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**Introduction**

In 2010, the foreign born comprise 9.4 per cent of the EU population, about 47 million people. About two thirds, 31 million people, were born outside the EU (Eurostat, 2011). For centuries European countries have been open societies. Exploration of trade opportunities and relations, colonization and de-colonization resulted in large scale migration flows leading many former colonial countries (U.K., France, The Netherlands, Belgium) to become even more ethnically and culturally diverse. In the past decades, labor immigration from countries such as Turkey and Maghrebi countries, followed by family reunification migration, further contributed to an increase of migrant stocks and diversity in EU receiving countries. More recently, asylum migration from countries such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, added even more numbers, contributing to even more social and cultural diversity. In the past decade, EU governments have become concerned about the acculturation process, involving both immigrant communities and native majority populations, leading to a decline in social cohesion, rise of xenophobia and populism (e.g. Breuil-Genier et al., 2011; Rudiger and Spencer, 2003). EU governments differ widely on how to prevent or cope with these phenomena leading to quite different immigration and integration policy orientations (Carrera et al., 2011; MIPEX, 2013).

The largest community in the EU with roots outside the EU is the Turkish community (Cornell et al., 2012). Bearing in mind the limitations of data sources on migrant populations, Fargues (2005) estimated that about 4.9 million first generation Turkish immigrants live in the EU (plus Switzerland). About 2.2 million of these are children, born and raised in the EU, called the Turkish second generation. The majority of the Turkish community (70%) lives in main urban areas of Germany, France (9%), The Netherlands (7%), Austria (5%) and Switzerland (3%).

While first generation immigrants are well-studied, research interest on the second generation is of more recent date (e.g. Alba and Nee, 2003; Berry et al. 2006; Berry and Sabatier, 2010; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). This is because they have now come to age and are becoming a growing subpopulation with social and economic dimensions in main cities of Europe. The Maghrebi and Turkish second generation are of particular interest as governments in some countries perceive their acculturation and economic integration as problematic. For instance, in the Netherlands, the multicultural policy orientation is cited to have failed by referring to the high school drop-outs among second generation Moroccan and Turkish students, and to the high unemployment and crime-rates of the Moroccan second generation. In Germany, there is concern about the development of parallel societies whereby the Turkish second generation is oriented more on the Turkish community and culture, than on wider German society. In France, the riots in banlieues, involving Algerian and Moroccan second generation youth groups pitched the cherished Republican model into crisis. The French second generation seem to face problems of identification which are potentially related to incompatibility of immigrant group norms and values and those of the national society in which they grew up (Becker, 2010; Crul and Schneider, 2010; Vermeulen en Penninx, 2000).

Regarding their acculturation, the second generation is raised at home in accordance with the value system in parents’ country of origin. Outside the home, in schools and in the streets of their neighborhood, they familiarize with national society norms, values and customs, and the expectations of the majority population towards immigrant groups (e.g. Mykyta et al., 2005). The latter is important because if expectations are not met this may lead to social exclusion, stigmatization and discrimination (e.g. Berry et al., 2006; Bourhis, et al., 2001). These expectations of the majority population are reflected in national immigration and integration policy
orientations. Policy orientations differ across EU countries. For instance, in France, the orientation is that people of immigrant origin are expected to fully assimilate and adopt the norms, values, and customs of the majority population. The Swedish and Dutch (at least up to 2000) policy orientation is quite different and inspired by the philosophy of multiculturalism.

Implication is that people of immigrant origin are expected to strike a balance between ethnic group norms, values and customs and those of national majority population. A high socio-cultural gap may lead to acculturative stress, adaptation difficulties and poor integration in the workforce. Acculturation thus involves both psychosocial and more distal contextual factors.

