

acculturation preferences tended to track those of the interviewees: agreement with an integrationist attitude for the public domain was highest when the minority group members also endorsed public Integration, and lowest when they were seen publically to endorse Assimilation; those in the Separation condition were in between those two values. Perceived minority group acculturation attitudes also affected participants' liking for the Muslim interviewees: this was highest in Integration and Assimilation conditions, and noticeably lower in Separation (actually in the 'dislike' portion of the scale). This was followed by a further study in which Muslim acculturation attitudes in both public *and* private domains were independently manipulated and their effects on white British majority members' acculturation attitudes were assessed, again in both public and private domains. Muslims' apparent acculturation attitudes in public had the same effect as in the study just described, both on acculturation measures and liking. Curiously, however, Muslims' *private* acculturation attitudes had an exactly opposite effect. Now, the majority's agreement with public integration was highest when they perceived the two Muslims to be *assimilating* in private, and lowest when they perceived them to be integrating in private. Although the explanation for this reversal is not immediately obvious, it does underline the point that acculturation processes may have rather different dynamics in public than in private (Arends-Toth & Van de Vijver, 2004).

Tip, Brown and Zagefka (under review) applied the same experimental logic to a study with British Muslims . Muslims were more in favour of public integration when they believed that this was also the choice of the majority; they were least in favour when they thought the majority favoured a separatist outlook. A similar effect was observed when majority members' private acculturation attitudes were manipulated although the relative

preferences for integration in the Assimilation and Separation conditions were reversed. Once more, liking for the (majority) outgroup was highest when it appeared to endorse public integration, and noticeably higher than when the majority seemed to be in favour of public assimilation (here the mean liking was in the 'dislike' portion of the scale). Majority members' apparent attitudes about private acculturation elicited a different pattern of liking however: this time, they were liked most by Muslims when they were seen to favour private separation, and least when they were seen to support private assimilation (again in the 'dislike' region of the scale).

Kunst and Sam (2013) investigated acculturation preferences of British Pakistanis and also took into account their perception of assimilation expectations held by the British majority (PSAE) and their perception of separation expectations held by ethnic peers (PESE). PESE was positively related to their own preference for separation, but negatively to their preference for integration. PSAE and PESE were both positively correlated with stress. PESE was also indirectly related to social-cultural adaptation: a higher PESE led to an increased preference for separation, which in turn lowered socio-cultural adaptation. Furthermore, there were generational differences: First-generation immigrants had a higher preference for separation and experienced less PSAE and reported less stress than second-generation immigrants.

We have seen, then, that ingroup and (perceived) outgroup acculturation attitudes are closely intertwined. The same is true for ingroup acculturation attitudes and intergroup attitudes more generally. Not only are our acculturation attitudes influenced by what we may think the outgroup endorses, but our own prejudice levels are likely to influence those same acculturation attitudes. This was shown in a large cross-national study involving

23

majority and minority school students in the UK, Belgium and Germany (Zagefka et al., 2014). Employing a longitudinal design (with a six month time lag), Zagefka and her colleagues found that prior prejudice levels amongst majority adolescents were longitudinally related to their later acculturation attitudes: more prejudiced people were subsequently less in favour of CM for minorities but *more* in favour of their adoption of the majority culture (CA). The same relationships amongst minority members were much weaker and were in exactly the opposite direction (prior prejudice led to less CA and (non-significantly) to more CM). The reverse 'causal' paths – from acculturation attitudes to prejudice – mirrored these same relationships but were somewhat smaller in magnitude. However, one result from this reversed longitudinal analysis was of interest: majority members who initially endorsed integration (high CM and CA) tended to be less prejudiced six months later. The research reviewed in this section provides several vivid illustrations of the insights provided by Redfield et al.'s (1936) conception of acculturation. Beyond question, acculturation is a dynamic process involving the mutual adaptation of both majority and minority groups.

19.4. Policy implications

Before we can list the policy implications of this research, we first need to turn to the contemporary UK political climate: what are the latest developments in terms of immigration policies and immigration support (or non-support)?

