

Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM) in native and migrant adolescents

Acculturation processes and intercultural relations in peripheral and central domains among native Italian and migrant adolescents.

An application of the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM)

AUTHORS:

Tiziana Mancini

Department of Arts and Literature, History and Social Studies, University of Parma, Parma, Italy

Benedetta Bottura

Department of Arts and Literature, History and Social Studies, University of Parma, Parma, Italy

Correspondence to:

Tiziana Mancini, *Department of Arts and Literature, History and Social Studies, University of Parma, 43125, Borgo Carissimi 10, Parma, Italy.*

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is the examination of the quality of the intercultural relations in central and peripheral domains of adolescent life, through the application of the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM) of Navas and co-workers to a sample of 355 hosts Italians and 175 migrant adolescents. Participants completed a questionnaire similar to that used by Navas et al., reworked for a different context (Italian) and age (adolescents) and distributed in two versions: for hosts and for migrants. Differences both at an intergroup level of analysis (between hosts and migrants points of view) and at an intraindividual one (between acculturation strategies and attitudes) were explored referring to three central (family, religious and way of thinking) and three peripheral (school, economic habits and friendships/relationships) domains of acculturation.

For strategies, results about hosts' perspective showed a perception of migrants as separated, more in the central domain than in the peripheral one. This perception does not coincide with the choice of migrants who declared to use integration strategy in both kinds of life domains.

Also for attitudes results demonstrated high discordances: while migrants reported that they would prefer integration into the peripheral domain and separation into the central one, hosts reported that they would prefer migrants adopted assimilation, regardless of esteemed domains. These discordances at intergroup as well as at intrapersonal level of analysis, predict conflictual intercultural relations more in central than in peripheral domains. Data also showed that for host adolescents types of intercultural relations empirically predicted attitudes towards the immigrants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural heterogeneity has become a structural element of Italian Society that allows natives and migrants alike to have experiences characterized by daily contact between their values, belief systems, regulatory systems, styles of behavior and attitudes. These encounters create opportunities for exchange and sometimes direct conflict (Hopkins and Kahani-Hopkins, 2004). Understanding the multidimensional nature of these processes requires that we examine the relationships between those living in a particular place—in this study, Italy—and those arriving in that place (Berry, 1997; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault and Senécal, 1997; Chrysochoou, 2004; Liebkind, 2001; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga and Szapocznik, 2010), as well as that we consider changes both at a collective level—the social, economic, political spheres—and at an individual level—the values, attitudes and perceptions of the world—with implications also at an interpersonal level (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder, 2006), both for hosts and migrants (AUTHOR, 2006).

Numerous models have investigated the outcomes of intercultural contact in the last twenty years, providing explanations as to how indigenous and/or immigrant groups relate to their host society. Studies of the process of acculturation have utilized several models developed out of the bi-dimensional model developed by Berry and coworkers (e.g., Berry and Sam, 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997; Horenczyk, 1996; Krishnan and Berry, 1992; Navas, García, Sánchez et al., 2005; Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker and Obdržálek, 2000; Piontkowski, Rohmann and Florak, 2002; Sabatier and Berry, 1996; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga and Szapocznik, 2010). These models have tended to explain the results of intercultural relations, in the process calling into question a variety of social, cultural and personal variables and providing more dynamic views of means and outcomes of the contact that occurs between host and migrant groups. Examples in this direction include Bourhis and colleagues' (1997) *Interactive Model of Acculturation* (IAC) and Piontkowski and colleagues' (2000, 2002) *Concordance Model of Acculturation* (CMA).

Both expand upon Berry's (1990) model by combining different perspectives: that of ethnic minorities and of the majority group (Bourhis et al., 1997) and that of what ethnic minorities do and what they should do (Piontkowski et al., 2000, 2002). Indeed, both models have explored the *consensual*, *problematic* or *conflictual* nature of intercultural relations, which is derived from the match/mismatch between these different perspectives. However, what we want to point out here is that the interpretations the two models provide of intercultural relations differ according to the level of analysis being considered. In particular,

originating from the match/mismatch between the immigrants' and hosts' acculturation point of views, Bourhis et al.'s (1997) interpretation of the three types of intercultural relations tends to adopt an *intergroup level of analyses*. It consists of a comparison between the immigrants' maintenance of their culture of origin and/or adoption of the host culture, and the majority group's perception about immigrants' maintenance of culture of origin and/or adoption of the host culture. Piontkowski et al.'s (2002) interpretation of consensual, problematic (cultural- and contact-) and conflictual intercultural relations tends to adopt, instead, an *intrapersonal level of analyses*. It consists of a comparison between what immigrants really do and what immigrants should do, respectively, according to the expectations (or attitudes) and the perceptions (or strategies) of the majority group (Rohman, Piontkowski and van Randenborgh, 2008; Piontkowski et al., 2002). Moreover, Zagefka and Brown (2002) and Zagefka, Brown, Broquard and Leventoglu Martin (2007) offer another interpretation of intercultural relations that tends to adopt an *interpersonal level of analyses*. It originates from the comparison between the attitudes toward acculturation choices (what immigrant should do) and the perceptions of the out-group's attitudes toward acculturation strategies.

Despite their validity, these models present us with a number of limitations. First, they consider general acculturation options or with regards *perception of strategies* — that is, what the immigrants really do and what the natives think they really do — or with regards *attitudes* — that is, what the immigrants would like to do in their new society or what the hosts would like immigrants do in the host society — while they give little consideration to the type of intercultural relations derived from both kinds of comparison (Navas, Rojas, Garcia and Pumares, 2007). Quite a few researches have in fact combined acculturation behaviors and acculturation attitudes (Ward and Kus, 2012). Second, although some authors have suggested that the acculturation process does not take place in the same way in different areas of life, few have sought to measure this link, usually referring to acculturation processes in general or to the fields of values, language, culture and social relations (e.g., Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2003, 2004; Berry, 1990; Berry and Sam, 1997; Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov, 2002; Bourhis et al., 1997; Horenczyk, 1996; Navas et al., 2007; Nguyen, Messe and Stollak, 1999; Sue, 2002; Trimble, 2002). Moreover, few studies have simultaneously considered the double plane of options put into practice and preferred in different life areas by the respective contact groups (Navas et al, 2007; Zagefka et al., 2007). Contact groups and many others individual, psychosocial and contextual factors can indeed influence migrants' and hosts' behaviors and attitudes and

lead to more or less adaptive, not necessarily mutually exclusive, options (e.g., Berry, 2001; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001; Piontkowski et al., 1995; Piontkowski et al., 2002; Rudmin and Ahmadzadeh, 2001; Rudmin, 2006; Ward, 2001; Zagefka and Brown, 2002).

In order to simultaneously consider the double plane of acculturation options put into practice (strategies) and preferred (attitudes) in different life areas by the respective contact groups (host Italians and immigrant living in Italy), this research has chosen to apply the *Relative Acculturation Extended Model* (RAEM) of Navas and colleagues (2005, 2006, 2007), a model that has focused on efforts to integrate some of the salient features of previous models and to correct some of the mentioned limitations. In the literature, there have been a select few studies that have applied this model outside of the geographical context that produced it—Spain, and precisely the region of Almeria—and to age groups other than adults (e.g., Dupuis and Safdar, 2010; Ward and Kus, 2012). This lack of ubiquity in part explains our interest in extending RAEM to an Italian context and, more specifically, to an adolescent-aged population sample.

1.1 THE RELATIVE ACCULTURATION EXTENDED MODEL (RAEM)

The RAEM (Navas et al., 2005; Navas, Fernandez and Rojas, 2006) gathers some elements from previous models (e.g., Berry, 2001; Bourhis et al., 1997; Piontkowski et al., 2002) and adds some new ones in order to offer new explanations for the acculturation strategies and attitudes preferred by both the native and migrant population in different acculturation domains. The most relevant contributions of the RAEM can be summarized as, on the one hand, the differentiation between the acculturation *strategies* adopted in reality and the acculturation *attitudes* ideally preferred by the groups in contact, and on the other hand, the consideration of different acculturation domains (political, work, economic, family, social, religion and ways of thinking).

With regards the differentiation between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes*, the model introduces the possibility of taking into account not only the acculturation strategies that immigrants say to have put into practice and hosts perceive the immigrants really put into practice in the host society, but also the acculturation attitudes that immigrants would choose if they could and the host population would like to see adopted by immigrant groups that come into it.