Using survey data collected in several European countries, this paper examines the antecedent of acculturation behavior - acculturation preferences- of the Turkish second generation in Europe. More specifically, we (1) assess and compare the acculturation preferences of second generation Turks who reside in main cities of six European countries, (2) identify and compare effects of psychosocial and contextual determinants of acculturation preferences. This research extends related previous research (Groenewold et al., 2013)

Conceptualization

Research on acculturation has a long history and can broadly be grouped into research on preferences, determinants, and consequences of acculturation (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2006). Acculturation preferences have mainly been addressed by Berry (1986 ) and colleagues (e.g. Bourhis et al., 1997; Navas et al., 2007). They argue that contact between members of the national society population and members of immigrant groups leads to adaptations in value systems of both groups. Persons may choose to apply national society norms, values and customs and those of the immigrant group. Based on the choices people make Berry classifies them into four acculturation categories (Figure 1): assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization.

Figure 1: Berry’s model of acculturation preferences (adapted from Berry, 1986; Berry et al., 1986)

The 'Integration' category comprises people combining the use of host culture norms and values in one domain of life (e.g. outside the home) with those of the immigrant
group in other life domains (e.g. at home). In the ‘Assimilation’ category are people who mostly refer to the host culture value system as guide to behavior while people in the ‘Separation’ category mostly refer to the immigrant group value system. The ‘Marginalization’ category comprises people who are neither explicitly guided by the immigrant group value system nor the host culture value system.

Berry’s typology derives from information on two orthogonal index scales. On the X-axis each person’s score on a ‘National Society Cultural Preference (NSP)’ index is recorded while the Y-axis records scores on an ‘Immigrant Group (Cultural) Preference (IGP)’ index. NSP values indicate the extent that a respondent prefers to take the host culture value system as guide to behavior, while IGP values indicate the extent that a respondent prefer to take the immigrant group value system as guide to behavior. At their midpoints, derived from applying the median or mean split method, the axis-scales are crossed, resulting in a quadrant comprising four acculturation preference categories (Donà and Berry, 1994). IGP and NSP scores of all respondents automatically lead to their classification into one of the four acculturation categories.

When it comes to examining determinants of acculturation, a coherent theoretical framework appears to be absent. Existing empirical studies include a wide range of determinants but interactions and mechanisms remain unspecified (e.g. Arentz-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2006). The interactive acculturation model (IAM) of Bourhis (et al., 1997) probably comes closest to such a framework. Among others, the model indicates that the migration and integration policy context is important in the formation of acculturation preferences of members of immigrant groups. Furthermore, exposure to the national society value system, cultural distance, and cultural vitality of immigrant groups are listed as important determinants of acculturation. Berry and colleagues (2006), among others, argue that that duration of residence, neighborhood characteristics and experiencing discrimination also impinge on acculturation.

These model and theories pertain to first generation immigrants and they do not specify to what extent they apply to the second generation, who are not immigrants themselves and have been exposed in schools and neighborhoods to national society norms, values and customs. Furthermore, they lack clear policy handles in the sense that application of the models in empirical research provide a direct link to (acculturation) behavioral change policies and programs. The latter is important in situations where a non-negligible proportion of the second generation positions in Berry's marginalization and separation quadrant (Figure 1).

We therefore ventured into other research domains in search for behavioral change theories that have been designed from a policy-handle perspective. We found that health research and health behavioral change policies (e.g. weight control, safe-sex behavior) are firmly rooted in behavioral change theories and models. They built on three main lines of psychosocial theories: Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986; 2001), the Theory of Reasoned Action and its elaboration into the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; 2005), and the Health Belief Model (Rosenstock, 1974; Glanz et al., 2002). Over the years these theories partly converged and reinforced each other by adapting and accommodating theoretical constructs operating as cognitive mediators of action.

A frequently applied model is the Health Belief Model (HBM). The model incorporates several concepts of social and cognitive psychological theories. The HBM predict health preferences and behaviour from determinants with clear policy handles. More specifically, the HBM contents that preferences and behaviour are
guided by perceptions about threats to some desired behavioural goal, by perceptions about benefits, barriers and cues to action regarding some instrumental behaviour contributing to the realization of the behavioural goal, and by a person’s perceived self-efficacy (e.g. Rosenstock, 1974; 1988). The latter refers to the control a person perceives to have over behaviour contributing to the successful realization of a desirable goal.