Like many other European countries, anti-immigration political parties saw a rise in popularity in the UK in the first decade of the 21st Century. An example is the UK Independence Party (UKIP), notorious for its anti-immigration agenda, which enjoyed an increase in popular support in recent years (BBC, 2014a), culminating with electoral success

in the 2014 European elections, being the party with the largest share of the UK vote: 27.5%, as compared to 25.4% for Labour and 23.9% for the Conservatives (BBC, 2014b). In addition, the British Coalition Government (2010-2015), made up of a Conservative majority and a Liberal Democrat minority, consistently attempted to restrict immigration and immigrants' rights (Ford & Heath, 2014). The then Prime Minister, David Cameron, publicly expressed his negative views on culture maintenance when he blamed what he called the 'failure of multiculturalism' in the UK on a 'lack of adaptation' on the side of minority members (The Independent, 2011), thus revealing a common misconception of what acculturation really entails. Cameron, like some early acculturation researchers, seems to equate acculturation with assimilation (see Chapter 2). In fact, the only area of immigration that the 2010-2015 government expanded was refugee resettlement, and refugee resettlement constitutes only of a tiny percentage of the total immigration numbers (e.g., the 2013 target was to resettle 750 refugees in the UK, against a total of 526,000 immigrants in that year; ONS, 2014). Thus, there is very little political enthusiasm for UK immigration which makes it more difficult for minorities to adopt an integration strategy.

A recent analysis of the British Social Attitudes survey (BSA) shows that the attitudes of the British public are similar to these political trends: In 2013, 77% of British people wanted to see immigration reduced. This percentage has increased since 1995, when it was only 63% (Ford & Heath, 2014). The same survey also showed that 47% of British people thought that immigration has a negative economic impact, and 45% that the large number of immigrants undermines British culture. Despite these findings, Ford & Heath's (2014) analysis also supports the positive effects of intercultural contact which we also found in much of our acculturation research in the UK: the more migrant friends people had, the

more positive their opinions were about immigration. In addition, there were substantial regional variations. Londoners and those with migrant heritage (who are more likely to have regular direct contact with migrants) had more positive than negative views about the effects of immigration.

This is important because the studies described in the sections above indicate the importance of considering the wider acculturation context. That is, in contrast to what has been often been suggested in the acculturation literature, Integration does not always seem to be the most successful acculturation attitude for minority adaptation in the UK. In some studies it was associated with better well-being, but sometimes Separation was the more adaptive strategy. The variety in the results is not so surprising, considering the many contextual influences in play. First, the majority's attitude towards cultural diversity probably played a role. For example, minority members' perceived discrimination, and prejudice levels among the majority, both have an influence on the acculturation attitudes adopted and on their well-being. On the one hand, this is promising, because it means that by lowering prejudice and discrimination, the acculturation attitudes and their consequences can be improved. However, the political and popular climate in Britain towards immigration shows that there might be a steep hill to climb. Nevertheless, even if Separation might occasionally prove pragmatically adaptive for some minority groups, its widespread adoption would hardly be beneficial for the society as a whole. This underlines the importance of political elites avoiding rhetoric which is likely to worsen the multicultural climate in the country as a whole.

Another contextual effect is that of family and peers. Especially parental support for intercultural contact seems to be rather beneficial. This has implications for public

education policies. Public support for single faith schools is, at best, equivocal (Voas & Ling, 2010), and yet successive governments' policies over the past two decades have encouraged their expansion with no clear political mandate. It is clear that faith schools are counterproductive as far as promoting positive intergroup relations is concerned. By definition, such schools must offer fewer opportunities for direct intergroup contact than more heterogeneous schools, with corresponding negative implications for intergroup attitudes (Brown & Hewstone, 2005).

Taken together, the results of acculturation research in the UK suggest that policy interventions should be focussed on simultaneously encouraging the culture maintenance of minority members and culture adoption of the mainstream culture (or contact between majority and minority group members). This is the combination that was termed 'multiculturalism' in Chapters 2 and 22, and is clearly more complex than the common use of the term to refer only to 'diversity' (see, Berry & Sam, 2013). Regarding culture maintenance, policies should focus on fostering a climate that is more tolerant of diversity. For example, for the benefit of people belonging to religious minorities, employers could provide multi-faith prayer rooms to ensure that people of all faiths have an accessible space to practise their religion. There are encouraging signs that such diversity awareness is growing: since the 1980s, the number of multi-faith rooms in the UK has risen, particularly in the last decade (BBC, 2013).