As in the previous model, in the RAEM acculturation strategies and attitudes derive from the position that immigrants and hosts take on the two dimensions of *Maintenance of the culture of origin* and *Adoption of the host culture*. Anyhow, in this model there is no one single acculturation strategy or attitude. The acculturation process is *complex* (different acculturation options can be adopted and preferred at the same time) and *relative*, because “the same strategies are not always used or the same options preferred when the interaction with other cultures takes place in different domains (i.e., work, family relationships, religious beliefs and customs)” (Navas et al., 2005, 27).

Indeed, although previous authors have acknowledged the importance of dividing the general acculturation context into different domains (e.g., Berry and Sam, 1997; Horenczyk, 1996), the RAEM has subdivided the socio-cultural space into seven different domains within which different acculturation strategies and attitudes can be chosen. The domains of the RAEM have been situated along a continuum that arranges them according to their *peripheral* or *central* position in the culture of origin (Leunda, 1996) and researchers have hypothesized (Navas et al., 2005) that contact between cultures leads to different intercultural relations according to their relative position in the socio-cultural space. Data have confirmed this assumption (Navas et al., 2006), showing an easier process of mutual adaptation, with a tendency to prefer strategies of integration and assimilation both by host groups and migrant ones in more peripheral domains (e.g., political system, work, economy); a greater resistance to change, with a tendency for migrants to prefer separation from the host culture and for hosts to prefer assimilation or integration of migrants into the host culture in the central domains (e.g., family relations, friendships relations, ideology, and religion).

Because of its double point of view, its double perspective, and its domain vision of the process of acculturation, the RAEM model appears to be the most suitable from among recent models for the study of intercultural relations in contemporary Italian society, in particular to consider the points of view of adolescent migrants and hosts.

1.2 TEENS AND YOUNG MIGRANTS: WHAT STRATEGIES, AND WITH WHAT OUTCOMES FOR INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS?

There is a rich body of literature that examines acculturation strategies and their outcomes on socio-cultural adjustment and psychological wellbeing in adolescence, but not for their outcomes on types of intercultural relations. The level of acculturation arising from contact between groups has been in fact studied with a focus on: the psychological (e.g., Searle and Ward, 1990) and sociocultural adjustment processes (e.g., Ward, 1996); the sociocultural well-being of young migrants (e.g., Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997; Schwartz, Zamboanga, Rodriguez and Wang, 2007); the choice young migrants make to adopt or not to adopt certain habits, mannerisms and customs, including the language, lifestyles and values of the host culture (e.g., Giang and Wittig, 2006; Gil and Vega, 1996; Montaruli, Bourhis, Azurmendi and Larranaga, 2011); and the symptoms, as well as the resultant risks, of an inadequate process of adaptation to a new and foreign culture (e.g., Gil, Vega and Dimas, 1994; Phinney and Chavira, 1995; Sam, 1994; Vega and Gil, 1998).

In this regard, Berry et al. (2006) have provided the best comprehensive framework. The study in question was part of an extensive cross-cultural research project—the *International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth* (ICSEY)—conducted in 13 countries and involving 5,366 young migrants (between 13 and 18 years of age) belonging to different cultural groups, their families and their peers from the dominant group. Taking the two-dimensional model of acculturation as a reference, the authors reported the use of all four strategies of acculturation, with a prevalence of orientation toward integration, followed by an orientation toward their ethnic group (separation), by young people who lack a clear direction (marginalization) and, finally, by assimilation. The research has indicated that integration with respect to others' acculturation choices promoted better psychological and sociocultural adaptations (Vedder, Sam and Liebkind, 2007); the exclusive orientation toward the adolescents' ethnic group, rather than leading individuals to opt to assimilate, appeared to promote greater psychological well-being but at the cost of sociocultural adaptation (Berry et al., 2006). As was the case with other studies (e.g., Navas et al., 2006; Quiles, Rodriguez, Navas, Betancor and Coello, 2006), the results of this extensive cross-cultural research have confirmed the central role of the perception of discrimination and prejudice by the majority group in young migrants' choice of acculturation strategies and adaptation (Lee and Rice, 2007; Liebkind and Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000; Vedder et al., 2007)—in other words, the lesser the perception of prejudice and

discrimination, the greater the probability that the young migrants would choose to pursue a strategy of integration.

The ICSEY study has not considered the possibility that psychological well-being and sociocultural adaptation could vary according to the immigrant perception of what host peers expected them to do in terms of acculturation choices, or of what they would choose if they could. It has not considered the possibility that different strategies — and so different adjustment outcomes — could exist in different domains of socio-cultural space; for example, in those where it is easier to adopt the manners of the host culture, such as in schools habits, or in those where it is easier to maintain the culture of origin, such as in family relations. Research conducted into this topic typically has referred to or considered exclusively adult-aged migrants. Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2003, 2004) found, for example, that ethnic minorities tended to favor integration in public domains and segregation in private ones. Some examples nevertheless could be found also in the literature on adolescents, in which some authors have shown that the indicators of psychological and sociocultural adaptation has varied in different life spheres. Authors have considered language proficiency and ethnic identity (Pfafferott and Brown, 2006; Vedder and Virta, 2005), the amount and intensity of social contacts and friendships (Alreshoud and Koeske, 1997; Birman, 1998; Smith and Khawaja, 2011; Townsend and Poh, 2008; Zhang and Brunton, 2007), the family interactions (Abad and Sheldon, 2008; Nguyen et al., 1999), suggesting that the multidimensional assessment of psychological and sociocultural adaptation across life domains is conceptually useful in creating a differentiated and rich picture of the acculturation process (Birman et al., 2002). Nevertheless, none these researches have explicitly used a domain-specific model (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2003, 2004) in order to measure acculturation strategies of migrants and/or hosts adolescents. Nevertheless, direct comparisons of the acculturation strategies advocated for by host adolescents and those preferred or pursued by their migrant peers are scant in the adolescent-centric literature. Examples of such studies include those conducted in Holland by Verkuyten and colleagues, which demonstrated that minority groups expressed a greater preference for multiculturalism than did hosts (Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten and Brug, 2004; Verkuyten and Martinovic, 2006); those conducted in Finland, Germany and Israel, in which Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, and Schmitz (2003) found substantial discrepancies between the acculturation preferences expressed by young hosts and migrants, respectively; and the contributions made by Brown and colleagues,

which have shown that host adolescents believed that migrants endorse strategies involving adoption (integration and/or assimilation) much less and strategies involving maintenance (mainly separation) much more than migrants declare to do (Pfafferott and Brown, 2006; Zagefka and Brown, 2002). Although the relevant contributions of these studies, they do not consider the specific context in which the comparison may be applied (Ward, Fox, Wilson, Stuart and Kus, 2010). We think that the application of the RAEM model may help us overcome this limitation in the literature and study the complex and relative nature of acculturation process in adolescence.

1.3 AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

Starting from the assumptions described above, this study has aimed to make a contribution to knowledge of acculturation processes and intercultural relations among host Italian and migrant adolescents.

Before presenting the research aims and hypotheses, we report some notes on the particular intergroup context of this study setting. Immigration is a relatively recent phenomenon in Italy: beginning in the early 1970s, the immigrant population reached a significant size in the early twenty-first century. In the 2010, Italy had the fourth-largest immigrant population of any European country, with 4.2 million foreign-born residents (7% of its total population; 7.5% at January 1, 2011; Istat, 2011), placing it behind Germany (7.1 million), Spain (5.7 million) and the United Kingdom (4.4 million; Eurostat 2010). The largest immigrant group present in Italy is the people from Romania, resident in numbers approaching 1 million (21.2% of the total foreign-born population), but foreigners resident in Italy include nationals of a wide range of countries: the top 16 countries represented only 75.5% of the total number of foreigners residing in Italy on January 1, 2011 (Istat, 2011). Due to repeated periods of political uncertainty, the Italian model of integration remains under construction. In fact, on the one hand certain Italian laws (in particular, the Turco-Napolitano law, 40/1998) oriented the nation in harmony with the pro-migration and pro-integration policies advocated by the European Commission; on the other hand, laws such as the Bossi-Fini law of 2002 revised national policy regarding migrants' entry and duration of stay in Italy for purposes of work and access to asylum procedures in a more restrictive direction (Zanfrini, 2010). The Italian cultural climate in regard to inter-

ethnic relations and immigration seems primed to reject migrants, even more so in the aftermath of the humanitarian emergency and the concomitant influx of citizens from North Africa that occurred in April, 2011.

