

Personality and Social Psychology

Young immigrants in Norway: The role of national and ethnic identity in immigrants' integration

SARAH E. MARTINY¹ , LAURA FROEHLICH,² JILWAN SOLTANPANAH¹ and MARIA S. HAUGEN¹

¹UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

²FernUniversität in Hagen, Hagen, Germany

Martiny, S. E., Froehlich, L., Soltanpanah, J. & Haugen, M. S. (2019). Young immigrants in Norway: The role of national and ethnic identity in immigrants' integration. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*.

The present work investigates the endorsement, antecedents, relationships, and consequences of young immigrants' social identities in Norway. Despite increasing numbers of refugees and immigrants entering Norway in recent years, little is known about the relationship between immigrants' different social identities and their feeling of integration into Norwegian society. The main goal of the present research is to fill this gap by investigating whether relationships found in other European countries replicate in the Norwegian context. In line with theoretical considerations and earlier international findings, results from two studies with different immigrant groups (Study 1: high school students; $N = 97$; Study 2: university students; $N = 93$) show that the more young immigrants in Norway endorse their national (i.e., Norwegian) identity, the less they endorse their ethnic identity (e.g., Kurdish). We further show that perceived conflict between the two cultures cannot explain the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity. In addition, immigrants' national identity endorsement is positively related to their dual identity endorsement (e.g., Kurdish-Norwegian). Positive contact with members of the receiving society predicts young immigrants' feeling of being integrated in Norwegian society and this relationship is mediated by national identity. Results are discussed in terms of the crucial role social identities play in immigrants' feeling of integration into European societies.

Key words: Immigration, social identities, integration, contact, perceived discrimination.

Sarah E. Martiny, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Department of Psychology, PO Box 6050 Langnes, 9037 Tromsø, Norway. Tel: +47 776 20721; e-mail: sarah.martiny@uit.no

INTRODUCTION

The number of immigrants and refugees entering Europe has substantially increased in recent years (Eurostat, 2017). Because of the severe humanitarian crises in different parts of the world (e.g., Syria), it seems likely that migration will continue. Political scientists assert that immigration has become a permanent feature on the European political agenda (Beckmann-Dierkes & Fuhrmann, 2011) and many researchers have argued that the integration of immigrants into multicultural societies is one of the biggest challenges of the twenty-first century (e.g., Deaux & Verkuyten, 2014).

Integration can be defined as having an equal opportunity to participate in central societal domains like the educational system and the labor market (OECD/EU, 2018), but it also encompasses identification with one's country of residence while maintaining identification with one's culture of origin (e.g., Berry, 1997). Research has shown that successful integration of immigrants (i.e., people who migrate and permanently reside in a foreign country), benefits both the immigrants and the receiving societies (e.g., Fratzscher & Junker, 2015). Therefore it has become increasingly important to investigate processes fostering the integration of immigrants into multicultural European societies. Recent research has also shown that specific features of the receiving country's socio-political context can affect immigrants' identity development and their integration (e.g., Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016). Thus, it is important to explore the factors contributing to immigrants' integration in diverse socio-political contexts and to test the validity of findings from one socio-political context in other

contexts in order to draw conclusions about the generalizability of theories and earlier empirical findings (Glöckner, Fiedler & Renkewitz, 2018). Therefore, the aim of the present paper is to test whether findings obtained in Central European countries such as Germany and the Netherlands (e.g., Martiny, Froehlich, Deaux & Mok, 2017; Froehlich, Martiny & Deaux, 2019; Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016) concerning the relationships between immigrants' different social identities as well as the antecedents and consequences of these identities replicate in the Norwegian context. In addition, we will extend earlier work by exploring what factors explain the expected negative relationship between immigrants' ethnic and national identity.

IMMIGRATION IN NORWAY

Exploring the antecedents and consequences of immigrants' social identities in Norway is important, as little social psychological research on immigrants has been conducted in Norway despite more than 40,000 refugees arriving in Norway in the last three years (SSB, 2018a). These new arrivals contribute to the steep increase in the number of immigrants in Norway in the last two decades: Whereas at the beginning of 1996 only 5.1% of the Norwegian population was immigrants (Vassenden, 1997), at the beginning of January 2005 they made up 8% of the population (Oppedal & Røysamb, 2007). Today about 17% of the Norwegian population are immigrants or Norwegian-born children of immigrant parents (SSB, 2018b). The percentage of immigrants in Norway's youth population is even higher: About 25% of the Norwegian population under 20 years of age are immigrants (SSB, 2018c). In 2018, about 50% of the immigrants were from

The data of both studies can be received on request from the first author (sarah.martiny@uit.no).

non-Western countries (SSB, 2018d), with the largest groups of non-Western immigrants coming from Somalia, Pakistan, Iraq, Philippines, and Syria (SSB, 2018e). The growth in the immigrant population in the past decades has transformed the formerly ethnically homogenous Norwegian society into an ethnically diverse and multicultural society (Oppedal & Røysamb, 2007) that faces similar challenges concerning the integration of immigrants as other non-settler European countries (e.g., Germany, the Netherlands).

Most of the existing research on immigrants in Norway has focused on immigrants' mental health and satisfaction with life (e.g., Berry, Phinney, Sam & Vedder, 2006; Oppedal & Røysamb, 2007; Sam, 1998, 2000; Virta, Sam & Westin, 2004). Therefore, more social psychological research based on findings from other European countries is needed to investigate the relationships between immigrants' multiple social identities in Norway as well as their antecedents and consequences. This research is important as it may inform governmental decisions about how to foster the integration of the large number of newly arriving immigrants and their children in Norway.

IMMIGRANTS' MULTIPLE SOCIAL IDENTITIES

As increasing numbers of people immigrate, many children and adolescents grow up in a culture that is different from their family's culture of origin. Thus, immigrant youth are exposed to two (or more) different cultures on a daily basis. This can lead to the internalization of more than one culture and identification with more than one ethnic group (i.e., multiple social identities; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). Immigrants often construct their multiple identities by identifying with their ethnic group of origin (i.e., *ethnic identity*, e.g., feeling Kurdish) as well as with the receiving society (i.e., *national identity*, e.g., feeling Norwegian; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind & Vedder, 2001). They can also identify with a combination of both groups (i.e., *dual identity*, e.g., feeling Kurdish-Norwegian; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Benet-Martínez & Hong, 2014; Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016). In migration research, dual identity has been defined and measured in different ways (Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016). It is most often measured either as high levels of identification with separate ethnic and national identities (e.g., Ng Tseung-Wong & Verkuyten, 2013) or as a direct measure reflecting the combination of the two underlying identities (e.g., Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Simon & Ruhs, 2008). In the present research, dual identity is conceptualized as a merged or blended identity (e.g., Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Roccas & Brewer, 2002), directly measured by identification with the hyphenated ethnic-national group (e.g., Kurdish-Norwegian).

Which Social Identity do Young Immigrants in Norway Endorse Most Strongly?

As outlined in the integrative model of identity formation (Deaux & Martin, 2003; McFarland & Pals, 2005; Schulz & Leszczensky, 2016), early in life immigrant children have a history of socialization experiences with their family and their ethnic group. Their ethnic group identity should therefore be chronically salient,

especially at a young age when they spend most of their time with their family members (Giordano, 2003; Phinney, 2006; Phinney & Ong, 2007). In addition, based on developmental intergroup theory (Bigler & Liben, 2006), ethnic identity should be more salient than national or dual identity for immigrant youth who belong to ethnic groups that are visually distinguishable from the receiving society. Being visually distinguishable will repeatedly lead to them being labeled as members of their ethnic group rather than as members of the receiving society (e.g., Khanna, 2004; Quintana, 1998; van Oudenhoven, Prins & Buunk, 1998). Especially for children, labeling is important as it gives them an understanding of which social categories are relevant in a specific social situation (Bigler & Liben, 2006). Finally, Norway is a country with strong assimilation norms (SSB, 2018f). In a study conducted by Statistics Norway, 49% of the Norwegian population completely or somewhat agreed to the statement "Immigrants should strive to become as similar to Norwegians as possible" in 2017 (SSB, 2018f). Research shows that in countries with strong assimilation pressure, immigrants can perceive this pressure as a threat to their ethnic identity. The perceived threat can in turn trigger a need to reassert their threatened identity and thus increase ethnic identity endorsement (Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007).