Finally, it seems to be important to take the acculturation domain into account. Acculturation in the public domain seems to have more effects on well-being, and perceptions of acculturation preferences for the public domain have much stronger effects

than preferences for the private domain. This suggests that the interventions mentioned here would have more of an impact when they are implemented in the public domain.

In order to fully comprehend acculturation processes, we need to realise that they cannot be studied or understood in isolation: majority members' acculturation preferences influence those of the minority and vice versa; and the prevailing social climate in the country of settlement influences the acculturation preferences of both groups. Acculturation is a dynamic intergroup process, and this needs to be recognised and acknowledged by policy makers.

Footnotes

1. In this chapter we will use 'strategies', 'preferences', 'orientations' and attitudes interchangeably. In doing so, we do not wish to imply that all such acculturation attitudes are 'freely chosen' however. There may be many situational constraints mitigating against 'choice'. The majority group is, by definition, larger and usually has more of an influence on which acculturation strategies are available to minority members and, as a consequence, minority members are not always free to endorse whichever acculturation strategy they would like.

19.5 References

Abrams, D. & Houston, D. M. (2006). Equality, Diversity and Prejudice in Britain. Results

from the 2005 National Survey. Report for the Cabinet Office, Equalities Review.

Arends-Toth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: Views of

Dutch and Turkish Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 249-266.

Arends-Toth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2004). Domains and dimensions in acculturation:

Implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 28,*

19–35.

Atzaba-Poria, N., Pike, A., & Barrett, M. (2004). Internalising and externalising problems in

middle childhood: A study of Indian (ethnic minority) and English (ethnic majority) children

living in   Britain. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*(5), 449–460.

Baysu, G., Phalet, K., & Brown, R. (2011). Dual identity as a two-edged sword: Identity threat

and minority school performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 74*(2), 121-143.

BBC (2002). Britain 'a racist society' poll. Retrieved from

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1993597.stm.

BBC (2005). UK majority back multiculturalism. Retrieved from http:// news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi

/uk/4137990.stm.

BBC (2013). Nigel Farage calls for Syrian refugees to be allowed into UK. Retrieved from

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-25539843.

BBC (2014a). Farage: UKIP has 'momentum' and is targeting more victories. Retrieved from

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-27567744.

BBC (2014b) UK European election results. Retrieved from

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/events/vote2014/eu-uk-results.

Berry, J.W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed). *Acculturation: Theory, Models and some New Findings*, (pp. 9-25). Boulder: Westview.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*(1), 5-68.

Berry, J. W., Phinney, J., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Berry, J. W. & Sabatier, C. (2011). Variations in the assessment of acculturation attitudes: Their relationships with psychological wellbeing. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 658- 669.

Berry, J.W., Sam, D.L. (2013) Accommodating cultural diversity and achieving equity : An introduction to psychological dimensions of multiculturalism. *European Psychologist, 18,* (3),151- 157

Brown, R., Baysu, G., Cameron, L., Nigbur, D., Rutland, A., Watters, C., Hossain, R., Letouze, D., & Landau, A. (2013). Acculturation attitudes and social adjustment in British South Asian children: A longitudinal study. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39(12), 1656-1667.

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37,* 255–343.

Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2011). The dynamics of acculturation: an intergroup perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 129-184.

Commons Library Standard Note (2013). Unemployment by ethnic background. Retrieved from www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/sn06385.pdf.

Cordeu, C. (2012) *Children and parents' acculturation attitudes: implications for self-esteem of immigrant children and the role of perceived discrimination*. Unpublished MSc dissertation,   University of Sussex, UK.

Crosby, F. (1982). *Relative deprivation and working women*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dimond, N. & Brown, R. (2012) *Psychological Adaptation and Intergroup Anxiety Among Refugees and Voluntary Immigrants in Britain.* Unpublished MS, University of Sussex.

Donà, G., & Berry, J. W. (1994). Acculturation attitudes and acculturative stress of central American refugees. *International Journal of Psychology, 29*(1), 57 - 70.

Fernandes, N. & Brown, R. (2012) *Not too late to integrate!: Prediction of acculturation strategies on Muslims' self-esteem and intergroup attitudes.* Unpublished MS, University of Sussex, UK.

Ford, R. & Heath, A (2014). *Immigration: A nation divided?* In: A. Park, C. Bryson, and J. Curtice, (Eds.). British Social Attitudes: the 31st Report, London: NatCen Social Research. Retrieved from http://www.bsa-31.natcen.ac.uk/media/38202/bsa31_full_report.pdf.