Within this setting, this research was designed to analyse how intercultural relations theoretically (Bourhis et al., 1997; Piontkowski et al., 2002) derived from acculturation processes, could change as a function of the central or peripheral areas of socio-cultural space in which they occur (Leunda, 1996). Referring to the RAEM model (Navas et al., 2005), in this research the acculturation processes is measured taking in to account both the acculturation options migrants actually use and what hosts perceived migrants to do, and the acculturation options that migrants prefer and hosts would prefer migrants to do. In the first case, defined as the real perspective, we refer to the acculturation *strategies*, in the second, defined as the ideal perspective, to the acculturation *attitudes*. Given the particular age range being considered and the specific developmental tasks that characterize individuals of that age, we considered school, consumer habits and friendships/relationships as peripheral domains of socio-cultural space and family relationships, religion and ways of thinking as central domains.

More specifically, the first aim of this research was to analyze the *types of intercultural relations* in the central and peripheral domains of socio-cultural space. Intercultural relations were examined considering the *consensual, problematic or conflictual outcomes*. In order to achieve this goal, two different levels of analysis were taken into account: a) at an *intergroup level of analysis*, host Italians and migrant adolescents' points of view on acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* in central and peripheral domains were compared according to the our interpretation of Bourhis et al. (1997) work; b) at an *intrapersonal level of analysis*, acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* as expressed by each group of participants in central and peripheral domains were compared according to the our interpretation of Piontkowski et al. (2002) work.

As has already been underlined, with the exception of Zagefka and Brown (2002), intercultural relations have thus far been analyzed among adult-aged population samples and as part of models that failed to take into account the different areas of individuals' experiences. Conversely, we expected that the types of intercultural relations could be related to the distinction between *central* and *peripheral* domains.

In respect to the types of intercultural relations derived from the comparisons between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* on an *intergroup level of analyses*, based on the adult-centric literature and relative to the comparison between the two points of view (hosts and migrants; or, intergroup level of analysis), we expected a greater level of agreement to exist between host and migrant adolescents in peripheral (school, relationships/friendships and consumer habits) as compared to central domains (family, religion and ways of thinking), with regard to both levels of reality considered (*strategies* and *attitudes*; Navas et al., 2007; **Hypothesis 1**). Research question 1 therefore reads: How do host and migrant adolescents differ in their acculturation strategies and attitudes across peripheral and central domains? Using domain non-specific models, most studies have found a preference for integration both in migrant groups and among members of the host society (e.g., Berry, 1997; Piontkowski et al., 2000; Zagefka and Brown, 2002). According to these studies and to the RAEM (Navas et al., 2005), we expected that in peripheral domains the agreement between host and migrant adolescents would be more on integration strategies/attitudes rather than the others model possibilities (**Hypothesis 2**).

In respect to the types of intercultural relations derived from the comparisons between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* on an *intrapersonal level*, and according to previous Navas et al.'s (2011) results, we expected a higher concordance (*consensual relations*) in the peripheral than in the central domains (**Hypothesis 3**) and a higher discordance (*problematic* and *conflictual relations*) in the central than in the peripheral domains for both groups of participants (**Hypothesis 4**).

The second aim of this research was to test whether the match/mismatch between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* for both groups of participants (types of intercultural relations) would predict the *attitudes toward the out-group*; in other words, we sought to test whether the theoretically expected types of intercultural relations - being conflictual or harmonious, as assumed in the previous sections of this work - could be empirically verified. Previous research has suggested that: a mismatch between hosts' and immigrants' preferred strategies yielded negative intergroup outcomes (Zagefka and Brown, 2002; Zagefka et al., 2007); a greater discordance between the host group's acculturation preferences and the strategies imputed to immigrants increased the perceived threat (Piontkowski et al., 2002; Rohmann et al., 2008) and prejudice against immigrants, especially in areas close to the core of the culture (Navas et al., 2011). In line with past studies, we expected that consensual intercultural relations would be associated with more positive

attitudes toward the out-group (lower perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts, lower intergroup bias, and lower negative emotional prejudice) as compared to problematic and conflicting relations (**Hypothesis 5**). Whether this relation varied according to acculturation domains and/or between host society and migrant adolescents was also a research question.

2. METHOD

2.1 PROCEDURE AND MATERIALS

This research used a structured questionnaire in two versions (one for hosts and one for migrants). It is a version of the questionnaire created and used by Navas et al. (2005) on a large sample of host and migrant adults in the region of Almeria, Spain, which has been adjusted for an adolescent-aged population and for an Italian context. The questionnaire consisted of many parts designed to detect and collect certain psychosocial variables and socio-demographic data, in addition to the information it had been designed to collect on *strategies* and *attitudes* of acculturation.

Acculturation strategies and attitudes. Changes from the Spanish adults' version included the wording of items and the domains of socio-cultural space used to measure acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes*. Six domains were analyzed: three related to the peripheral domains of *school* (e.g., matters, way of teaching), *consumer habits* (e.g., things that teens buy, how they spend or save money) and *friendships* (e.g., relationships with peers of the same country of origin and with Italian-native peers); three related to the central domains of *family relationships*, *religious choices* (e.g., beliefs, traditions and religious practices) and *ways of thinking* (e.g., principles and values that are considered important). For each of these domains, *strategies* and *attitudes* of acculturation have been reconstructed through responses to two questions: the first related to the *Maintenance of the culture of origin*, the second related to the *Adoption of the host culture* (see Appendix). Each response was measured using a 5-point, Likert-type scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very much), with the addition of an "I don't know" response that, depending on the area being assessed and planes of reality, were collected in 2%–12% of cases involving migrant adolescent participants and from 3%–16% of cases involving native-peer participants (see Appendix).

Psycho-social variables. These variables were measured using certain scales included in the Navas et al.'s (2005) original questionnaire. The *Perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts* measured the amount of tension participants perceived between the people of their country of origin and current Italians (3 items, $\alpha = .80$), using a 5-point, Likert-type scale (1 = none, 5 = very much); *Emotional prejudice toward the out-group* was adapted from the component of denial of positive emotions toward out-groups of the subtle prejudice scale (Pettigrew and Meertens, 1995) and measured the intensity of negative feelings (fear, mistrust, discomfort; 3 items, $\alpha = .65$) toward Italians, again using a 5-point, Likert-type scale (1 = never, 5 = very often); the *Ingroup bias* measured the amplitude of favoritism toward own ethnic group (positive values) on the bases of seven items (way of being and outlook on life, customs and food habits, hygiene and cleanliness, ways of speaking and communicating, beliefs about the relationship between men and women, religious beliefs and practices, education given to children), which were adapted from the component of exaggeration of cultural differences of the subtle prejudice scale (Pettigrew and Meertens, 1995). For each item, participants gave a judgment (1 = very negative, 5 = very good) referring both to their group of origin ($\alpha = .74$) and to the out-group ($\alpha = .88$). Ingroup bias was computed by subtracting the overall judgment attributed to the respondent's own ethnic group from that attributed to the out-group.

The two versions (host and migrant) of the questionnaire were administered in class, in the presence of a researcher. The delivery of the two different versions of the questionnaire was done on the basis of heritage indications (parents' country of origin) provided by school officials, ensuring that the responses of all participants would remain anonymous.

2.2 PARTICIPANTS

The study involved a group of 366 Italian and 187 migrant adolescents living in Italy. The responses of 11 Italian adolescents were excluded from subsequent analyses, as they declared that only one of their parents had been born in Italy (mixed families). In addition, 12 migrant participants were excluded from the analysis, 4 because one of their parents had been born in Italy (mixed families), 3 because both parents had been born in Italy, 2 because they declared the place of birth of one of their parents to be either Gales or Portugal and 3 because they had been adopted by Italian families.

Out of the 355 Italian adolescents included in the study, 196 were male (55.5%) and 158 (44.5) were female, and all were between 14 and 20 years of age ($M = 16.78$, $SD = 1.44$). In the migrant adolescents group, males were significantly underrepresented (69, 39.7%, Females 105, 60.3%) as compared to Italian adolescent participants [$\chi^2(1) = 11.72$, $p < .001$], and their mean age ($M = 17.08$, $SD = 1.60$, 14 to 22 years) was slightly higher [$F(1, 524) = 4.73$, $p = .030$] than that of the sample of Italian adolescents.

Among the 175 migrant adolescents, 14 (8.0%) were born in Italy and the rest claimed various nationalities, including: Moldova (31, equal to 17.7% of the migrant participants), Albania (17, 9.7%), Morocco (13, 7.5%), Peru (11, 6.3%), India (10, 5.7%), Côte d'Ivoire (10, 5.7%), Ghana (9, 5.1%), Romania (8, 4.6%) and an additional 20 nations at a low frequency.