Whereas the influence of socialization experiences within families and the role of labeling for identity development are largely independent of specific socio-political factors (and thus should generalize across immigrant groups in different countries), increased ethnic identity endorsement triggered by threat should be most likely in countries with strong assimilation pressure. This theoretical claim is supported by research (e.g., Diehl & Schnell, 2006; Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Phinney, Berry, Vedder & Liebkind, 2006; Simon & Ruhs, 2008). In addition, research shows that immigrants report stronger dual identity endorsement than national identity endorsement in countries with strong assimilation pressure (Diehl & Schnell, 2006; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). In sum, based on theoretical considerations and earlier research, we predict that in Norway, a non-settler country with strong assimilation pressure, young immigrants (i.e., adolescents and young adults) will report higher ethnic than national identity and higher dual than national identity.

How do Young Immigrants' Social Identities Relate to Each Other?

Empirical evidence on the interrelations of identities is inconclusive. Some studies show that ethnic and national identity are unrelated (i.e., compartmentalized; Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Phinney *et al.*, 2001), whereas in other studies they have been negatively related (i.e., incompatible; e.g., Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016, Study 1; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007), or even positively related (i.e., compatible; Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016). These inconsistencies might be explained by context-specific variables such as the socio-political context (e.g., Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016), national history of immigration (e.g., Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012a), climate towards immigrants in the receiving society (e.g., assimilation

pressure; Phinney *et al.*, 2001), and perceived incompatibility of identities (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Schulz & Leszczensky, 2016; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012b). Earlier research suggests that a perceived incompatibility between two identities should result in a negative relationship between them. Researchers have argued that the incompatibility of two identities (for example, a negative relationship between the Norwegian identity and the Kurdish identity) can arise from conflicts between cultural norms and values that are attached to each identity (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Hirsh & Kang, 2016; Schulz & Leszczensky, 2016; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012b; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). In addition, in countries with strong assimilation pressure, earlier work has mostly found that dual and national identity are compatible, that is, positively correlated (e.g., Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). It has been argued that in these countries, one of the ways for young immigrants to maintain their connection with their culture of origin is to develop a dual identity that is constructed close to the receiving society's norms and values in order to avoid conflicts between the dual and national identity (Martiny *et al.*, 2017).

In the present work, we aim to replicate and extend existing literature by investigating the relationship between ethnic, national, and dual identity and the role of perceived cultural conflict with young immigrants in Norway. As outlined earlier, scant research on the contribution of psychological factors to immigrants' identity development and integration has been conducted in Norway. However, research from Germany has provided evidence for incompatibility between young immigrants' ethnic and national identity (Martiny *et al.*, 2017), and compatibility between young immigrants' national and dual identity (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Germany provides a comparable socio-cultural context for immigrants in Norway. Both countries have roughly the same proportion of immigrants (20% in Germany and 17% in Norway), a similar history of immigration (i.e., a traditional non-settler country with immigration starting in the 1960s as labor migration and more recently through asylum seeker, refugee, and family reunification programs), and a relatively strong assimilation pressure towards immigrants (SSB, 2018f; Zick, Wagner, van Dick & Petzel, 2001). Thus, based on these important similarities between the two countries, we predict that Norwegian immigrant youths' national and ethnic identity will be negatively related (i.e., incompatible). In addition, we predict that their national and dual identity will be positively related (i.e., compatible). As outlined earlier, perceived incompatibilities between identities can result from conflict between the two cultures' norms and values (e.g., Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Hirsh & Kang, 2016). Therefore, we explore what role perceived cultural conflict plays in the relationship between the national and dual identities of young immigrants in Norway.

Which Variables Predict Immigrants' Social Identities?

On the one hand, the integrative model of identity formation (Deaux & Martin, 2003) states that social networks play an important role in predicting identity formation. A person's social

identity is reinforced through participation in a social network, especially when others in the network recognize and accept that person's membership in the network (Deaux & Martin, 2003; McFarland & Pals, 2005). In line with this argument, previous research in different European contexts has showed that one important predictor of national and dual identity is contact with members of the receiving society (e.g., Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2012). More precisely, having positive contact and more friends belonging to the ethnic majority group is related to higher identification with the receiving society (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2012; Schulz & Leszczensky, 2016).

On the other hand, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986) and the rejection-identification model (Branscombe, Schmitt & Harvey, 1999; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002) predict that discrimination and negative experiences with members of the receiving society lead to reduced national identification and increased ethnic identification. Especially for immigrants who are visibly distinguishable from receiving society members, group boundaries can be perceived as impermeable, and thus they can only protect their positive social identity by increasing identification with their ethnic ingroup (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Empirical research supports these assumptions and consistently finds positive relationships between perceived discrimination and ethnic identity, and negative relationships between perceived discrimination and national identity (e.g., Alvarez, Juang & Liang, 2006; Branscombe *et al.*, 1999; Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Ramos, Cassidy, Reicher & Haslam, 2012; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007; but see Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Thus, in the present work, we investigate both positive contact and perceived discrimination as predictors of immigrants' multiple social identity endorsements. We expect that positive contact with receiving society members will predict stronger national and dual identity endorsement, whereas perceived discrimination will predict stronger ethnic identity and weaker national identity endorsement.

What are the Consequences of Immigrants' Social Identities?

The question of how to foster immigrant integration into Western societies is one of the central challenges of this century (Deaux & Verkuyten, 2014). Social psychological and immigration research has shown that feeling integrated and "at home" in the receiving society contributes to immigrants' successful integration and well-being (e.g., Berry, 1997). Immigrants' national identity has positive consequences for education, participation in the labor market, and feeling integrated into the receiving society (e.g., Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Nekby & Rödin, 2010; Nekby, Rödin & Özcan, 2009). For example, cross-sectional work in Germany showed that the more strongly adolescent immigrants endorsed their national identity and dual identity, the more strongly they felt integrated into the German society (Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, a longitudinal study conducted with immigrant children in Germany showed that the more these children endorsed their national identity, the more they endorsed integration norms (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019). Both cross-sectional and longitudinal results from Germany showed an indirect effect of contact with members of the receiving society

on integration and integration norms via stronger national identity. These findings highlight the significant role of national identity for immigrant youth's feelings of integration. However, before generalizing these findings and drawing conclusions for other cultures, it is important to test their validity in different cultural contexts (Glöckner *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, in the present work, we test whether these earlier findings from Germany hold true in the Norwegian context for young immigrants of different age groups (i.e., adolescents and young adults). We thus investigate whether positive contact with members of the receiving society predicts Norwegian immigrants' feeling of being integrated in society via their national identity.

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

The present research represents a third step in a cumulative research program investigating the importance of social identity for the integration of young immigrants in multicultural European societies. In a first step, we established how the different social identities of Turkish-origin adolescents in Germany are interrelated, as well as their antecedents and consequences in two cross-sectional studies (Martiny *et al.*, 2017). In a second step, we replicated these relationships over time in a longitudinal study with immigrant children in Germany (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019). These studies provided reliable cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence with two different age groups of immigrants in Germany. As a third step, the present research now aims to replicate these findings from Germany in a comparable sample of adolescent immigrants in Norway (Study 1). In addition, we test the predicted effects in a new sample of immigrant university students (Study 2) in order to test the generalizability of the findings to older, well-educated immigrants. Thus, in two cross-sectional, correlational studies with immigrant groups in Norway (high-school students: $N = 97$ and university students: $N = 93$), we tested the following predictions: H1 – immigrants will report higher levels of ethnic identity than national and dual identity; H2 – immigrants' ethnic and national identities will be negatively correlated (i.e., incompatible) and their national and dual identities will be positively correlated (i.e., compatible); H3 – contact with members of the receiving society will predict stronger national and dual identity; H4 contact with receiving society members will predict stronger perceived integration in Norway, mediated by stronger national identity; H5 – perceived discrimination will predict stronger ethnic identity endorsement and weaker national identity endorsement among immigrants (only tested in Study 2). In addition, we investigate whether perceived conflict between immigrants' culture of origin and the culture of the receiving society can explain the expected negative relationship between national and ethnic identity. Based on effects sizes from earlier work conducted in Germany (Martiny *et al.*, 2017), we expect moderate effects ($\beta = 0.35$) for correlations and regression coefficients as well as small-to-medium indirect effects ($ab = 0.15$). With these effect sizes, to achieve a power of 0.80 with a confidence level of 0.95, a sample size of $N = 100$ immigrants per study was recruited.