Hossain, R., Watters, C., Brown, R., Cameron, L., Landau, A., Le Touze, D., Nigbur, D. & Rutland, A. (2007) Social Capital, Ethnicity and children's well-being: aspects of social capital in the everyday   lives of British Punjabi children.   *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care, 3*, 4-21.

Jaspal, R., Cinnirella, M. (2010). Media representations of British Muslims and hybridised threats to identity. *Contemporary Islam, 4*(3), 289-310.

Kunst, J.R. & Sam, D.L. (2013). Relationship between perceived acculturation expectations

and Muslim minority youth's acculturation and adaptation. *International Journal of*

Intercultural Relations, 37, 477– 490.

National Centre for Social Research (2013). *30 years of British Social Attitudes self-reported*

racial prejudice data. Retrieved from

http://www.natcen.ac.uk/media/338779/selfreported-racial-prejudice-datafinal.pdf.

New Policy Institute (2007). Poverty rates among ethnic groups in Great Britain. Retrieved

from http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/2057.pdf.

Okoh, E. & Brown, R. (2014) *Do Acculturation Attitudes and Generation Status Determine*

the Well-being and Intergroup emotions of African Immigrants? Unpublished MS, University

of Sussex, UK.

ONS (2013). Immigration patterns of non-UK born populations in England and Wales in

2011. Retrieved from http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/ons/dcp171776_346219.pdf.

ONS (2014). Migration Statistics Quarterly Report, May 2014. Retrieved from

http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_362934.pdf.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice:

judgments of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias.

Personality and Social   Psychology Bulletin, 27(5), 550-561.

Pew Research Centre. (2008). *The Pew Global Attitudes Report: unfavorable atttitudes of*

Jews and Muslims on the increase in Europe. Washington: Pew Research Center.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. NY:

Simon & Schuster.

Prokopiou, E., Cline, T., & De Abreu, G. (2012). "Silent" monologues, "loud" dialogues and

the emergence of hibernated I-positions in the negotiation of multivoiced cultural

identities. *Culture & Psychology, 18*(4), 494–509.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). Memorandum on the study of

acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*, 149-152.

Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or

bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-

identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(1), 49-65.

Snauwaert, B., Soenens, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2003). When integration does not

necessarily imply integration: different conceptualizations of acculturation orientations lead

to different   classifications. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 231-239.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S.

Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-45). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Strang, A. & Ager, A. (2010). Refugee integration: Emerging trends and remaining agendas.

Journal of Refugee Studies, 23, 589-607.

The Guardian (2013). UKIP's Nigel Farage shocks own party with call to let in Syrian

refugees. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/dec/29/nigel-

farage-ukip-syria-refugees.

The Independent (2011). *Cameron: My war on multiculturalism*. Retrieved from

http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/cameron-my-war-on-

multiculturalism-2205074.html.

Tip, L.K. (2013). *Causes and consequences of public and private acculturation preferences:*

Views of minority and majority group members in three countries (Doctoral thesis,

University of Sussex, United Kingdom). Retrieved from

http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/44726/1/Tip%2C_Linda_Kirsten.pdf.

Tip, L.K., Zagefka, H., González, R., Brown, R., Cinnirella, M., & Na, X. (2012). Is the biggest

threat to multiculturalism... threat itself? *International Journal of Intercultural*

Relations, 36(1), 22-30.

Tip, L.K., Brown, R., & Bond, R. (under review). Longitudinal effects of domain-specific

acculturation attitudes on well-being and intergroup emotions.

Tip, L.K., Brown, R., Collyer, M., & Morrice, L. (in preparation). Acculturation attitudes of

resettled refugees in the UK.

Tip, L.K., Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (under review). The role of domain specificity in meta-

perceptions of acculturation and acculturation preferences.

Van de Vijver, F. (2008). Method effects in the assessment of acculturation orientations are

real, but small. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*, 390.

Voas, D., & Ling, R. (2010). Religion in Britain and the United States. In A. Park, J. Curtice, K.

Thomson, M. Phillips, E. Clery & S. Butt (Eds.), *British Social Attitudes: the 26th Report* (pp.

65-86).   London: Sage.