Participants were drawn from three separate technical and professional high schools from a town in central Italy.

2.3. ANALYSIS OF DATA

The answers host and migrant participants gave to the items designed to measure *Maintenance of the culture of origin* and *Adoption of the host culture* with regard to both the three peripheral areas (schools, consumer habits, friendships) and the three central areas (family, religion, ways of thinking) were merged to create 16 synthetic indicators (2 levels of reality (strategies vs. attitudes) * 2 acculturation dimensions (maintenance vs. adoption) * 2 groups (host vs. migrant) * 2 domains (central vs. peripheral, each with 3 items). Four separate Principal Axis Factoring (PAF; with Varimax rotation and two-factor extraction criteria) were conducted on the total sample and Cronbach's reliability indexes had been checked on the two groups of participants (cf. Table 1). The results of the PAF confirmed the distinction made between the areas of schools, consumer habits and friendships (peripheral domains) and the areas of family, religion and ways of thinking (central domains).

As can be seen below (Table 1), the reliability indexes are acceptable overall, even if some appear to be lower than ideal. The lowest values observed in the peripheral domains are attributable to the conceptual distance between school and consumer habit areas on the one hand and that of friendships on the other (AUTHOR and Navas, 2012). Even if the elimination of friendship items from the peripheral domains' indicators will have led to a slight increase in the alpha

index, we decided to consider friendships to occupy a position in the peripheral domains because its introduction into the central domains' indicators would have involved a substantial reduction of internal consistency.

Also, three independent judges attributed the friendship items at the peripheral domain, justifying conceptually their choice on the bases of the age of participants. Finally, friendship was excluded from the items loaded in the peripheral domains to ensure it didn't substantially change the results.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

An independent *t* test was used to compare the two different points of view (those of hosts and migrants) with respect to the acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes*, while a paired *t* test was used to compare the two domain types (Hypothesis 1). In order to facilitate our understanding of the results, in each of the two domains the four strategies and attitudes of acculturation—*separation*, *assimilation*, *integration* and *marginalization*—were reconstructed using the theoretical median of the scale (= 3) as the breaking point of the distribution; the mean positions on the two indicators (*Maintenance of the culture of origin* and *Adoption of host culture*) were screened on a Cartesian axes plane with origin at the intermediate point of the scale (= 3). The proximity to and/or the distance from the positions expressed by the two groups (hosts and migrants) with respect to the four acculturation strategies (separation, assimilation, integration, and marginalization) in the two acculturation domains (peripheral and central) was used to get an impression of the distribution of the data and to test Hypothesis 2.

A paired *t* test was applied to each of the two socio-cultural domains and, separately, each group of participants was first used to analyze the level of concordance or discordance between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* (Hypotheses 3 and 4). According to the procedure laid out by Piontkowski and colleagues (2002), each participant was then assigned to one kind of intercultural relation on the basis of the expressed level of concordance and/or discordance observed between the real (*strategies*) and ideal (*attitudes*) perspectives (see Table 2). To simplify subsequent comparisons, only three types of intercultural relations were considered—consensual, problematic and conflicting—meaning we thus neglected the difference between culture-problematic and contact-problematic relationships.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The three types of intercultural relations were used to compare the hosts and migrants point of view and to check within each of them for differences between central and peripheral domains, through chi-square test. Finally, two analyses of variance with Tukey post-hoc tests were conducted separately on the host and migrant groups of adolescents, in which we considered the three types of intercultural relations as factors and the three indicators of negative attitudes toward the out-group as independent variables (Hypothesis 5).

3. RESULTS

3.1 ACCULTURATION STRATEGIES AND ATTITUDES ON AN INTERGROUP LEVEL OF ANALYSES: COMPARISON BETWEEN HOST AND MIGRANT POINTS OF VIEW (HYPOTHESES 1 AND 2)

The comparison between acculturation *strategies* adopted by migrant adolescents and those attributed to migrants in Italy by their host peers in peripheral and central domains of socio-cultural space, respectively, is presented in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Hosts and migrants tended to differ with respect to both dimensions of the bi-dimensional model: the mean position of the migrant participants was, in fact, significantly different from that of their host peers, both as regards the *Maintenance of the culture of origin*, $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.39$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 3.74$, $t_{\text{Peripheral}}(269.26) = 4.15$, $p < .001$, $d = .42$; $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.89$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 4.16$, $t_{\text{Central}}(511) = 3.02$, $p < .01$, $d = .28$, and the *Adoption of the host culture* $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.91$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 2.85$, $t_{\text{Peripheral}}(523) = -13.37$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.24$; $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.09$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 1.98$, $t_{\text{Central}}(311.81) = -10.91$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.07$. In both the peripheral and central domains, migrant adolescents reported keeping the traditions of their parents' country of origin significantly less often and having adopted the customs and traditions of the host culture significantly more often than their host peers believed migrants did in Italy (see ^a and ^b in Table 3).

Significant differences emerged from the comparison between the *peripheral* and *central* domains (Table 3) that was performed separately on the two groups of participants (see ^z and ^y in Table 3), on both the *Maintenance of the culture of origin*, $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.74$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 4.16$, $t_{\text{Hosts}} (340) = -8.05$, $p < .001$, $d = .48$; $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.39$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 3.89$, $t_{\text{Migrants}} (171) = -6.95$, $p < .001$, $d = .51$, and the *Adoption of the host culture*, $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 2.85$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 1.98$, $t_{\text{Hosts}} (340) = 16.16$, $p < .001$, $d = .93$; $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.91$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 3.09$, $t_{\text{Migrants}} (170) = 10.24$, $p < .001$, $d = .83$. In general, *host adolescents* believed that migrants were more inclined to maintain their culture of origin in the central domains of family relations, religion and ways of thinking than in the peripheral ones of school, consumer habits and friendships. The same participants believed that migrants tended to rarely adopt the host culture and that this would be more evident in a central domain as compared to a peripheral one. Nevertheless, for both acculturation domains, the mean values reported by host participants on Adoption dimension did not exceed the theoretical median of the scale, thus revealing a tendency to consider the acculturation strategies adopted by migrants as being primarily based on separation from the host culture. According to the perspective of their host peers, teenage *migrants* maintained their culture of origin significantly more often in the central domains as compared to the peripheral ones. However, as opposed to host adolescents, migrant adolescents declared that they felt they had adopted the customs of the host culture in both types of domain, although they did report having done so significantly more often in the peripheral domains than in the central ones.

Differences found between the two groups of participants in the two types of socio-cultural domains are made more evident in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Figure 1 clearly shows that, compared to the four strategies of acculturation provided by the two-dimensional model, the strategy of *integration* preferred by migrant participants is in opposition to the hosts' representation of migrants as preferring to be *separate*. With respect to the differences that emerged between the two domains of socio-cultural space, we can observe that migrants are higher in Adoption of host culture than in Maintaining culture of origin and hence more close to assimilation in the peripheral domains, while on the contrary they are higher in Maintenance than in Adoption in central one retaining therefore strategies

closer to those of separation. On the other hand host peers tended to attribute to migrants in Italy strategies more closer to those of integration in peripheral domains and separation strategies in central ones.

With regard to the *attitudes*, differences in the responses of host and migrant participants to the question of what hosts would like migrants to do and what migrants would like to do in the two different domains were also significant (Table 4).

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

With the exception of adoption of the host culture in the peripheral domains, the differences between hosts' and migrants' points of view were significant at the $p < .001$ level (see ^a and ^b in Table 4) in the other three comparisons. As can be noted from Table 4, migrant participants said they would like to *maintain the traditions* of their parents' country of origin both in the *peripheral* domains, $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.51$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 2.73$; $t(521) = -8.83$, $p < .001$, $d = .83$, and in the *central* ones, $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 3.86$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 2.55$, $t(414.00) = -11.84$, $p < .001$, $d = .11$, significantly more often than their host peers believed that migrants in Italy should . They would also like to *adopt* the customs and traditions of the host culture in the *central domains* significantly less often, $M_{\text{Migrants}} = 2.85$ vs. $M_{\text{Hosts}} = 3.36$, $t(400.27) = 4.72$, $p < .001$, $d = .45$, than their host peers believed migrants in Italy should (see ^a and ^b peaks in Table 4).