STUDY 1

Method

Participants. Study 1 was conducted with high-school students in the Oslo metropolitan area in 2016. To recruit participants, the third author, a Norwegian-Kurdish university student, contacted principals of high schools with large number of immigrant students. The student informed the principals about the study purpose and which student sample we aimed to recruit. When agreeing to participate, the principals informed the classroom teachers; classes with the highest proportions of immigrant students participated in the study. Participants were from ten different classes in three different schools. The analyses were conducted on the data from immigrant students. Ninety-seven immigrant students participated (42 male, 54 female, 1 missing), with ages ranging from 15 to 23 years ($M_{\text{age}} = 17.67$ years, $SD = 1.54$). Immigrant status was assigned to participants based on their own classification as immigrants or native Norwegians (for details see below in the Procedure). The largest participant groups came from Kurdistan¹ (12%), Pakistan (11%), and Poland (10%). About 70% of the participants came from non-Western countries.

Procedure. A female university immigrant student administered the materials. The study was conducted during school hours in students' classrooms. The experimenter first distributed two questionnaires to each student including a consent form. One questionnaire was for immigrant students and the other was for native Norwegians.² The experimenter then instructed the students to choose the appropriate questionnaire according to whether they were immigrants or were native Norwegian. Then the experimenter read the instructions in Norwegian aloud about the setup of the questionnaire and how to fill in the items concerning their immigrant background. The instructions also included a definition of culture and ethnicity (i.e., "Your ethnicity is the group of your ancestors you often share a language with." "Your culture is the group of people you share your traditions and often a language with."). In order to ensure that all participants understood the consent form, the experimenter read it aloud, informing the participants about the purpose and duration of the study (15–20 minutes) as well as their participant rights (e.g., participation was anonymous and voluntary). After written consent was given, the experimenter collected the consent forms separately and instructed the students to fill in the questionnaire. Because all participating students were attending Norwegian high schools that had Norwegian as the main teaching language, the consent form and the questionnaire were in Norwegian.³ Participants received a bar of chocolate as compensation for their participation.

Materials. The questionnaire consisted of 58 items. The scales will be reported below in the order in which they were assessed. Scales in Norwegian and English translation can be found in the Supplemental Material.

Social identities. Following the procedure by Martiny *et al.* (2017), national identity was measured first ("How Norwegian do you feel?"), then dual identity ("How Norwegian-[ethnic group] do you feel?") and then ethnic identity ("How [ethnic group] do you feel?"). Participants answered these items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *very little* to 5 = *very much*.

Bicultural identity integration. Next, participants' bicultural identity integration was assessed with the Bicultural Identity Integration Scale Version 1, BIIS-1 (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). This version contains eight items representing two subscales: four items measured cultural distance (e.g., "I keep [ethnic group] and Norwegian cultures separate") and four items measured cultural conflict (e.g., "I am conflicted between the Norwegian and [ethnic group] ways of doing things," Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.79$). Participants answered both scales, but as we only had hypotheses about the conflict subscale, in the following analyses, only the cultural conflict subscale was included. This and all following

scales, if not indicated otherwise, were assessed on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *completely disagree* to 5 = *completely agree*.

Contact with Norwegians. To measure participants' positive contact with native Norwegians we used a 3-item scale (Martiny *et al.*, 2017). This scale was a combination of quantity and quality of contact ("It is important for me to have contact with Norwegians"; "I have a lot of contact with Norwegians," "I like having contact with Norwegians"; Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.77$).

Perceived integration. Participants' integration into Norwegian society was measured by two items ("I feel more comfortable in my country of origin than in Norway" and "Norway is my home"; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Because these two items were not highly correlated, $r(95) = -0.51$, $p < 0.001$, both items were used separately in the following analyses.

Demographics. Participants indicated their age, gender, grade, and school.⁴

Statistical analyses. Analyses were conducted with SPSS version 25 (IBM, Armonk, NY). To examine the mean levels of identities (H1), we conducted a one-factorial repeated-measures ANOVA on identity endorsement (ethnic, national, and dual). Relationships between multiple social identities (H2) were investigated with bivariate Pearson's correlations. To investigate the prediction of multiple social identities by contact with members of the receiving society (H3), we computed multiple regression models predicting the three identities by contact with members of the receiving society. Finally, we computed a mediation models with the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2018) to test H4.

Results

Levels and interrelations of identities. We investigated mean differences between the three identities using repeated-measures analysis of variance. In line with Hypothesis 1, there was a significant effect of identity, Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.87$, $F(2,88) = 6.78$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.13$. Least significant difference post hoc tests showed that participants reported higher ethnic identity ($M = 3.90$, $SE = 0.14$) than national identity ($M = 3.03$, $SE = 0.15$; $p = 0.001$), and higher dual identity ($M = 3.58$, $SE = 0.14$) than national identity ($p = 0.002$). Ethnic identity and dual identity did not differ significantly ($p = 0.091$).

In line with Hypothesis 2, higher ethnic identity was associated with lower national identity (incompatibility), $r(90) = -0.45$ [-0.60 , -0.27], $p < 0.001$, and higher national identity was associated with higher dual identity (compatibility), $r(93) = 0.27$ [0.07 ; 0.45], $p = 0.009$. There was no relationship between dual identity and ethnic identity, $r(91) = 0.11$ [-0.10 ; 0.31], $p = 0.294$.⁵

Contact with members of the receiving society. Next, we tested whether positive contact with members of the receiving society predicted each of the three social identities using regression analyses. First, in order to test Hypothesis 3, we computed a regression model with national identity as the outcome and contact as the predictor, controlling for the other two identities. The model was significant, $F(3, 86) = 19.29$, $p < 0.001$, explaining about 38% of the variance. Contact significantly predicted national identity ($b = 0.59$ [0.25 ; 0.92], $\beta = 0.33$, $SE = 0.17$, $p = 0.001$), while controlling for the effects of ethnic identity ($b = -0.42$ [-0.61 ; -0.23], $\beta = -0.39$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < 0.001$) and dual identity ($b = 0.24$ [0.04 ; 0.43], $\beta = 0.22$, $SE = 0.10$, $p = 0.017$). The model for dual identity was

significant as well, $F(3, 86) = 7.87$, $p < 0.001$, explaining about 22% of the variance. Contact significantly predicted dual identity ($b = 0.64$ [0.09 ; 0.83], $\beta = 0.26$, $SE = 0.19$, $p = 0.015$), while controlling for the effects of ethnic identity ($b = 0.33$ [0.12 ; 0.54], $\beta = 0.33$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = 0.003$) and national identity ($b = 0.27$ [0.05 ; 0.49], $\beta = 0.29$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = 0.017$). Contact did not significantly predict ethnic identity ($b = -0.22$ [-0.58 ; 0.14], $\beta = -0.13$, $SE = 0.18$, $p = 0.230$).

Mediation models for feeling integrated. As outlined in the Method section, feeling integrated was assessed with two items focusing on two different components of feeling integrated (i.e., feeling at home in Norway; preferring the country of origin over Norway). These items did not correlate sufficiently to be combined into one score, $r(97) = -0.51$. Therefore, mediation models were computed with each item separately.

We first tested Hypothesis 4 by examining whether the relationship between contact with native Norwegians and feeling at home in Norway (the first measure of integration) was mediated by participants' national and dual identity (Process Model 4, Hayes, 2018, 50,000 bootstrap samples; see Table 1). Contact predicted national identity ($a_1 = 0.86$ [0.55 ; 1.17]), which in turn predicted feeling at home ($b_1 = 0.46$ [0.29 ; 0.63]). A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the specific indirect effect ($a_1b_1 = 0.39$ [0.21 ; 0.56]) was above zero. Contact also predicted dual identity ($a_2 = 0.50$ [0.18 ; 0.83]), which in turn predicted feeling at home ($b_2 = 0.26$ [0.09 ; 0.42]). The confidence interval for this specific indirect effect ($a_2b_2 = 0.13$ [0.02 ; 0.28]) was also above zero, as was the total indirect effect through both mediators (0.52 ; [0.30 ; 0.76]). Contact did not predict feeling at home independent of the mediators ($c' = 0.07$ [-0.22 ; 0.36]).