In the first column of Table 1 these six beliefs or perceptions about a particular preference or desired behaviour are presented.

Table 1. Adaptation of the Health Belief Model to explain integration preferences
(adapted from Glanz et al., 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HBM concept (1)</th>
<th>HBM applied to the distal goal of an HIV/STD-free life and condom use as instrument (2)</th>
<th>Generalization of HBM (3)</th>
<th>HBM applied to the distal goal of having integration preferences and social inclusion as instrument (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Perceived susceptibility</td>
<td>Perceived risk of becoming infected</td>
<td><strong>Perceived threat</strong> of acquiring undesirable state X</td>
<td><strong>Perceived threat</strong> to social inclusion (1+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Perceived severity</td>
<td>Perceived seriousness of becoming infected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Perceived benefits</td>
<td>Perceived benefits of condom use</td>
<td>Perceived benefits of implementing counteracting measure Y</td>
<td><strong>Perceived benefits</strong> of social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Perceived barriers</td>
<td>Perceived barriers to condom use</td>
<td>Perceived barriers to implementing counteracting measure Y</td>
<td><strong>Perceived barriers</strong> to social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cues to Action</td>
<td>Personal or environmental events motivating condom use</td>
<td>Personal or contextual events motivating a person to implement counteractive measure Y</td>
<td><strong>Cues to action</strong>, i.e. exposure to events motivating a person to exhibit behavior contributing to social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Confidence in one’s ability to successfully use condoms</td>
<td>Confidence in successfully implementing counteracting measure Y</td>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy</strong>, i.e. confidence in one’s ability to exhibit behavior contributing to social inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application of the model requires that, first, some distal preference or behavioral goal is identified and agreed upon (e.g. HIV/STD infection-free life). Then, an assessment is made of the extent that people perceive that this distal goal might not realize (i.e. perceived susceptibility), and how serious people perceive it if the goal would not be realized (i.e. perceived severity). The perceived susceptibility and severity constructs are often combined and referred to as ‘perceived threat’, which is easier to interpret and operationalize, and as it conveys a kind of ‘readiness to act’ in response to, yet unspecified, policy handles. Subsequently, an instrumental behavior or measure is identified which, if properly implemented, contributes to the realization of the stated goal. Then, the perceived benefits of and barriers to the instrumental behavior are
identified and assessed, and the ‘cues to action’. The latter are all external stimuli affecting the implementation of the instrumental behavior (e.g. important events in the household or community, certain policies, relevant behavior of role-models). Last but not least, each person’s self-efficacy is assessed. Self-efficacy beliefs, according to Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986), is the most pervasive mechanism of personal agency and “foundation of human agency” (Bandura, 2001, p. 10).

The second column illustrates how Glanz (et al., 2002) applied the HBM model to the distal goal of an HIV/STD infection-free life, and condom use as the instrumental safe-sex behavior. In the third column, we transformed the HBM in an abstract but portable form so that it can be applied more easily in other domains of study (e.g. Groenewold et al., 2012).

In the fourth column the HBM (column 4, Table 1) is applied to the distal goal of ‘having desirable acculturation preferences’ (of the Turkish second generation). We define ‘desirable’ as ‘having high scores on both NSP and IGP’, which is, positioning in Berry’s ‘integration’ quadrant (Fig. 1). This is a distal goal from a multiculturalist perspective on acculturation and migrant integration (e.g. Berry et al., 1977). Social inclusion is chosen as ‘instrumental behaviour or measure’ under the assumption that social life is conducted in a framework of relationships in which people seek inclusion and belongingness to a social group and the wider society in which they live. This also applies to migrants arriving in a new setting, and, in particular, to migrant children born and raised in a receiving society. The second generation is partially socialized by the majority population in schools and in the workplace, and they, in principle, seek inclusion and belongingness to both the national society in which they live and the ethic group to which they belong (e.g. Abrams et al. 2005; Alman, 2013). The ‘perceived threat’ construct evaluates a persons’ view about feelings and threats of social exclusion, while the other HBM constructs – perceived benefits, barriers, cues to action, and self-efficacy directly relate to the instrumental behavior of social inclusion.