Comparing *peripheral* and *central* domains separately for each of the two groups of participants, significant differences emerged on both dimensions (see ^z and ^y peaks in Table 4): *Maintenance of the culture of origin*, $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 2.73$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 2.55$, $t_{\text{Hosts}}(344) = 3.28$, $p < .01$, $d = .16$; $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.51$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 3.86$, $t_{\text{Migrants}}(170) = -5.45$, $p < .001$, $d = .36$, and *Adoption of the host culture*, $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.55$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 3.36$, $t_{\text{Hosts}}(339) = 3.41$, $p < .01$, $d = .17$; $M_{\text{Peripheral}} = 3.64$ vs. $M_{\text{Central}} = 2.85$, $t_{\text{Migrants}}(168) = 10.47$, $p < .001$, $d = .88$. From the perspective of the host adolescents, migrants should in general look to adopt more elements of the host culture, although they reported having this opinion more often in the peripheral domains than in the central domains, where they nevertheless did feel that migrant adolescents should maintain less contact with their culture of origin than they would consider appropriate in the peripheral domains. On the other hand

differences appeared in the desires of migrant adolescents. As might be expected, their desire to maintain their culture of origin was higher in the central domains than in the peripheral domains, whereas their desire to adopt the host culture was higher in the peripheral domains. From the migrants' point of view, therefore, the integration of the two cultures was the alternative to which they would aspire in the peripheral domains. On the other hand, they showed a greater desire to maintain their heritage in the central domains. With regards to acculturation attitudes, host adolescents opposed the idea that migrants—regardless of the considered domain—should mainly seek to assimilate into the host culture (Figure 2).

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

In summary, with respect to the acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes*, Hypothesis 1 was not totally confirmed. In fact, greater agreement was found between host and migrant adolescents in peripheral domains than in central domains, but only surrounding the adoption of the host culture dimension and only for the *attitudes*. Significant mismatches emerged from the other comparisons. In the same way we did not find any agreement between host and migrant adolescents regarding integration strategies and attitudes pertaining to the peripheral domains (H2); counter to this, the data have shown a contraposition between the two points of view, with migrants showing a greater preference for integration with respect to both strategies and attitudes in peripheral domains, and hosts imagining migrants as separate but desiring that they assimilate in both acculturation domains.

3.2 COMPARISONS BETWEEN ACCULTURATION *STRATEGIES* AND *ATTITUDES* ON AN *INTRAPERSONAL LEVEL OF ANALYSES* (*Hypotheses 3 and 4*)

A paired *t* test comparison between the two perspectives (*strategies* vs. *attitudes*) showed that the host adolescents group exhibited significant differences ($p < .001$) on both dimensions (*Maintenance and Adoption*) and both types of considered domain (*peripheral and central*), which confirmed what has already been noted—that host participants attributed to migrants strategies based primarily on a desire for the

maintenance of their culture of origin while claiming that they should adopt more Italian customs and traditions in both the *peripheral*, $M_{Strategies} = 3.74$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 2.73$, $t_{Maintenance\ of\ culture\ of\ origin} (345) = 16.60$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.18$; $M_{Strategies} = 2.85$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 3.55$, $t_{Adoption\ of\ host\ culture} (348) = -13.17$, $p < .001$, $d = .77$, and *central domains*, $M_{Strategies} = 4.16$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 2.55$, $t_{Maintenance\ of\ culture\ of\ origin} (336) = 17.92$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.43$; $M_{Strategies} = 1.98$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 3.36$, $t_{Adoption\ of\ host\ culture} (331) = -16.26$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.25$.

There was slightly less of a discrepancy between the two perspectives of reality from the perspective of adolescent migrants; significant differences emerged only on *Adoption of the host culture*, and were more pronounced in the *peripheral domains*, $M_{Strategies} = 3.91$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 3.64$, $t (173) = 4.27$, $p < .001$, $d = .33$, than in the *central* ones, $M_{Strategies} = 3.09$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 2.85$, $t (167) = 3.00$, $p < .01$, $d = .23$. Migrants declared that they used cultural references of the host society more than they would like. A significant difference was found on the *Maintenance of their culture of origin* in the *peripheral domains*, $M_{Strategies} = 3.39$ vs. $M_{Attitudes} = 3.51$, $t (171) = -2.01$, $p = .046$, $d = .13$, where migrants affirmed that they referred to their culture of origin less often than they would like. Figure 3 shows the distribution of host and migrant participants deriving from the congruence/incongruence between acculturation strategies and attitudes in the two kinds of domains considered (see Table 2).

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

Comparisons between hosts and migrants' distribution in the three types of intercultural relations confirmed the tendencies highlighted above: in both acculturation domains, the differences between host and migrant participants were high and significant, $\chi^2_{Peripheral\ Domain} (2) = 113.78$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .48$; $\chi^2_{Central\ Domain} (2) = 58.67$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .34$. The mismatches perceived by host adolescents between acculturation strategies attributed to migrants and what they think migrants should do predicted more *conflicting* (*Adjusted Standardized Residuals*, $rsa_{Peripheral\ Domains} = 8.8$; $rsa_{Central\ Domains} = 6.1$) or *problematic* ($rsa_{Central\ Domains} = 2.1$) intercultural relations than those that emerged regarding migrants' points of view. Conversely, the convergence perceived by migrant participants in both acculturation domains predicted more *consensual* relationships ($rsa_{Peripheral\ Domains} = 9.7$; $rsa_{Central\ Domains} = 6.9$).

However, it is noteworthy that, whereas among migrant adolescents the outcome of consensual intercultural relationships was the most significantly over-represented in both types of domain [$\chi^2_{\text{Peripheral Domain}} (2) = 70.75$, $p < .001$, res. = 46.7; $\chi^2_{\text{Central Domain}} (2) = 100.27$, $p < .001$, res. = 57.7], for host participants, the concentration of cases in the three cells varied significantly only in the central domains [$\chi^2 (2) = 45.24$, $p < .001$], where there was a significant concentration of responses in the cell of conflictual reports (res. = 49.7).

As Figure 1 shows, the data partially confirm Hypotheses 3 and 4: the largest discrepancy between acculturation *strategies* and *attitudes* was in fact found in the fields that refer to the central domains of socio-cultural space (family relationships, religion and ways of thinking), where we found that conflictual relations were significantly overrepresented as compared to their occurrence in the peripheral domains but only among host group participants [Hypothesis 4; $\chi^2 (1) = 18.08$, $p < .001$]. To the contrary, a higher concordance (consensual relations) was found in the peripheral domains, where we found that consensual relations were significantly overrepresented as compared to the central domains but also, in this case, only among host participants [Hypothesis 3; $\chi^2 (1) = 17.16$, $p < .001$]. Therefore, it was in the central domains that intercultural relations seemed to exhibit greater extents of difficulty.

3.3 TYPES OF INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THE OUT-GROUP (Hypothesis 5)

Analyses of variance showed significant effects only for the host group of participants, for which the types of intercultural relations (consensual, problematic and conflicting) significantly predicted the *attitudes toward the out-group* (immigrants) in both acculturation domains. Specifically, the data have shown that, among host adolescents, *perceptions of intergroup tensions and conflicts*, $F_{\text{Peripheral domain}} (2, 321) = 17.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .09$; $F_{\text{Central domain}} (2, 342) = 7.16$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, *negative emotional prejudice toward migrants*, $F_{\text{Peripheral domain}} (2, 322) = 13.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; $F_{\text{Central domain}} (2, 343) = 9.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$, and *ingroup bias*, $F_{\text{Peripheral domain}} (2, 313) = 44.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .21$; $F_{\text{Central domain}} (2, 334) = 24.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$, were significantly lower in *consensual* than in *conflicting* types of intercultural relations. Nevertheless, post-hoc analyses (Tukey test; Table 5) revealed that, in 5 out of 6 comparisons, *consensual* relations differed significantly from *problematic* relations on measures of attitudes toward migrants. Only in the cases of

perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts, and negative emotional prejudice in the central domains problematic intercultural relations did not significantly deviate from conflicting ones. No differences emerged between the two acculturation domains.

In summary, the data confirmed that the match/mismatch between acculturation strategies and attitudes was able to empirically predict the *attitudes toward out-group*; that was true, however, only for host adolescents, whereas no significant relations were found for migrant participants. This is partly in line with the expectation of Hypothesis 5, in which we had assumed that harmonious intercultural relations are associated with more positive attitudes toward the out-group than problematic and conflicting ones.