Next, we tested Hypothesis 4 with the second measure of integration, namely, whether the relationship between contact with native Norwegians and preferring the country of origin over Norway was mediated by participants' national and dual identity (Process Model 4, Hayes, 2018, 50,000 bootstrap samples; see Table 2). Contact predicted national identity ($a_1 = 0.86$ [0.55 ; 1.18]), which in turn negatively predicted preferring the country of origin over Norway ($b_1 = -0.44$ [-0.62 ; -0.25]). A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the specific indirect effect ($a_1b_1 = -0.38$ [-0.56 ; -0.20]) did not include zero. Contact also predicted dual identity ($a_2 = 0.50$ [0.18 ; 0.83]), but dual identity did not predict preferring the country of origin over Norway ($b_2 = 0.02$ [-0.16 ; 0.20]). The confidence interval for this specific indirect effect ($a_2b_2 = 0.01$ [-0.08 ; 0.12]) included zero. The confidence interval for the total indirect effect through both mediators did not include zero (-0.37 [-0.56 ; -0.16]). Contact did not predict preferring the country of origin over Norway independent of the mediators ($c' = 0.12$ [-0.21 ; 0.45]).

Due to the cross-sectional nature of the data, we also investigated reversed mediation models with national and dual identity as the predictors, contact as the mediator, and the two integration measures as outcomes. In three of the four models the indirect effect was non-significant (the confidence interval included zero). Only the indirect effect of dual identity on feeling at home in Norway via contact was significant, but this effect was smaller than in the theoretically driven model reported above (0.09 [0.02 ; 0.19]).

Table 1. Mediation model for the relationship of contact to feeling at home via national and dual identity (Study 1, N = 97)

Antecedent	Consequent											
		M1			M2			Y (Feeling at Home)				
		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p
X (Contact)	a_1	0.86 [0.55; 1.17]	0.16	<0.001	a_2	0.50 [0.18; 0.83]	0.16	0.003	c'	0.07 [-0.22; 0.36]	0.15	0.639
M1 (Nat. ID)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	b_1	0.46 [0.29; 0.63]	0.09	<0.001
M2 (Dual ID)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	b_2	0.26 [0.09; 0.42]	0.08	0.002
Constant	i_{M1}	-0.57 [-1.89; 0.75]	0.66	0.391	i_{M2}	1.48 [0.11; 2.85]	0.69	0.035	i_Y	1.45 [0.37; 2.53]	0.54	0.009
		$R^2 = 0.25$				$R^2 = 0.10$				$R^2 = 0.43$		
		$F(1, 89) = 30.19, p < 0.001$				$F(1, 89) = 9.47, p = 0.003$				$F(3, 87) = 22.14, p < 0.001$		

Note: Confidence intervals are displayed at the 95% level.

Table 2. Mediation model for the relationship of contact to preference for country of origin via national and dual identity (Study 1, N = 97)

Antecedent	Consequent											
		M1			M2			Y (Preference Origin Country)				
		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p
X (Contact)	a_1	0.86 [0.55; 1.18]	0.16	<0.001	a_2	0.50 [0.18; 0.83]	0.16	0.003	c'	0.12 [-0.21; 0.45]	0.16	0.462
M1 (Nat. ID)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	b_1	-0.44 [-0.62; -0.25]	0.09	<0.001
M2 (Dual ID)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	b_2	0.02 [-0.16; 0.20]	0.09	0.818
Constant	i_{M1}	-0.57 [-1.89; 0.74]	0.66	0.390	i_{M2}	1.48 [0.11; 2.84]	0.69	0.035	i_Y	3.03 [1.82; 4.24]	0.61	<0.001
		$R^2 = 0.25$				$R^2 = 0.10$				$R^2 = 0.22$		
		$F(1, 91) = 30.46, p < 0.001$				$F(1, 91) = 9.61, p = 0.003$				$F(3, 89) = 8.26, p < 0.001$		

Note: Confidence intervals are displayed at the 95% level.

Additional analyses: perceived conflict between the culture of the receiving society and participants' culture of origin. We tested whether the negative relationship between ethnic and national identity could be explained by perceived conflict between the culture of the receiving society and participants' culture of origin. We used partial correlations and controlled for perceived cultural conflict. When controlling for perceived cultural conflict, the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity remained significant, $r(86) = -0.45$ [0.27; 0.60], $p < 0.001$, indicating that perceived cultural conflict did not explain the negative relation of these two variables (all items, means, standard deviations, and correlations can be found in the Supplemental Material).

Discussion

The results of Study 1 supported our predictions and were mostly in line with earlier work testing similar hypotheses in samples of German immigrant youth (e.g., Froehlich *et al.*, 2019; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Adolescent immigrants in Norway reported higher levels of ethnic identity than national identity. In addition, national and ethnic identity were negatively related (i.e., incompatible), whereas national and dual identity were positively related (i.e., compatible). Positive contact with members of the receiving society predicted young immigrants' national and dual identity, which in turn predicted the feeling of being integrated into Norwegian society. For mediational analyses involving young immigrants' preference of their country of origin as the

criterion variable, the indirect effect was significant via national identity, but not via dual identity. Surprisingly, perceived conflict between the Norwegian culture and participants' culture of origin did not explain the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity.

In order to test the generalizability of the present findings for young immigrants of different age groups in Norway and to gain more insight into the role of perceived cultural conflict for the relationship between national and ethnic identity, we conducted a second study with a different immigrant sample. Instead of focusing on adolescents (i.e., high-school students), Study 2 investigated well-educated young adults (i.e., university students). In Norway, 33.4% of the general population (SSB, 2017a) and about 22% of the immigrant population (SSB, 2017b) has a university degree. By investigating immigrant students admitted to university, we thus chose a selective sample with higher education than the average immigrant in Norway. As education is a basis for socioeconomic participation and integration, we were interested in whether the pattern found in a broad sample of immigrant high-school students would replicate in an older and well-educated sample of immigrant university students. In addition, we included a measure of perceived discrimination to assess not only a positive factor of the social environment (i.e., contact with members of the receiving society) on different social identities, but also a negative factor. We thus aimed to investigate whether the proposed identity processes predicting higher perceived integration would generalize across immigrant groups in different stages of their education.

STUDY 2

Method. Participants. Study 2 was conducted with university students in Northern Norway. Participants were recruited by snowball sampling with a link to the questionnaire distributed through Facebook, the Learning Management System of the University (*Fronter*), and Twitter. One hundred and eight participants filled in an online questionnaire; of these, 93 reported being immigrants. Participants were identified as immigrants based on the following question: *Do you have migrant background?* (response options: yes/no). In addition, we asked in a next question: *If yes, please note the country you or your family came from in the box. By migration background we mean that you or at least one of your parents or grandparents have immigrated to Norway.* Analyses were performed only on the responses from those participants who had indicated having a migration background ($M_{\text{age}} = 27.69$ years, $SD = 8.19$; 63 female). The largest participant groups were immigrants from Western countries, namely Germany (11%), Russia (9%) and Sweden (9%) that were typically not visually distinguishable from Norwegians. Forty-four percent of the participants came from non-Western countries.

Procedure. Data were collected in the spring of 2018 using an online questionnaire. Participants answered 91 items in total. First, participants read the consent form and clicked the “continue” button to indicate their wish to participate in the study. In the consent form the participants were informed about the purpose and duration of the study (15–20 minutes), as well as their participant rights (e.g., participation was anonymous and voluntary). After questionnaire completion, participants had the option to save their email address in a separate folder to win a gift card for their participation. Email addresses could not be connected to questionnaire responses at any time.

Materials. Items are reported below in the order in which they were assessed. We used the same items as in Study 1 to assess participants’ national, ethnic, and dual identity. Next, we used the same four items from the BIIS-1 (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005) used in Study 1 to assess cultural conflict (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.83$). Then, we used the same items as in Study 1 to assess (positive) contact with members of the receiving society (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.76$) as well as immigrants’ integration (“Norway is my home” and “I feel more comfortable in my country of origin than in Norway”; Martiny *et al.*, 2017). Again, the integration items were not highly correlated, $r(93) = -0.54$, so the analyses were conducted with each item separately. Perceived discrimination was measured with nine items adapted from Noh and Kaspar (2003; e.g., “Because of my ethnicity I have been insulted or bullied,” Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.92$). Finally, we assessed demographics including age and gender.⁶

Results

Levels and interrelations of identities. Mean differences between the three identities were again tested using repeated-measures analysis of variance. There was a significant effect of identity, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.90, $F(2,86) = 4.89$, $p = 0.010$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.10$. However, in contrast to Hypothesis 1 and the results of Study 1, Least significant difference post hoc tests showed that participants reported lower ethnic identity ($M = 3.05$, $SE = 0.16$) than national identity ($M = 3.76$, $SE = 0.14$; $p = 0.005$), and lower dual identity ($M = 3.27$, $SE = 0.14$) than national identity ($p = 0.004$). Ethnic identity and dual identity did not differ significantly ($p = 0.202$).