Ward, C. (1996). Acculturation. In D. Landis & R. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural*

training (pp. 124-147). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zagefka, H., Binder, J., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A.,

Demoulin, S., Leyens, J-P (2014). The relationship between Acculturation Preferences and

Prejudice: Longitudinal Evidence from Majority and   Minority Groups in Three

European Countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44,* 578-589.

Zagefka, H., Mohamed, A., & Mursi, G. (under review). Antecedents of intra/ intergroup

friendships and stress levels among ethnic and religious minority members.

Zagefka, H., Tip, L., González, R., Brown, R., & Cinnirella, M. (2012). Predictors of majority

members' acculturation preferences: Experimental evidence. *Journal of Experimental Social*

Psychology, 48, 654-659.

Table 1 Endorsement of acculturation attitudes in Britain

	Culture maintenance desire (CM)	Culture adoption desire (CA)	Contact (DC)
Minority views			
Zagefka, Binder et al., 2014: Ethnic minority members (N = 101)	3.32	2.76	
Zagefka, Mohamed et al, under review: Female Muslims (N = 250) Somalis (N = 198)	4.44 4.47	1.89 1.89	
Tip, Brown & Bond, under review: Muslims sample Time 1 (N = 209)	4.62 (priv) 4.45 (pub)		3.66 (priv) 4.00 (pub)
Okoh & Brown, 2014, unpub.: African migrants to UK (N = 194)	3.61 (pub) 3.64 (priv)	2.40 (pub) 2.17 (priv)	3.65 (pub) 3.17 (priv)
Fernandes & Brown, 2012, unpub.: Muslims in UK (N = 91)	3.84	3.34	3.68
Dimond & Brown, 2012, unpub.: Refugees & others (N = 40)	3.73	4.10	
Brown et al., 2013: South Asian children (N = 215)	3.72		3.86
Cordeu (2012): Immigrant children (many from Latin America) (N = 40)	4.01		4.12

Tip, Brown, Collyer, &			
Morrice, in preparation:			
Resettled refugees (N = 278)	3.28	3.14	4.07
	Majority views		
Zagefka, Binder et al., 2014:			
White British (N = 255)	3.14	3.22	
Nigbur et al., 2008:			
White British children (N = 180)	3.58		4.18

Note. All measures were 5-point scales with higher values indicate more support for the acculturation dimension. Unless otherwise indicated, these attitudes referred to the public domain.

Table 2 Classification of people by acculturation strategy in Britain

	Integration	Assimilation	Separation	Marginalisation
Minority views				
Zagefka, Binder et al. (used CA): Ethnic minority members	10	12	42	36
Zagefka, Mohamed et al, under review (used CA):				
Female Muslims	7	3	84	6
Somalis	9	1	81	9
Tip, Brown & Bond, under review (used DC): Muslims	84.7 (pub) 61.2 (priv)	2.9 (pub) 2.4 (priv)	11.5 (pub) 34.0 (priv)	1 (pub) 2.4 (priv)
Okoh & Brown (using DC): Africans	54.1 (pub) 36.1 (priv)	18.5 (pub) 16.0 (priv)	17.5 (pub) 33.0 (priv)	9.8 (pub) 14.9 (priv)
Okoh & Brown (using CA)	14.9 (pub) 7.7 (priv)	5.2 (pub) 8.8 (priv)	56.7 (pub) 61.3 (priv)	23.2 (pub) 22.2 (priv)
Fernandes & Brown (used DC): Muslims	46.2	13.2	29.7	11.0
Dimond & Brown (used CA): Refugees and voluntary migrants	70.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Brown et al. (used DC): South Asian children	77	9	11	3
Cordeu (used DC): Immigrant children	75	10	10	5
Tip, Brown, Collyer, & Morrice, in preparation:				
Resettled refugees (**using DC**)	46.8 (pub)	34.3 (pub)	7.1 (pub)	9.3 (pub)
Resettled refugees (**using CA**)	26.1 (pub)	21.4 (pub)	28.2 (pub)	22.9 (pub)

Majority views				
Zagefka, Binder et al. (used CA): White British	11	30	31	28
Nigbur et al. (used DC): White British Children	61.1	21.1	7.2	10.0

Note. Percent of sample favouring each of the strategies, based on scale midpoint splits (those scoring at mid-point(3) were placed in the Low group on each dimension).