4. DISCUSSION

Scarce are the acculturation studies applied to adolescence, a period characterized by developmental processes that are fundamental in structuring attitudes toward their own and others' cultural diversity. Consider, for example, how young migrants often find themselves making choices that involve modulation in the use of their different cultural references, especially between those of which parents are carriers and those learned or otherwise acquired from the host culture. In this respect, some research has shown that the adopted solutions—in terms of not only attitude and behavior toward acculturation (Berry et al., 2006), but also identity (Berry et al., 2006; LaFromboise, Coleman and Gerton, 1993; Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997)—most often involve different combinations of the two cultural references rather than a clear preference for one of the two cultural references. Overcoming at least in part this gap in the literature, this study confirmed that migrant adolescents adopt and prefer to adopt *integration* rather than acculturation strategies, even if they would prefer to retain more of the traditions of their family's country of origin, religion and ways of thinking (the central domains).

There are various personal and social factors that adolescence-focused literature has identified as predictors of the choice of acculturation of young immigrants (Berry et al., 2006; Vedder et al., 2007). The study of how these choices may depend on comparisons with the attitudes expressed by the host group, however, and on comparisons with immigrants' wishes in specific areas of life, still remains largely unexplored, at least in reference to subjects still in the midst of adolescence. It is in this area that the present study has sought to

place itself. We hypothesized that the results of these comparisons and, consequently, the different resolutions to the contact between different cultures (Bourhis et al., 1997; Piontowski et al., 2000), could depend on the socio-cultural domains involved in the choice. In particular, we hypothesized that intercultural relations in terms of conflicting or problematic versus consensual relations between hosts and migrants in the host country could be related to the centrality of the domains in which the acculturation choices could be made (Leunda, 1996). We considered the RAEM model the most useful in our efforts to verify the hypotheses laid out in this research and, above all, most useful in trying to orient our reflections on the problems of intercultural relations, beginning with the first theoretical proposal of Bourhis et al. (1997) and continuing through the work of Piontkowski and colleagues (2002), in a more contextual dimension. Based on the existing literature, which largely related to adult-aged migrants (e.g., Bourhis et al., 1997; Navas et al., 2006; Piontowski et al., 2002), we hypothesized that both intergroup comparison—that is, comparisons between the points of view of host peers and of migrants—and intrapersonal comparison—that is, comparisons between acculturation strategies adopted by or attributed to migrants and those desired by both groups—would have the potential to generate more conflicting intercultural relations in the central domains than in the peripheral ones, with host and migrant adolescents having agreed on integration and assimilation as the preferred acculturation strategies to be pursued in the peripheral domains.

Our results, however, have only partially confirmed these assumptions. Related to the *comparison between the two points of view*, Hypothesis 1 was, in fact, confirmed only with reference to the adoption of the host culture dimension (and not also for maintenance of the culture of origin) and only for attitudes (and not also for strategies), with the data revealing disagreement between host and migrant adolescents' points of view as generalized both to the peripheral and to the central acculturation domains. This disagreement seems to reflect inharmonious intercultural relations, as became more evident once we considered the acculturation strategies/attitudes declared by participants. Contrary to Hypothesis 2, we in fact observed that host adolescents tended to view migrants' strategies as primarily based on a desire to maintain *separation* from the host culture (and not to achieve integration, as had been speculated), attributing to them a stronger desire to preserve their culture of origin not only in the central domains of daily life such as family, religion and ways of thinking, but also, albeit with less intensity, in the peripheral domains of consumption habits, school affairs and friendship relations. In the same way, host participants expressed a clear desire to see migrants

assimilate to the dominant culture in both acculturation domains. Migrants did not agree with this representation since, on the one hand, they confirmed the maintenance of strong references to their culture of origin and, on the other hand, they also affirmed their desire to adopt the customs of the host culture, not only in the peripheral domains but also in the central ones, even if to a lesser extent. Their choices were based on attempts at integrating the two cultural references and this was in contrast with the hosts' representations, which were more focused on the perception of a rigid and polarized orientation to the culture of origin, especially in the central domains of socio-cultural space. It is curious to see how this attribution captured, albeit only in part, the desires of young migrants who had reported using the cultural references of the host society more than they would like in both domains. As such, the discrepancy between the two perspectives of reality was also associated with the desire to have a less-strong anchor to the culture of origin, but only in reference to the peripheral domains. Nevertheless, the mismatch revealed that in migrant adolescents and at the intrapersonal level of analysis, conflicting or problematic intercultural relations were not more frequent than consensual ones in central acculturation domains, as hypothesized. In fact, Hypotheses 3 and 4—according to which a higher concordance (consensual relations) would be more expected in the peripheral than in the central domains and a higher discordance (problematic and conflicting relations) in the central than in the peripheral domains—were verified only for host adolescents.

These results are only partly in line with those derived from researches that have analyzed adult-aged population samples, particularly those of Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2003; 2004), which showed that natives preferred the integration of Turkish minorities in both the public and private domains while minorities preferred integration only in the public domain while maintaining a practiced separation in private ones. Our data have confirmed instead those researches conducted on adolescents. In particular, with regard to the greater preference our migrant adolescents expressed for integration, results are in line with Dutch studies (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten and Brug, 2004; Verkuyten and Martinovic, 2006); with regard to the substantial discrepancies found between the acculturation preferences expressed by our host and migrant participants, results are in line with studies conducted in Finland, Germany and Israel (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2003).

Therefore our results have shown that, at least in adolescence, the need for identification with the culture of origin for young migrants may be strong, as may be the need to adopt the culture of their host peers. It is

possible to assume that this need is related to the identity construction processes that are central to adolescence (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997). Living or being born in the host country means having to cope with the task of building a bi-cultural identity. More data should be collected in order to statistically verify whether these needs are dependent on the ethnic group, on the cultural distance and/or on time spent in Italy. However, in accordance with studies that have examined adult-aged population samples (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2003; 2004), the data presented here have shown that it is in domains in which contact and comparison with host peers is less likely (e.g., central domains) that migrants feel a more pronounced need to identify with their culture of heritage. As Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) have shown, frequent interactions with the out-group (host group) are essential to reduce prejudice and therefore to improved integration strategies. Among our migrant participants, this need remained partially unfulfilled in practice, and it constitutes a need that should address host peers' expectations of assimilation. The opinions host participants have expressed in terms of the real and ideal acculturation choices seem symptomatic of a much more pronounced and polarized dissatisfaction than is found among migrant adolescents. Almost ignoring the possibility that a migrant can draw from multiple cultures and make choices that involve the simultaneity and/or the alternation (e.g., La Framboise et al., 1993, Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997) of their cultural references, the host adolescents who took part in this research did not hesitate to oppose the image of migrants as separate from the host culture, giving voice to the idea that they should assimilate in both considered domains. This probably generated in the host adolescents—and, to a much lesser extent, in their migrant peers—conflicting perspectives that contributed to the maintenance of negative attitudes toward migrants. Although the data analyzed in this study do not allow us to clearly define whether it is this intrapersonal contrast that has generated less favorable attitudes toward migrants or whether this contrast is itself the result of a more negative attitude toward migrants, we have confirmed (Hypothesis 5) that, in host adolescents, the cognitive mismatch between acculturation strategies and attitudes imputed to migrants empirically predicted worse *attitudes towards the out-group*, characterized by a greater perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts, a greater occurrence of negative emotional prejudice and a greater favoritism toward native Italians. Data have confirmed the findings of previous studies of adult-aged samples (e.g., Navas et al., 2011; Piontkowski et al., 2002; Rohmann et al., 2008) and adolescent-aged samples (e.g., Zagefka and Brown, 2002; Zagefka et al., 2007) and have shown that speculation about the types of

intercultural relations can be empirically verified. The fact that the same type of association has not been found in migrant groups is not surprising. As studies on Social Identity theory (Tajfel, 1982) have widely confirmed, to assert or defend own social identity, migrant minorities adopt strategies other than those based on discrimination against the host society group (AUTHOR, 2006). Further studies are needed to determine whether the intrapersonal mismatch perceived by migrants would be able to impact on their psychological well-being and socio-cultural adaptation.

Following Bourhis and colleagues' (1997) intergroup proposal about how the combination of two different points of view can generate consensual, problematic and conflicting relations, our data have shown that the most central domains were those in which it was presumably more difficult to create consensual relationships in adolescence. Both on real and ideal levels of reality, the positions expressed by migrants and hosts, respectively, tended to be either conflicting (for example, opposing the separation strategy to the integration one in both kinds of domains) or problematic (for example, opposing natives' attitudes of assimilation to the migrants' attitudes of separation in central domains).