In line with Hypothesis 2, analyses showed that participants’ ethnic identity was negatively correlated with their national identity (incompatibility), $r(90) = -0.46$ [-0.61 ; -0.28],

$p < 0.001$, and their national identity was positively correlated with their dual identity (compatibility), $r(90) = 0.24$ [0.03 ; 0.43], $p = 0.021$. In addition, there was a positive relationship between dual identity and ethnic identity, $r(90) = 0.26$ [0.06 ; 0.44], $p = 0.014$.

Contact with members of the receiving society. We then tested whether positive contact with members of the receiving society predicted the three social identities using regression analyses. To test Hypothesis 3, we computed a regression model with national identity as the outcome and contact as the predictor, controlling for the other two identities. The model was significant, $F(3, 84) = 20.68$, $p < 0.001$, explaining about 43% of the variance. Contact significantly predicted national identity ($b = 0.25$ [$0.00.04$; 0.47], $\beta = 0.20$, $SE = 0.11$, $p = 0.023$), while controlling for ethnic identity ($b = -0.67$ [-0.89 ; -0.46], $\beta = -0.55$, $SE = 0.11$, $p < 0.001$) and dual identity ($b = 0.54$ [0.30 ; 0.77], $\beta = 0.39$, $SE = 0.12$, $p < 0.001$). Contact with members of the receiving society predicted neither dual identity ($p = 0.692$) nor ethnic identity ($p = 0.964$).

Mediation models for feeling integrated. As reported above, contact with members of the receiving society was positively related to participants’ national identity, but not to their dual identity. Therefore, we tested Hypothesis 4 only for national identity (Process Model 4, Hayes, 2018, 50,000 bootstrap samples; see Table 3) with the first measure of integration as the outcome (“Norway is my home”). Contact predicted national identity ($a_1 = 0.62$ [0.25 ; 0.99]), which in turn predicted feeling at home in Norway ($b_1 = 0.54$ [0.39 ; 0.69]). A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the specific indirect effect ($a_1b_1 = 0.34$ [0.11 ; 0.61]) was above zero. Contact did not predict feeling at home independent of the mediator ($c' = 0.25$ [-0.03 ; 0.54]).

We also tested Hypothesis 4 with the second measure of integration, namely preferring the country of origin over Norway (see Table 3). Contact predicted national identity ($a_1 = 0.62$ [0.25 ; 0.99]), which in turn negatively predicted preferring one’s country of origin over Norway ($b_1 = -0.59$ [-0.76 ; -0.42]). A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the specific indirect effect ($a_1b_1 = -0.36$ [-0.70 ; -0.11]) did not include zero. Contact did not predict preferring the country of origin over Norway independent of the mediators ($c' = -0.16$ [-0.48 ; 0.15]).

As in Study 1, we computed reversed mediational models with national identity as the predictor, contact as the mediator, and the two integration measures as outcomes. Indirect effects via contact were non-significant (i.e., the confidence intervals included zero).

Perceived discrimination. We tested Hypothesis 5, namely that perceived discrimination would predict stronger ethnic identification and weaker national identification, using regression analyses while controlling for the other two identities. The complete regression model with national identity as outcome was significant, $F(3, 84) = 20.61$, $p < 0.001$, explaining about 42% of the variance. Perceived discrimination significantly negatively predicted national identity ($b = -0.22$ [-0.41 ; -0.03], $\beta = -0.19$, $SE = 0.10$, $p = 0.025$), while controlling for the effects of ethnic identity ($b = -0.52$ [-0.67 ; -0.37] $\beta = -0.58$, $SE = 0.08$, $p < 0.001$) and dual identity ($b = 0.44$ [0.26 ; 0.61], $\beta = 0.43$, $SE = 0.09$, $p < 0.001$). Perceived discrimination

Table 3. Mediation models for the relationship of contact to feeling at home/preference for country of origin via national identity (Study 2, $N = 93$)

Antecedent	M				Y1 (Feeling at Home)				Y2 (Preference Origin Country)		
	Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	p
X (Contact)	a 0.62 [0.25; 0.99]	0.19	0.001		c' 0.25 [-0.03; 0.54]	0.14	0.083		c' -0.16 [-0.48; 0.15]	0.16	0.299
M (Nat. ID)	–	–	–		b 0.54 [0.39; 0.69]	0.08	<0.001		b -0.59 [-0.76; -0.42]	0.08	<0.001
Constant	i_M 1.01 [-0.69; 2.71]	0.85	0.240		i_M 0.91 [-0.34; 2.16]	0.63	0.151		i_Y 5.11 [3.75; 6.47]	0.68	<0.001
	$R^2 = 0.33$				$R^2 = 0.66$				$R^2 = 0.64$		
	$F(1, 90) = 11.01, p = 0.001$				$F(2, 89) = 34.24, p < 0.001$				$F(2, 89) = 31.17, p < 0.001$		

Note: Confidence intervals are displayed at the 95% level.

Table 4. Correlations between measures for Study 2

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. National identity	1							
2. Dual identity	0.28**	1						
3. Ethnic identity	-0.43**	0.26**	1					
4. Contact	0.33**	0.19*	-0.12	1				
5. Discrimination	-0.12	0.07	-0.01	-0.18*	1			
6. Feeling at home in Norway	0.68**	0.14	-0.40**	0.33**	-0.10	1		
7. Preference of country of origin	-0.55**	-0.06	0.42**	-0.27**	0.09	-0.51**	1	
8. BIIS_Conflict	-0.27**	0.08	0.21*	-0.14	0.43**	-0.20*	0.19*	1

* $p < 0.05$,

** $p < 0.01$

predicted neither dual identity ($p = 0.263$) nor ethnic identity ($p = 0.206$).

In addition, inspection of bivariate correlations (Table 4) showed that perceived discrimination correlated positively with cultural conflict ($r(91) = 0.45$ [0.27; 0.60], $p < 0.001$), which in turn correlated positively with ethnic identity ($r(90) = 0.26$ [0.05; 0.44], $p < 0.001$). Thus, we computed an exploratory mediation model (Process Model4, Hayes, 2018, 50,000 bootstrap samples, see Table 5) including perceived cultural conflict as a potential mediator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and ethnic identity. Perceived discrimination predicted perceived cultural conflict ($a_1 = 0.44$ [0.25; 0.63]), which in turn predicted ethnic identity ($b_1 = 0.41$ [0.12; 0.70]). A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the specific indirect effect ($a_1b_1 = 0.18$ [0.05; 0.37]) was above zero. Perceived discrimination did not predict ethnic identity independent of the mediator ($c' = -0.16$ [-0.46; 0.13]).

Additional analyses: perceived conflict between the culture of the receiving society and participants' culture of origin. We again tested whether the negative relationship between ethnic and national identity could be explained by the perceived conflict between the culture of the receiving society and the culture of origin using partial correlations. When controlling for perceived cultural conflict, the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity remained significant, $r(87) = -0.42$ [-0.58; -0.23], $p < 0.001$, indicating that perceived cultural conflict did not explain the negative relationship between these two identities. All items, means, standard deviations, and correlations can be found in the Supplemental Material.

Discussion

The results of Study 2 mostly supported our hypotheses. In line with Hypothesis 2, national and ethnic identity were negatively related and national and dual identity were positively related. In line with Hypothesis 5, perceived discrimination was negatively related to national identity. However, in contrast to our prediction, perceived discrimination was not directly related to ethnic or dual identity. An exploratory mediation model showed that the relationship between perceived discrimination and ethnic identity was mediated by higher perceived cultural conflict. Whereas experience of discrimination had a direct negative influence on national identity, it appeared to indirectly increase young immigrants' ethnic identity via higher perceived cultural conflict. In line with Hypothesis 3, contact was positively related to national identity. However, in Study 2 it was not related to dual identity. In line with Hypothesis 4, contact was positively related to feeling integrated in Norway via national identity. As in Study 1, perceived conflict between the receiving society's culture and the culture of origin did not explain the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity.