Below, we identify and specify proxy indicators for each of these HBM inspired determinants of acculturation preferences of the Turkish second generation.

Data

Data of the TIES project (The Integration of the European Second Generation) were used. The second generation of three immigrant groups were sampled and interviewed in 15 major cities of 8 countries: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland and The Netherlands. Between June 2006 and December 2008, respondents were sampled and interviewed, covering issues such as educational attainment, labor market participation, cultural identity and preferences, discrimination experiences, religion and religiosity, social and familial networks. Respondents were persons in the age range 18 to 35 years old, born in the survey country with one or both parents born in Turkey, Morocco or Former Yugoslavia. A native comparison group of peers were also sampled and interviewed. We focus in this paper on the Turkish second generation. They were surveyed in most of the cities and are representatives of the largest immigrant group in the EU. In 2004, the survey countries comprise about 96% of the Turkish second generation in the EU plus Switzerland (Fargues, 2005; Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012).

Between June 2006 and December 2008, respondents were sampled and interviewed, about issues such as educational attainment, labor market participation, cultural identity and preferences, discrimination, religion, and migrant networks. In
each country, 500 respondents from each second generation group and 500 respondents from the national comparison group were sampled and interviewed. Comparison group members were sampled in the same neighborhoods as the second generation. In Dutch and Swedish cities, respondents were sampled from municipal population registers. In the German-speaking countries and France, access to the population register was not granted so that a database of first, middle, surnames and other person information was compiled from registers of different kind of institutions, such as electricity boards and phone companies. Using special screening software a sampling frame was constructed permitting sampling of second generation respondents. Native born comparison group members were sampled using a random walk strategy whereby the addresses of sampled second generation respondents served as reference point (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012).

Overall non-response rates were in the range of 40 to 60 per cent, which is high but not uncommon in surveys of immigrant populations in Europe (Stoop, 2005). Non-response bias was assessed using the response of interviewers on questions about how difficult it was to obtain information from each respondent. According to the Continuum of Resistance model (Lin and Schaeffer, 1995) difficult-to-reach respondents can serve as proxies for unobserved non-respondents. Easy and difficult-to-reach respondents differ regarding educational attainment and gender requiring derivation of non-response weights. Regarding item-non response, imputation was necessary in some cases, notably regarding the Dutch survey data. The general policy followed was to examine and compare relevant background characteristics of respondents and non-respondents, and accept the mode (nominal scale variables) or median (interval scale variables) of respondents as imputed value.

Sample design weights, population weights and non-response weights were combined and used in analyses to ensure that findings are, statistically speaking, representative for the Turkish second generation as a whole in these 11 cities (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012).

Methods

Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) is used to examine effects of HBM-inspired indicators on IGP and NSP, respectively. MCA assumes interval scale measurement of the dependent variable and nominal scale measurement of the independent variables. Therefore interval scale independents variables were converted into nominal scale variables whereby scores were categorized in low, medium or high. This conversion contributes to ease of interpretation of analytical results. MCA fits an additive model to the data, without the need to making assumptions about the shape of the relationship between independents and a dependent. The MCA statistical model is (Andrews et al., 1973, p.36):

\[ Y_{i,j,n} = \bar{Y} + a_i + b_j + ... + s_{i,j,n} \]

where,
- \( Y_{i,j,n} \) = The score on the dependent variable Y (NSP or IGP) of individual \( n \) who falls in category \( i \) of independent variable A, category \( j \) of independent variable B, etc.
- \( \bar{Y} \) = Grand mean on the dependent variable Y (NSP or IGP).
- \( a_i \) = The “effect” of members in the \( i^{th} \) category of independent variable A.
- \( b_j \) = The “effect” of members in the \( j^{th} \) category of independent variable B.
- \( s_{i,j,n} \) = Error term for this individual.
Application of MCA leads to estimates of grand means of IGP and NSP, respectively, and of estimates of deviations-of-grand-means for all independent variable categories. These deviation-estimates can be summed and added to the grand mean estimates of IGP and NSP, respectively, permitting the profiling of sub-groups with particular acculturation preferences and background characteristics.