Similar outcomes were found following Piontkowski and colleagues' (2002) intrapersonal proposal concerning the combination of the perspective of reality with that of expectations within or among each group of participants. Also in this case, and in part confirming Hypotheses 3 and 4, the conditions for more conflicting intercultural relations were found to exist in most central domains. Although such discordance was significantly greater among host adolescents than in migrant peers, in both groups of participants the largest discrepancy was found in central domains such as family relationships, religion and ways of thinking, confirming that these were the areas in which intercultural relations encountered greater degrees of difficulty.

The current study has several limitations. First, reaching a cause-and-effect conclusion about the impact of types of intercultural relations on attitudes toward out-group cannot be achieved based on this study's findings due to its cross-sectional design. For the same reason, this study does not allow us to define the extent to which the expectations of hosts can influence the choices and attitudes of migrants.

Within these limitations, these results highlight a potentially conflicting situation and therefore suggest the urgent need of applicative tracks aimed at improving consensual intercultural relations among young people, at least in an Italian context. In particular, tracks that allow native adolescents to restructure the often rigid

and polarized expectations on the one hand, and, on the other, tracks that help migrant adolescents become aware of the potential of their diverse cultural backgrounds.

5. REFERENCES

- Arends-Tóth, 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-Tóth, 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.
- Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives* (Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 37, pp. 201–234). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46*, 5–68.
- Berry, J.W. & Sam, D.L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J.W. Berry, M.H. Segall, C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, Vol. 3, Social behavior and applications* (pp. 291–326). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berry, J.W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 611–627.
- Berry, J.W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L. & Vedder, P. (Eds.) (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berry, JW. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*, 5–68.
- Birman, D., Trickett, E.J and Vinokurov, A. (2002). Acculturation and Adaptation of Soviet Jewish Refugee Adolescents: Predictors of Adjustment Across Life Domains. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30* (5), 585-607.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S. & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32*(6), 369-386.
- Chrysochoou, X. (2004). *Cultural Diversity: Its social psychology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Dupuis, D.R. & Safdar, S. (2010). Terror management and acculturation: do thoughts of death affect the acculturation attitudes of receiving society members? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34, 436- 451.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Eurostat (2010). Population of foreign citizens in the EU27 in 2010; <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>
- Giang, M.T. & Wittig, M.A. (2006). Implications of adolescents' acculturation strategies for personal and collective self-esteem. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12 (4), 725-739.
- Gil, A. G. & Vega, W. A. (1996). Two different worlds: Acculturation stress and adaptation among Cuban and Nicaraguan families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 13 (3), 435–456.
- Gil, A. G., Vega, W. A. & Dimas, J. M. (1994). Acculturative stress and personal adjustment among Hispanic adolescent boys. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 22 (1), 43-54.
- Hopkins, N. & Kahani-Hopkins, V. (2004). Identity construction and British Muslims' political activity: Beyond rational actor theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43 (3), 339–356.
- Horenczyk, G. (1996). Migrant identities in conflict: Acculturation attitudes and perceived acculturation ideologies. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 241-250). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Horenczyk, G. (1997). Immigrants' perception of host attitudes and their reconstruction of cultural groups. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 34–38.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., Horenczyk, G. & Schmitz, P. (2003). The interactive nature of acculturation: Perceived discrimination, acculturation attitudes and stress among young ethnic repatriates in Finland, Israel and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27 (1), 79-97.
- Krishnan, A. & Berry, J.W. (1992). Acculturative stress and acculturation attitudes among Indian immigrants to the United States. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 4 (2), 187-212.
- Istat (2011). La popolazione straniera residente in Italia. <http://www.istat.it/it/archivio/39726>
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin* 114 (3), 395-412.

- Lee, J. J. & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education, 53*, 381–409.
- Leunda, J. (1996). Relaciones entre grupo y sociedad. In Andalucía Acoge (Ed.), *El acercamiento al otro: formación de mediadores interculturales* (pp. 100–109). Sevilla, Spain: Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Asuntos Sociales.
- Liebkind, K. & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2000). The influence of experiences of discrimination on psychological stress: A comparison of seven immigrant groups. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 10*, 1–16.
- Liebkind, K. (2001). Acculturation. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 386- 406). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- AUTHOR, T. (2006). *Psicologia dell'identità etnica. Sé e appartenenze culturali*. Roma: Carocci editore.
- AUTHOR, T., & Navas Luque, M. (2012). Strategie e atteggiamenti di acculturazione. Adattamento del Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM) ad un gruppo di adolescenti italiani. In D. Giovannini & L. Vezzali (a cura di), *Immigrazione, processi interculturali e cittadinanza attiva* (pp. 243-254). Caserta: Edizioni Melagrana.
- Montaruli, E., Bourhis, R., Azurmendi, M.J. & Larranaga, N. (2011). Social identification and acculturation in the Basque Autonomous Community. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35* (4), 425-439.
- Navas, M. S., García, M. C., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernández, J. S. (2005). Relative acculturation extended model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 21-37.
- Navas, M., García, M. C. & Rojas, A. J. (2006). Acculturation strategies and attitudes of African immigrants in the south of Spain: Between reality and hope. *Cross-Cultural Research, 40*, 331-351.
- Navas, M., Rojas, A. J., García, M. & Pumares, P. (2007). Acculturation strategies and attitudes according to the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): The perspectives of natives versus immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*, 67-86.

- Marisol, M., Rojas, A.J. & García M. (2011). Concordancia entre actitudes y percepciones de aculturación de la población autóctona hacia los inmigrantes magrebíes: relación con las actitudes prejuiciosas. *Anales de Psicología*, 27 (1), 186-194.
- Nguyen, H. H., Messé, L. A., & Stollak, G. E. (1999). Toward a more complex understanding of acculturation and adjustment: Cultural involvements and psychosocial functioning in Vietnamese youth. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 5-31.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Meertens, R.W. (1995). Subtle and Blatant Prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal in Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Pettigrew, T.F. & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783.
- Pfafferott, I., & Brown, R. (2006). Acculturation preferences of majority and minority adolescents in Germany in the context of society and family. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 703–717
- Phinney, J. & Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 7, 3–32.
- Phinney, J. S. & Chavira, V. (1995). Parental ethnic socialization and adolescent coping with problems related to ethnicity. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5 (1), 31-53.
- Phinney, J. W ., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being. An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493-510.
- Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P. & Obdržálek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and nondominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 1-26.
- Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A. & Florack, A. (2002). Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 5 (3), 221-232.
- Poyrazli, S. & Grahame, K. M. (2007). Barriers to adjustment: Needs of international students within a semi-urban campus community. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 34, 28–45.
- Quiles, M.N., Rodríguez, A., Navas, M.S., Rodríguez, R., Betancor, V. & Coello, E. (2006). Variables moderadoras y mediadoras de la relación percepción de diferencias-ansiedad intergrupala. *Psicothema*, 18, 105-111.

- Roccas, Horenczyk & Schwartz (2000). Acculturation discrepancies and well-being: the moderating role of conformity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(3), 323-334.
- Rohmann, A., Piontkowski, D. & Van Randenborgh, A. (2008). When attitudes do not fit: discordance of acculturation attitudes as an antecedent of intergroup threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 337-352.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2006). Debate in Science: The case of Acculturation. *AnthroGlobe Journal*: http://www.anthroglobe.info/docs/rudminf_acculturation_061204.pdf
- Rudmin, F. W., & Ahmadzadeh, V. (2001). Psychometric critique of acculturation psychology: The case of Iranian migrants in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 41-56.
- Sabatier, C. & Berry, J. W. (1996). Inmigracion y aculturacion. In R. Y. Bourhis, & J. Ph. Leyens (Eds.), *Estereotipos, discriminacion y relaciones entre grupos* (pp. 217–239). Madrid, Spain: McGraw-Hill.
- Sam, D.L. (1994). Acculturation of young immigrants in Norway. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Bergen, Norway.
- Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Rodriguez, L. & Wang, S. C. (2007). The structure of cultural identity in an ethnically diverse sample of emerging adults. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 159-173.
- Schwartz, S.J., Unger, J.B., Zamboanga, B.L. and Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the Concept of Acculturation Implications for Theory and Research. *American Psychological Association*, 65 (4), 237–251. DOI: 10.1037/a0019330
- Searle, W. & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 449-464.
- Smith, R.A. & Khawaja, N.G. (2011). A review of the acculturation experiences of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 699-713.
- Sue, S. (2002). Foreword. In K. M. Chun et al. (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. xvii-xxi). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tajfel H. (1982), *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanaka-Matsumi, J., & Draguns, J. (1997) Culture and psychopathology. In J.W. Berry, M.H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, 2nd eds., Vol. 3: Social behaviors and applications* (pp. 413–448). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Townsend, P. & Poh, H. J. (2008). An exploratory study of international students studying and living in a regional area. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 18, 240–263.
- Trimble, J. E. (2002). Introduction: Social change and acculturation. In K. M. Chun et al. (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 3-13). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Vedder, P., Sam, D.L., & Liebkind, K. (2007). The Acculturation and Adaptation of Turkish Adolescents in North-Western Europe. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11 (3), 126-136.
- Vedder, P. & Virta, E. (2005). Language, ethnic identity, and the adaptation of Turkish immigrant youth in the Netherlands and Sweden. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 317–337
- Vega, W. A. & Gil, A. G. (1998). *Drug use and ethnicity in early adolescence*. New York, NY, Plenum Press.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic peer victimization and psychological well-being among early adolescents. In X. Chen, D. French, & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Peer relations in cultural context*. Cambridge7 Cambridge University Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Brug, P. (2004). Multiculturalism and group status: The role of ethnic identification, group essentialism and protestant ethic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 647–661.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2006). Understanding multicultural attitudes: The role of group status, identification, friendships, and justifying ideologies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 1–18.
- Ward, C. (1996). Acculturation. In D. Landis, & R.S. Bhagat, (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 124–147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ward, C., Fox, S., Wilson, J., Stuart, J. & Kus, L. (2010). Contextual influences on acculturation processes: The roles of family, community and society. *Psychological Studies*, 55 (1), 26-34.
- Zagefka, H. & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies, relative fit and intergroup relations: Immigrant-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 171-188.

Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Broquard, M. & Martin, S. L. (2007). Predictors and consequences of negative attitudes toward immigrants in Belgium and Turkey: Acculturation preferences, acculturation preference 'fit', and economic competition. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.

Zanfrini L. (2010). *Sociologia della convivenza interetnica*. Milano: Laterza.

Zhang, Z. & Brunton, M. (2007). Differences in living and learning: Chinese international students in New Zealand. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 124–140.

Table 1

Indicators used to measure attitudes and strategies of acculturation

Domains		<i>Maintenance of</i>						
		<i>the culture of</i>			<i>Adoption of</i>			
		<i>origin</i>			<i>host culture</i>			
		<i>n</i>			<i>n</i>			
		<i>n</i>	<i>item</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>item</i>	<i>α</i>	
<i>Acculturation strategies</i>	PERIPHERAL	Hosts	275	3	.30	308	3	.57
	(School, Consumer habits, Friendships)	Migrants	159	3	.60	167	3	.56
	CENTRAL	Hosts	279	3	.84	279	3	.80
	(Family, Religion, Way of thinking)	Migrants	155	3	.66	149	3	.72
<i>Acculturation attitudes</i>	PERIPHERAL	Hosts	286	3	.60	300	3	.55
	(School, Consumer habits, Friendships)	Migrants	161	3	.65	158	3	.56
	CENTRAL	Hosts	284	3	.82	293	3	.82
	(Family, Religion, Way of thinking)	Migrants	153	3	.72	149	3	.64

Table 2

Interethnic relations reconstructed according to the Concordance Model of Acculturation (CMA).

<i>Acculturation attitudes</i>		<i>Acculturation Strategies (real perspective: what they really do)</i>			
		Separation	Assimilation	Integration	Marginalization
(ideal perspective: what they should / would do)	Segregation	CONSENSUAL	CONFLICTUAL	PROBLEMATIC	PROBLEMATIC
	Assimilation	CONFLICTUAL	CONSENSUAL	PROBLEMATIC	PROBLEMATIC
	Integration	PROBLEMATIC	PROBLEMATIC	CONSENSUAL	CONFLICTUAL
	Exclusion	CONFLICTUAL	CONFLICTUAL	CONFLICTUAL	CONFLICTUAL

Note: Adapted from Piontkowski et al., 2002, p. 224.

Table 3

Acculturation *strategies* in the peripheral and central domains (descriptive statistics).

		Acculturation dimensions					
		<i>Maintenance of the culture of origin</i>			<i>Adoption of host culture</i>		
Acculturation domains		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
PERIPHERAL (School, Consumer habits, Friendships)	Hosts	348	3.74 ^{az}	0.74	351	2.85 ^{by}	0.87
	Migrants	173	3.39 ^{bz}	0.99	174	3.91 ^{ay}	0.83
CENTRAL (Family, Religion, Way of thinking)	Hosts	341	4.16 ^{ay}	0.98	341	1.98 ^{bz}	1.00
	Migrants	172	3.89 ^{by}	0.96	171	3.09 ^{az}	1.12

Note: ^{a, b} = Parameter that differ significantly ($t, p < .01$) between the two groups of participant (Hosts and Migrants);

^{y, z} = Parameter that differ significantly ($t, p < .001$) between the two types of domain (Peripheral and Central).

Table 4

Acculturation *attitudes* in the peripheral and central domains (descriptive statistics)

		Acculturation dimensions					
		<i>Maintenance of the culture of origin</i>			<i>Adoption of host culture</i>		
Acculturation domains		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
PERIPHERAL (School, Consumer habits, Friendships)	Hosts	350	2.73 ^{by}	0.96	350	3.55 ^y	0.95
	Migrants	173	3.51 ^{az}	0.92	174	3.64 ^y	0.80
CENTRAL (Family, Religion, Way of thinking)	Hosts	346	2.55 ^{bz}	1.26	340	3.36 ^{az}	1.20
	Migrants	171	3.86 ^{ay}	1.00	169	2.85 ^{bz}	0.98

Note. ^{a, b} = Parameter that differ significantly ($t, p < .001$) between the two groups of participant (Hosts and Migrants);

^{y, z} = Parameter that differ significantly ($t, p < .01$) between the two types of domain (Peripheral and Central).

Table 5

Consensual, problematic and conflicting intercultural relations and attitudes toward immigrants (perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts, emotional negative prejudice, and intergroup bias) in peripheral and central domains (descriptive statistics; Hosts, $n = 355$).

Acculturation domains		Intercultural relations			
		<i>Consensual</i>	<i>Problematic</i>	<i>Conflictual</i>	<i>Total</i>
Attitudes towards immigrants		<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
PERIPHERAL	Perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts (range: 1–5)	3.85 (0.60) ^a	4.09 (0.64) ^b	4.34 (0.62) ^c	4.08 (0.65)
	Emotional negative prejudice (range: 1–5)	3.02 (0.92) ^a	3.26 (0.99) ^a	3.69 (0.97) ^b	3.30 (0.99)
	Ingroup bias (range: 1–5)	0.98 (0.77) ^a	1.63 (1.07) ^b	2.20 (0.94) ^c	1.56 (1.05)
CENTRAL	Perception of intergroup tensions and conflicts (range: 1–5)	3.81 (0.64) ^a	4.08 (0.62) ^b	4.18 (0.65) ^b	4.08 (0.65)
	Emotional negative prejudice (range: 1–5)	2.85 (0.88) ^a	3.27 (0.97) ^b	3.50 (0.99) ^b	3.30 (0.99)
	Ingroup bias (range: -5–5)	0.89 (0.93) ^a	1.46 (1.00) ^b	1.91 (0.96) ^c	1.57 (1.04)

Note: ^{a, b, c} = Parameter that differ significantly (*Tukey test*, $p < .05$) among the three types of intercultural relations.

APPENDIX

<i>Level of reality</i>	<i>Acculturation dimensions</i>	<i>Migrant version items</i>	<i>Host version items</i>
<i>Acculturation strategies</i>	Maintenance of culture of origin	How much are you currently maintaining traditions of your country of origin, in each of the following domains or contexts?	How much do you believe that migrants in Italy are currently maintaining traditions they had in their country of origin, in each of the following domains or contexts?
	Adoption of host culture	How much have you adopted the traditions of Italy, in each of the following domains or contexts?	How much do you believe that migrants are currently maintaining Italian traditions in each of the following domains or contexts?
<i>Acculturation attitudes</i>	Maintenance of culture of origin	How much would you like to keep traditions of your country of origin, in each of the following domains or contexts?	How much would you like that migrants in Italy keep traditions they had in their country of origin, in each of the following domains or contexts?
	Adoption of host culture	How much would you like to adopt the traditions of Italy, in each of the following domains or contexts?	How much would you like that migrants in Italy keep Italian traditions in each of the following domains or contexts?
<i>Acculturation domains</i>			School consumer habits Friendships family relationships religious choices ways of thinking