Surprisingly, and in contrast to earlier work (Diehl & Schnell, 2006; Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Phinney *et al.*, 2006; Simon & Ruhs, 2008) and the results of Study 1, Hypothesis 1 was not confirmed in Study 2. In this sample of immigrant university students, the pattern of social identity endorsement levels were reversed: Students most strongly endorsed their national identity, followed by their dual identity, and they reported the lowest endorsement of their ethnic identity. This surprising pattern might be due to the specific sample of

Table 5. Mediation model for the relationship of perceived discrimination to ethnic identity via perceived cultural conflict (Study 2, $N = 93$)

		Consequent						
		M (Conflict)			Y (Ethnic Identity)			
Antecedent		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	<i>p</i>		Coeff. [LLCI; ULCI]	SE	<i>p</i>
X (Discrimination)	<i>a</i>	0.44 [0.25; 0.63]	0.10	<0.001	<i>c'</i>	−0.16 [−0.46; 0.13]	0.15	0.267
M (Conflict)		–	–	–	<i>b</i>	0.41 [0.12; 0.70]	0.15	0.006
Constant	<i>i</i> ₁	1.24 [0.79; 1.69]	0.23	<0.001	<i>i</i> ₂	2.50 [1.78; 3.22]	0.36	<0.001
		$R^2 = 0.44$				$R^2 = 0.29$		
		$F(1, 89) = 20.89, p < 0.001$				$F(2, 88) = 3.93, p = 0.023$		

Note: Confidence intervals are displayed at the 95% level.

university students and will be discussed further in the General Discussion.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Results of two studies conducted with different immigrant samples in Norway replicated and extended earlier research on immigrants' social identities and integration from other European countries like Germany and the Netherlands (e.g., Fleischmann & Verkuyten, 2016; Martiny *et al.*, 2017; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). The current research substantiated a proposed theoretical model and past empirical findings of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies on the interrelations, antecedents, and consequences of immigrants' multiple social identities for their integration into the receiving society. Thus, the current research represents the third step in a cumulative research program investigating young immigrants' ethnic, national, and dual identities in European contexts. An initial step (Martiny *et al.*, 2017) established the relative level of endorsement, relationships, and consequences of young immigrants' multiple social identities in two cross-sectional studies with Turkish-origin adolescents in Germany. A second step (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019) substantiated the relationships between the variables in a longitudinal study with immigrant children in Germany. Finally, the present research established the generalizability of relationships between variables in the Norwegian cultural context with two different immigrant samples. This stepwise systematic approach and the remarkable robustness of the main results between samples and cultural contexts provides credible and reliable evidence for the importance of young immigrants' multiple social identities in the integration process and strengthens the claim that social psychological research can make an important contribution to understanding integration and social cohesion in multicultural European societies.

First, in both studies, we found ethnic and national identity to be incompatible (i.e., negatively related). This means that it is difficult for young immigrants in Norway to positively endorse both their ethnic and national identity, a pattern of compatibility that would reflect the acculturation orientation of integration that has been shown to be the most positive in terms of integration outcomes for immigrants (e.g., Berry, 1997). Interestingly, the different immigrant samples investigated in the present research seem to adopt different strategies of dealing with the incompatibility of their identities. For adolescent immigrants from

predominantly non-Western cultural backgrounds it might be an adaptive strategy to place more emphasis on their ethnic identity, because they are visually distinguishable from Norwegians and thus have limited opportunities to show individual mobility towards the majority group (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and conform to the high assimilation pressure in Norway. In contrast, adult immigrants from Western cultural backgrounds with high education seem to place more emphasis on their Norwegian identity, as it might be easier for them to conform to the high assimilation pressure and "pass as Norwegian," because they are not visually distinguishable from native Norwegians.

The argument that the two immigrant samples seem to adopt different strategies to cope with the incompatibility of their identities is also supported by the different mean levels of the endorsement of the three social identities in the two studies. Whereas in Study 1 a relatively unselective sample of immigrant high-school students participated, in Study 2 a selective sample of university students with migration background participated. Even though a relatively large percentage of the general population in Norway receives a university degree (33.4%; SSB, 2017a), only 22% of the immigrants living in Norway attend and graduate from university (SSB, 2017b). Therefore, the sample was more selective in terms of education than the sample of high-school students investigated in Study 1. Furthermore, the majority of the sample (52%; 4% missing) came from European countries (e.g., Germany, Russia, and Sweden). Thus, more than half of the sample was likely not visually distinguishable from Norwegians, which has been shown to lead to better integration outcomes than those found for immigrants who are visually distinguishable from receiving society members (e.g., Khanna, 2004; Quintana, 1998; van Oudenhoven *et al.*, 1998). In order to investigate whether the role of Western versus non-Western background is able to explain the higher endorsement of the Norwegian identity, we compared participants' mean levels of endorsement of the three identities for Western and non-Western immigrants in Study 2. The mean levels of social identity endorsement did not differ depending on Western versus non-Western background (all $ps \geq 0.40$). Thus, the difference found between social identity endorsement in Study 1 and 2 does not seem to be driven by immigrants' country of origin, but might be due to the different levels of education in the two samples. Interestingly, however, this was the only major difference in the results between Study 1 and Study 2.

In both studies the negative relationship between national and ethnic identity was not explained by perceived conflict between

participants' culture of origin and the Norwegian culture. Thus, independent of how much conflict young immigrants perceived between their ethnic culture and Norway's culture, ethnic and national identity were negatively related. This might be due to the strong assimilation pressure that is present in Norwegian society. Norwegian society might give all immigrants – regardless of how much cultural conflict they feel – the feeling that the Norwegian way is the only acceptable way of doing things in Norway. Thus, even immigrants who come from relatively similar cultures and who are not visually distinguishable from Norwegians (e.g., European immigrants) might feel a strong assimilation pressure that signals the need to decide to either become a “real” Norwegian or to endorse their ethnic identity (thereby not fitting into the Norwegian society). In line with this, we found that the mostly non-Western immigrant sample in Study 1 showed higher levels of ethnic identity than national identity, whereas the sample of largely Western immigrants in Study 2, showed higher levels of national identity.

We found in both studies that national identity and dual identity were positively related. This might indicate that due to the strong assimilation pressure in Norway, immigrants may maintain a connection with their culture of origin by constructing a dual identity that is close to the receiving society's culture, thereby reducing the conflict between the culture of origin and the receiving society's culture (for the same argument see Martiny *et al.*, 2017). In addition, both studies showed that contact with receiving society members played a key role in young immigrants' integration into Norwegian society. Interestingly, this relationship was mediated by national identity, underscoring the central role of identification with the receiving society for immigrants' integration.

Finally, Study 2 replicated earlier work in showing that perceived discrimination was negatively related to national identity. That means that the more immigrants experienced discrimination in Norway, the less Norwegian they felt. Surprisingly and in contrast to the rejection-identification model (Branscombe *et al.*, 1999; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002), however, perceived discrimination was not directly positively related to ethnic identity. However, an exploratory mediation model showed an indirect effect of perceived discrimination due to ethnic group membership on stronger ethnic identity via higher perceived cultural conflict. Thus, highly educated immigrants in Norway seem to cope with experiencing discrimination by reducing their endorsement of their national identity and only indirectly by increasing their endorsement of their ethnic identity. It should be noted that the mediation model was exploratory and developed post hoc after inspection of bivariate correlations between variables. Thus, it should be interpreted with caution and replicated in further studies. Nonetheless, this finding might point to the acculturation strategy of separation (Berry, 1997), in which immigrants withdraw from the culture of the receiving society and turn to their culture of origin as a result of perceived discrimination. Experiences of being discriminated against because of ethnic group membership seem to exacerbate perceptions of conflict between the culture of the receiving society and the culture of origin. If discrimination signals difficulties in assimilating to the culture of the receiving country, perceived cultural conflict may be resolved by increased

identification with their ethnic group. Future research should investigate this finding in detail.