Several indices were derived in this study. The indices of discrimination, religiosity, neighborhood quality and self-efficacy were derived using the optimal scaling technique of Categorical Principle Component Analysis (CATPCA) (Linting et al., 2007). The reliability indicator (Cronbach α) for the indices appeared to be “good” to “excellent” (i.e. 0.70 to 0.94, Table 2).

Indices were derived from country and ethic group specific data and were normalized before their use in model estimation based on a pooled country data.

**Indicators**

**Dependent variables**

The Immigrant Group Preference (IGP) index and a National Society Preference (NSP) index feature as dependent variables (i.e. axis-scales in Figure 1). As we cannot a priori assume that a given set of person characteristics has the same effect on IGP and NSP, we included them as two distinct dependent variables. Scores on IGP and NSP are derived independently and constitute X,Y-coordinates. These permit the positioning of each respondent in Figure 1, and derivation of the implied acculturation preference style. This can also be achieved for groups with particular background characteristics, or, background-tracing (profiling) of persons or groups positioning in a particular quadrant (separation, marginalization).

Studies essentially follow three different approaches to measure acculturation preferences: (1) ranking preferences of the four acculturation categories using vignettes, (2) assessing both preferences for immigrant group and national society values and then classifying respondents into four acculturation categories, and (3) simultaneous measurement of each acculturation preference styles using distinct subscales (Ward and Rana-Deuba, 1999; Berry and Sabatier, 2010). In our study, IGP and NSP were derived using the second approach, using the responses on four Likert items about acculturation preferences. Subsequent to the introduction statement “...The integration of people of immigrant origin in (survey country) is an important topic in political debates and in the media...”, the question was posed “....To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?... (1) At home, people of immigrant origin have the right to live as much as possible in accordance with the cultural customs and norms of their parents’ country of or region of origin; (2) At home, people of immigrant origin have the right to live as much as possible in accordance with the national cultural customs and norms; (3) Outside the home, people of immigrant origin have the right to live as much as possible in accordance with the cultural customs and norms of their parents’ country of or region of origin; (4) Outside the home, people of immigrant origin have the right to live as much as possible in accordance with the national cultural customs and norms.”

The phrasing of items is such that answers can be interpreted as a projection of respondents’ preferences. Response categories are (1) totally disagree,....., (5) totally agree. Response analysis of questions (1) and (3) resulted in a high (rank-) correlation and so did the analysis of questions (2) and (4). As the response on the
same question pertaining to different domains was similar (e.g. Berry, 2006) response scores on each pair of questions were summed leading to an IGP-scale based on questions (1) and (3), and a NSP-scale based on questions (2) and (4). Values, ranging from 2 to 10, were converted into Z-scores, and rescaled to a 0 to 5 range. Midpoints on IGP and NSP scales were derived by applying the mean split method (McIver and Carmines, 1981).

**Independent variables**

*Age* and *sex* are included as demographic control variables to ensure that effects of independent variables are not confounded by differences in age-sex composition.

We included *Educational attainment* as proxy for the duration of exposure to national society norms, values, customs, and to intercultural contact. High attainment implies a long exposure time and this is expected to be associated with high NSP scores. High attainment may also lead to high appreciation of one’s own cultural heritage (e.g. Odé and Veenman, 2003), and thus to high IGP scores.