Implications of the results

The present work highlights the importance of (positive) contact between immigrants and members of the receiving society for integration and thus adds to the literature on the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) by demonstrating the beneficial effects of positive contact on intergroup relations. The results of these two studies therefore clearly speak against the ethnic segregation of neighborhoods, schools, and classes (see also Leszczensky & Pink, 2015). Policy implications of this research include fostering intergroup contact through intervention programs (e.g., incorporating cooperative learning methods like the jigsaw puzzle method at the classroom level, Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Silkes & Snapp, 1978; forming neighborhood initiatives or sports clubs at the community level) in order to create positive intergroup contact and friendships, thereby enabling immigrants to develop a strong national identity. Furthermore, immigration policies focusing on integration and multiculturalism can create a more warm and welcoming climate in which diversity is valued and receiving society members have an active role in the integration process (e.g., Christ, Asbrock, Dhont, Pettigrew & Wagner, 2013; Fussell, 2014; Huo, Dovidio, Jimenez & Schildkraut, 2018; Phelps, Eilertsen, Türken & Ommundsen, 2011; Phelps, Ommundsen, Türken & Ulleberg, 2013). Such a climate would ideally enable immigrants to strongly endorse both their ethnic identity and their national identity and thereby reduce identity incompatibility and identity conflict. This might be achieved by advertising campaigns aimed at changing the perceptions of Norwegian society towards immigrants by promoting the benefits of a multicultural Norwegian society, and thereby reducing assimilation pressure. This problem could also be targeted by early interventions in schools to reduce negative attitudes and discrimination against immigrants. Both approaches are in line with literature demonstrating the importance of receiving society members' attitudes towards immigrants for the immigrants' willingness to identify with the receiving society's culture and to integrate (e.g., Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Sénécal, 1997; Huo *et al.*, 2018).

Limitations and future research

The present research makes an important contribution to the field of migration studies, as it investigates the relationships between young immigrants' different social identities, as well as their antecedents and consequences in Norway, a country in which little social psychological research on the integration of immigrants has been conducted to date. However, some limitations of the present research need to be addressed. First, both studies used a cross-sectional design in which all variables were measured concurrently. Thus, even though theoretical considerations suggest causal relationships between variables, with the present data we are not able to draw conclusions about causality. To address this weakness, a series of mediational models investigated the reversed order of variables (e.g., whether national and dual identity predict integration via contact with receiving society members), and in

these models the indirect effects were mostly non-significant (with one exception). This strengthens our confidence in our theoretical model. In addition, a prior longitudinal investigation with immigrant children in Germany provided some evidence for the proposed causal direction of variables (Froehlich *et al.*, 2019). In order to develop successful interventions, knowledge about causal relationships is crucial. Therefore, more research should test the outlined hypotheses in longitudinal designs with immigrants of different origins and age groups in Norway and other Western or Northern European countries. Second, it has been argued that it is important to distinguish between different immigrant groups when investigating identity development and the integration patterns of immigrants (e.g., Schulz & Leszczensky, 2016). We agree with this argument as immigrants' experiences within Norwegian society might differ for different immigrant groups (e.g., the experiences of Somalis vs. Swedes may differ based on their ability to speak Norwegian when they arrive and whether they are visually distinguishable from Norwegians). In the present work, we combined all immigrant groups in our analyses. This was necessary because of the small numbers of immigrants in total in Norway. Norway is a small country with a little more than 5 million inhabitants. Thus, it was not possible for us to collect large enough samples from different immigrant groups to allow for statistical comparisons. The only differentiation we were able to make was by country of origin (Western vs. non-Western immigrant in Study 2). Splitting up the sample, did, however, not show different results in social identity endorsement for the two groups. Nevertheless, future research might aim at sampling a large enough group of immigrants to distinguish between immigrants from different regions (e.g., Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa), as splitting up the sample into the two categories of Western versus non-Western might not have been sufficient to reflect potential differences between immigrants' countries of origin. Third, in the present research, we did not assess immigrant generation. Earlier research has shown that immigrant generation has an effect on integrational issues, because some of the problems newly arriving immigrants might face (e.g., language difficulties) will disappear (or be replaced with other problems such as awareness of discrimination) for later generations (e.g., Algan, Dunstmann, Glitz & Manning, 2009; Giuliani, Tagliabue & Regalia, 2018). For this reason, future research should assess and test effects of immigrant generation. Fourth, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the two subsamples of immigrants investigated in the present work not only differ in terms of age and educational level, but also in terms of their social context and their social networks. Even though this was not assessed in the current study, it is likely that the high-school students participating in Study 1 were living at home (with their immigrant families). Thus, through their families and maybe also through their neighborhoods of residence, they likely lived within communities largely consisting of members of their ethnic groups or immigrants in general (from various ethnic backgrounds). This is likely as ethnic segregation in neighborhoods in Oslo varies between and within neighborhoods, ranging between 17% and 53% of immigrants within neighborhoods (SSB, 2015). The university students participating in Study 2 were very likely mostly living in student housing in not-segregated neighborhoods in a small Northern Norwegian

university town. Thus, the university students were living in a social environment that fostered contact with native Norwegians more and might thus also lead to more assimilation pressure. This might have contributed to the sample's high endorsement of the national, Norwegian identity. Further research should assess these variables and test their relationships with immigrants' identity endorsement. In addition, we argue that future research should focus on the development of social identities and attitudes about integration among young children. Until now, the vast majority of research has focused on adolescent or adult immigrants, whereas research on immigrant children's identity development is scarce (but see Froehlich *et al.*, 2019).

Conclusion

The present results underscore that it is a challenge for immigrants to develop their different social identities in a way that allows them to highly endorse both their ethnic and their national identity – the pattern that would be most beneficial to their integration (e.g., Berry, 1997). Identity incompatibility makes it more likely for some immigrant groups to strongly endorse their ethnic identity. This seems to be especially true when the immigrants come from non-Western countries and are thus likely to be visually distinguishable from receiving society members. For other immigrant groups identity incompatibility makes it more likely to endorse their national identity. This seems to be especially true when the immigrants are highly educated and from Western countries. In light of the current debate in psychology about the replicability of results, the fact that the current research replicated established patterns of identity construction for two new, understudied immigrant populations in the Norwegian context increases our confidence in the generalizability of our theoretical model and empirical results across Western and Northern European countries.

NOTES

¹ The contemporary use of the term «Kurdistan» mostly refers to the following regions: southeastern Turkey (Turkish Kurdistan), northern Iraq (Iraqi Kurdistan), northwestern Iran (Iranian Kurdistan), and northern Syria (Rojava) (see <https://www.britannica.com/place/Kurdistan>).

² The questionnaire for the native Norwegian students included scales such as attitudes towards immigrants and contact with immigrants. In this research program, we were only interested in the responses of the immigrant students, but because we were collecting data in class rooms, we had to ensure that the native Norwegian students also received a similarly long questionnaire to fill in. The responses of native Norwegian students were excluded from all further analyses.

³ The experimenter also brought an English version of the consent form and the questionnaire. This were requested by very few students whose Norwegian was not yet advanced enough to understand the Norwegian material.

⁴ In addition we assessed: BIS-1, cultural distance subscale, Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005), social ties with their country of origin (Martiny *et al.*, 2017), how many Norwegian friends participants have, family integration, relationship to the family, and further demographics, including how long they had been in Norway, which language they spoke at home, their place of birth, their parents' place of birth, whether they planned to stay in Norway or move back to their homeland after their education, how well they spoke their native language, how well they spoke Norwegian, and how well they understood this questionnaire.

⁵ All confidence intervals reported in squared parentheses in the present research indicate a 95% level of confidence.

⁶ In addition we assessed: BIIS-1, cultural distance subscale, Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005), social ties with their country of origin (Martiny et al., 2017), how many Norwegian friends participants have, language spoken at home, family integration, relationship to the family, religiosity, and parent's country of origin, occupation, and education.

REFERENCES

- Algan, Y., Dustmann, C., Glitz, A. & Manning, A. (2009). The economic situation of first- and second-generation immigrants in France, Germany, and the UK. IZA Discussion Papers, No. 4514, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-20091105853>.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alvarez, A. N., Juang, L. & Liang, C. T. (2006). Asian Americans and racism: When bad things happen to "model minorities". *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 477–492.
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, D., Sikes, J. & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Beckmann-Dierkes, N. & Fuhrmann, J. (2011). Immigration country Norway -Demographic trends and political concepts. *KAS International Reports, 2*, 36–48 Retrieved from https://www.kas.de/c/document_library/get_file?uuxml:id=7ee7fdcd-e6be-d604-38fd-e3b70d2ca322&groupId=252038. Accessed 19 August 2019
- Benet-Martínez, V. & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 1015–1050.
- Benet-Martínez, V. & Hong, Y.-Y. (Eds.) (2014). *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46*, 5–34.
- Berry, J., Phinney, J., Sam, D. & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 55*, 303–332.
- Bigler, R. S. & Liben, L. S. (2006). A developmental intergroup theory of social stereotypes and prejudice. In R. V. Kail (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (vol 34, pp. 39–89). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S. & Sénécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32*, 369–386.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T. & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 135–149.
- Christ, O., Asbrock, F., Dhont, K., Pettigrew, T. F. & Wagner, U. (2013). The effects of intergroup climate on immigrants' acculturation preferences. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 221*, 252–257.
- Deaux, K. & Martin, D. (2003). Interpersonal networks and social categories: Specifying levels of context in identity processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66*, 101–117.
- Deaux, K. & Verkuyten, M. (2014). The social psychology of multiculturalism: Identity and intergroup relations. In V. Benet-Martínez & Y.-Y. Hong (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Multicultural Identity* (pp. 118–138). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Diehl, C. & Schnell, R. (2006). "Reactive ethnicity" or "assimilation"? Statements, arguments, and first empirical evidence for labor migrants in Germany. *International Migration Review, 40*, 786–816.
- Eurostat (2017). Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics. Accessed 19 August 2019
- Fleischmann, F. & Phalet, K. (2016). Identity conflict or compatibility: A comparison of Muslim minorities in five European cities. *Political Psychology, 37*, 447–463.
- Fleischmann, F. & Verkuyten, M. (2016). Dual identity among immigrants: Comparing different conceptualizations, their measurements, and implications. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22*, 151–166.
- Fratzcher, M. & Junker, S. (2015). Integrating refugees: A long-term, worthwhile investment. *DIW Economic Bulletin, 5*, 612–616
- Froehlich, L., Martiny, S. E. & Deaux, K. (2019). A Longitudinal Investigation of the Ethnic and National Identities of Children with Migration Background. *Social Psychology*.
- Fussell, E. (2014). Warmth of the welcome: Attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policy. *Annual Review of Sociology, 40*, 479–498.
- Giordano, P. (2003). Relationships in adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*, 257–281
- Giuliani, C., Tagliabue, S. & Regalia, C. (2018). Psychological well-being, multiple identities, and discrimination among first and second generation immigrant Muslims. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 14*, 66–87.
- Glöckner, A., Fiedler, S. & Renkewitz, F. (2018). Sound and efficient science: A strategic alignment of research processes as way out of the replication crisis. *Psychologische Rundschau, 69*, 22–36.
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd edn). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hirsh, J. B. & Kang, S. K. (2016). Mechanisms of identity conflict: Uncertainty, anxiety, and the behavioral inhibition system. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 20*, 223–244.
- Huo, Y. J., Dovidio, J. F., Jiménez, T. R. & Schildkraut, D. J. (2018). Local policy proposals can bridge Latino and (most) white Americans' response to immigration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*, 945–950.
- Khanna, N. (2004). The role of reflected appraisals in racial identity: The case of multiracial Asians. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*, 115–131.
- Leszczensky, L. & Pink, S. (2015). Ethnic segregation of friendship networks in school: Testing a rational-choice argument of differences in ethnic homophily between classroom- and grade-level networks. *Social Networks, 42*, 18–26.
- Martiny, S. E., Froehlich, L., Deaux, K. & Mok, S. Y. (2017). Defining ethnic, national, and dual identities: Structure, antecedents, and consequences of multiple social identities of Turkish-origin high school students in Germany. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 27*(5), 400–410.
- Martinovic, B. & Verkuyten, M. (2012). Host national and religious identification among Turkish Muslims in Western Europe: The role of ingroup norms, perceived discrimination and value incompatibility. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 893–903.
- McFarland, D. & Pals, H. (2005). Motives and contexts of identity change: A case for network effects. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*, 289–315.
- Nekby, L. & Rödin, M. (2010). Acculturation identity and employment among second and middle generation immigrants. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 31*, 35–50.
- Nekby, L., Rödin, M. & Özcan, G. (2009). Acculturation identity and higher education: Is there a trade-off between ethnic identity and education? *International Migration Review, 43*, 938–973.
- Ng Tseung-Wong, C. & Verkuyten, M. (2013). Religious and national group identification in adolescence: A study among three religious groups in Mauritius. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*, 846–857.
- Noh, S. & Kaspar, V. (2003). Perceived discrimination and depression: moderating effects of coping, acculturation, and ethnic support. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*, 232–238.
- OECD/ EU (2018). *Settling in 2018: Indicators of immigrant integration*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Oppedal, B. & Røysamb, E. (2007). Young Muslim immigrants in Norway: An epidemiological study of their psychosocial adaptation and internalizing problems. *Applied Developmental Science, 11*, 112–125.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.

- Phelps, J. M., Eilertsen, D. E., Türken, S. & Ommundsen, R. (2011). Integrating immigrant minorities: Developing a scale to measure majority members' attitudes toward their own proactive efforts. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 404–410.
- Phelps, J. M., Ommundsen, R., Türken, S. & Ulleberg, P. (2013). Intergroup perception and proactive majority integration attitudes. *Social Psychology*, 44, 196–207.
- Phinney, J. S. (2006). Ethnic identity exploration in emerging adulthood. In J. J. Arnett & J. L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century* (pp. 117–134). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J. S., Berry, J. W., Vedder, P. & Liebkind, K. (2006). The acculturation experience: Attitudes, identities, and behaviors of immigrant youth. In J. W. Berry, J. S. Phinney, D. L. Sam & P. Vedder (Eds.), *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation across national contexts* (pp. 71–116). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K. & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493–510.
- Phinney, J. S. & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 271–281.
- Quintana, S. M. (1998). Children's developmental understanding of ethnicity and race. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 7, 27–45.
- Ramos, M. R., Cassidy, C., Reicher, S. & Haslam, S. A. (2012). A longitudinal investigation of the rejection-identification hypothesis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51, 642–660.
- Roccas, S. & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88–106.
- Sam, D. L. (1998). Predicting life satisfaction among adolescents from immigrant families in Norway. *Ethnicity & Health*, 3, 5–18.
- Sam, D. L. (2000). Psychological adaptation of adolescents with immigrant backgrounds. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 5–25.
- Schmitt, M. T. & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). The internal and external causal loci of attributions to prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 620–628.
- Schulz, B. & Leszczensky, L. (2016). Native friends and host country identification among adolescent immigrants in Germany: The role of ethnic boundaries. *International Migration Review*, 50, 163–196.
- Simon, B. & Ruhs, D. (2008). Identity and politicization among Turkish migrants in Germany: The role of dual identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1354–1366.
- SSB (2015). Retrieved from https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/_attachment/242847?_ts=150652833e8. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2017a). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/utdanning/faktaside/utdanning>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2017b). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/statbank/table/09598/>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018a). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/statbank/table/08382/tableViewLayout1/>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018b). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/innvbf>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018c). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/statbank/table/07111/tableViewLayout1/>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018d). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/innvandring-og-innvandrer/faktaside/innvandring>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018e). Retrieved from https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/_attachment/309561?_ts=15c43dcaa50. Accessed 19 August 2019
- SSB (2018f). Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/statbank/table/08778/tableViewLayout1/>. Accessed 19 August 2019
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S. & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995–1013.
- Vassenden, K. (Ed.) (1997). *Innvandrere i Norge: Hvem er de, hva gjør de og hvordan lever de?* (Statistiske Analyser 20. Statisk Sentralbyrå). Retrieved from https://www.ssb.no/a/histstat/sa/sa_020.pdf. Accessed 19 August 2019
- Verkuyten, M. & Martinovic, B. (2012a). Immigrants' national identification: Meanings, determinants, and consequences. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 6, 82–112.
- Verkuyten, M. & Martinovic, B. (2012b). Social identity complexity and immigrants' attitude toward the host nation: The intersection of ethnic and religious group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1165–1177.
- Verkuyten, M. & Yildiz, A. A. (2007). National (dis) identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1448–1462.
- Virta, E., Sam, D. & Westin, C. (2004). Adolescents with Turkish background in Norway and Sweden: A comparative study of their psychological adaptation. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 45, 15–25.
- Zick, A., Wagner, U., van Dick, R. & Petzel, T. (2001). Acculturation and prejudice in Germany: Majority and minority perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 541–557.

Received 5 June 2019, accepted 12 September 2019

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's web site:

- Table S1.** Descriptive Statistics for Study 1.
Table S2. Correlations between Measures for Study 1.
Table S3. Descriptive Statistics for Study 2.
Table S4. Correlations between Measures for Study 2.
Data S1. Supplemental Material.