Regarding the HBM-related independent variables, we had to search for proxy indicators among the available survey variables as the surveys were not designed to collected data on HBM-related factors. We included a ‘+’ or ‘-’ sign to indicate the expected direction of effects of HBM factors and proxy indicators on the two dependents, NSP-index and IGP-index.

1. **Perceived threat to social inclusion (-).**
   
   a. *The perception that respondent is being discriminated (-).* Experiencing discrimination, negative stereotyping and stigmatization, at school, at work, contributes to feelings of fear to be socially excluded. Such experiences may stem from judgments of members of the in-group (own ethnic group) or the out-group (national society population) (e.g. Alba and Nee, 2003). We included an index of perceived discrimination to represent fear of social exclusion. The index is based on seven Likert items on experience with discrimination at school, in the neighborhood, at restaurants and other leisure time destinations, at encounters with police and with government institutions. Item response was measured on a 5-point scale (1 Never to 5 Frequently). Index scores were classified into three percentile categories (low, medium, high). We expect that a high discrimination index score is associated with lower scores on NSP, and with higher scores on IGP.

   b. *The perception that the relationship between national majority population and the Turkish community deteriorated in recent years (-).* A deterioration of the relationship between the two groups may lead to higher inequality and exclusionary measures taken by the majority population. This can be perceived as a threat to social inclusion and identification with the majority population.

2. **Perceived benefits of social inclusion (+)**

   a. *The perception that living together with people of different origin in place of residence is enriching (+).* Under ideal circumstances, social inclusion in the wider society is associated with positive feelings towards members of other social groups, such as towards members of the majority population.
b. *The perception that the school-system in the country of residence offers equal opportunities to everybody (+).* The feeling of being socially accepted and included in a society is likely to foster positive evaluations about equal opportunities and chances, for instance in the educational system.

3. **Perceived barriers to social inclusion (-).**

   a. *The perception that differences in religiosity are high (-).* Differences in religiosity, within and between social groups, reflect cultural distance, which can be a barrier to social inclusion and integration. Various studies show that people integrate more easily into a new society if religious tolerance is high and religiosity levels are similar (e.g. Bourhis, *et al.* 1997; Foner and Alba, 2008; Pew Research Center, 2005). The Turkish second generation is predominantly Islamic and generally maintains stronger religious beliefs than their Christian peers in the national majority population. We constructed an *index of religiosity*, which was derived from the response on Likert item questions on (1) perceived importance of being member of a particular religious group, (2) perceived importance of being a religious person, (3) perceived strength of affiliation with one’s religious group, (4) perceived degree of similarity with members of one’s own religious group, (5) perceived personal relationship with God, (6) perception that religion is the ultimate political authority, (7) importance given to religious symbols in public to demonstrate religious commitment. Item response was measured on a 5-point scale (1 Totally agree to 5 Totally disagree). The actual religiosity index was constructed as a sum-scale whereby index scores were classified into three percentile categories (low, medium, high). We expect higher religiosity index scores to be associated with lower NSP scores and higher IGP scores.

   b. *Attendance of a primary school where the majority of children is of immigrant origin (-).* We included this indicator of the school environment because national society norms, values and customs are less likely to be actually applied in life at school. Such primary schools may reinforce feelings among migrant children that they indeed are different from, and socially excluded by, the majority population. The lack of intercultural contact with native born children also contributes to this.

4. **Cues to action contributing to social inclusion (+)**

   a. *Presence of a national integration policy orientation promoting social and economic participation, equal rights and social inclusion (+).* The policy orientation characteristic is represented by the variable ‘country’. The six countries represent three different types of policy orientations (inclusive, exclusionary, and assimilistic). The main policy orientation in Sweden and The Netherlands is inclusionary in that immigrants and their children are given the right to preserve their culture, they are protected by law against ethnic discrimination, and they have equal access and rights to all welfare state entitlements, including citizenship, as members of the national majority population. Policy orientations in the German-speaking countries are generally exclusionary in the sense that members of immigrant communities face much higher barriers to citizenship and welfare state entitlements. The French policy orientation is assimilistic. Immigrant community members have equal rights and access to welfare state entitlements and citizenship as native born French, but they are discouraged to preserve and cultivate their ethnic group identity contributing to the ideal of French monoculture (e.g.
(Crul et al., 2012; Huschek et al., 2012; MIPEX, 2011). Expectation is that highest NSP and IGP scores are found among respondents in countries with an ‘inclusive’ policy orientation (Sweden, The Netherlands).

b. The perception that neighborhood quality is high (+). Neighborhood quality affects feelings of social inclusion as people of immigrant origin living in neighborhoods of ‘concentrated disadvantage’ generally find it more difficult to find employment, good quality housing and education, and they perceive to be social excluded from the mainstream society (e.g. Mykyta et al., 2005). Conversely, in neighborhoods with a high concentration of immigrants where municipality and immigrant groups effectively cooperate and successfully upgrade housing and living conditions, immigrant community members feel more socially included and they show interest in the national society and its value system (e.g. Sampson et al. 1997). We constructed a neighborhood quality index based on seven Likert items that measure attachment to respondent’s neighborhood, contact with neighbors, contact with other people in the neighborhood, livability of the neighborhood, perceived control of vandalism, crime and garbage in the neighborhood. Item response was measured on a 5-point scale (1 ‘totally agree’ to 5 ‘totally disagree’). This index resembles Samson’s Social Cohesion and Trust Scale (Samson et al., 1997).

5. Perceived behavioral control (self-efficacy) (+)

The perception that respondent has control over behavior contributing to the realization of personal goals (i.e. social inclusion, high scores on NSP and IGP) (+). The surveys collected four of the ten items of the general self-efficacy scale (Schwarzer and Born, 1997). An index of self-efficacy could successfully be derived from items questions on: (1) whether respondent finds it is easy to stick to aims to accomplish goals, (2) whether most problems can resolved if respondent puts effort in it, (3) whether respondent generally finds solutions in case of trouble, and, (4) whether respondent is confident in successfully handling issues coming on his/her way. Item response was measured on a 4-point scale (1 not true at all...4 exactly true).

Main results

1. In most countries, respondents of the Turkish second generation maintain integration or assimilation preferences, but there are some salient differences between countries that may be related to: (1) country-specific integration policy orientation (e.g. France (assimilistic), The Netherlands and Sweden (inclusiveness, multiculturalism).

2. Indicators of the five HBM constructs showed effects in expected directions in the pooled analysis, but in some countries effects of some indicators are weaker than expected, or even absent. The latter may be influenced by the choice of proxy indicators for the five main HBM constructs as the TIES-project survey questionnaires were not designed for the measurement of HBM constructs.

3. According to expectation, the common set of indicators of acculturation preferences that we derived had quite different effects on the two dependent variables NSP and IGP. The indicators explained almost 30% of the variation in NSP while they only explained 9% of the variation in NSP. This means that
the HBM inspired determinants of acculturation preferences are of particular importance to be considered in promoting the national society cultural value system among the second generation.

4. The cues-to-action indicators (national policy orientation and neighborhood quality) contributed most to the explanation of preference for the national society value system (NSP), but also the perceived benefit indicators (perception that cultural diversity is enriching, and positive opinion about equal opportunities in the school system (and probably also in general) contribute in important ways to the explanation.

5. Also, the cues-to-action indicator ‘national policy orientation’ is important to the explanation of preferences for the Turkish ethnic group culture and value system. However, equally important is the perceived barrier indicator religiosity. A high religiosity is associated with strong preference for the Turkish ethnic group culture. Furthermore, the perceived threat indicator ‘discrimination’ and perceived barrier indicator ‘proportion of migrant children in primary school’ contribute in significant ways. A high perceived level of discrimination and being socialized in a primary school with a large proportion of children of immigrant origin are both associated with expression of high preferences for the Turkish ethnic group culture.
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