Who fits in?

What social markers are important for acculturation in Finland

Säde Helena Sfakiotakis
University of Helsinki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Social Psychology
Master's Degree Programme in Ethnic
Relations, Cultural Diversity and Integration
Master's Thesis, May 2016

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Faculty	Department
Faculty of Social Sciences	Department of Social Research

Author
Säde Helena Sfakiotakis

Title
Who fits in? What social markers are important for acculturation in Finland

Subject
Social psychology

Level	Month and Year	Number of pages
Master's Thesis	May 2016	101

Abstract

Immigration to Finland has seen a significant rise since the 1990s. The adaptation of immigrants to the society is a relevant and popular theme in public discussion. This study explores the opportunities of immigrants to adapt to and become members of the Finnish society, as reported by Finnish respondents. Acculturation is an extensively studied field, but it has rarely been studied through social markers of the receiving society, or through the opinions and attitudes of the native majority population. In this study, a new angle is introduced through the analysis of acculturation opportunities for immigrants from the perspective of the native Finnish.

The study was carried out with a quantitative method. The SPSS tool was used for handling data. The data material has been gathered with a questionnaire sent to students at the University of Helsinki and at Aalto University (N=198). The outline of the questionnaire is borrowed from that of a larger research project, where Singapore, Canada and Japan are studied in addition to Finland. The central research questions are: first, who fits in, secondly, is it possible to fit in, and thirdly, what factors predict why some people are more reluctant than others to accept immigrants as parts of the ingroup.

The theoretical background of the study is based on John W. Berry's acculturation studies. The theoretical models used are the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) and the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM), which have been derived and elaborated from Berry's work by other researchers. In order to support the analysis and discussion of results, a number of hypothetical models have been used, such as G.W. Allport's contact hypothesis, the similarity attraction hypothesis and the culture distance theory.

The results were analyzed through the creation of three dimensions of acculturation, i.e. sociocultural adaptation, socioeconomic adaptation, and social psychological adaptation. The results indicate that Finns set greatest expectations for acculturation in the social psychological dimension, followed by the sociocultural dimension and lastly by the socioeconomic dimension. For the most part, Finns are confident that immigrants can achieve these expectations with relative ease regardless of the dimension of acculturation. In addition, the study found that certain factors, such as greater perceived threats, explained greater expectations of acculturation.

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta/osasto	Laitos
Valtiotieteellinen tiedekunta	Sosiaalitieteiden laitos

Tekijä
Säde Helena Sfakiotakis

Työn nimi
Who fits in? What social markers are important for acculturation in Finland

Oppiaine
Sosiaalipsykologia

Työn laji	Aika	Sivumäärä
Pro gradu - tutkielma	Toukokuu 2016	101

Tiivistelmä

Maahanmuutto Suomeen on lisääntynyt huomattavasti 1990-luvun alusta lähtien. Maahanmuuttajan sopeutuminen suomalaiseen yhteiskuntaan ja kulttuuriin on tullut ajankohtaiseksi puheenaiheeksi. Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastellaankin juuri maahanmuuttajan sopeutumismahdollisuuksia eli akkulturaatiota suomalaiseen kulttuuriin. Akkulturaatio on paljon tutkittu ilmiö, mutta sitä on harvoin tutkittu vastaanottavan yhteiskunnan sosiaalisten erityispiirteiden ja enemmistön mielipiteiden ja asenteiden kautta. Tämä tutkimus tarjoaa uutta ulottuvuutta akkulturaatioon keskittymällä sosiaalisten erityispiirteiden (engl. social markers) merkitykseen sopeutumisessa. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan maahanmuuttajien akkulturaation mahdollisuuksia suomalaissyntyisten Suomen kansalaisten näkökulmasta.

Tutkimus on toteutettu kvantitatiivisesti. Työkaluna aineiston käsittelyssä on käytetty SPSS-tilasto-ohjelmaa. Tutkimuksen aineisto on kerätty kyselylomakkeella Helsingin yliopiston ja Aalto-yliopiston opiskelijoilta (N = 198). Kyselylomake pohjautuu laajempaan tutkimushankkeeseen, jossa tutkitaan Suomen lisäksi mukana Singaporea, Kanadaa ja Japania. Tämä tutkimus on osa kyseistä laajempaa tutkimushanketta kuitenkin vain kyselylomakkeen ja aihe-alueen osalta. Keskeisimmät tutkimuskysymykset ovat seuraavat: ensinnäkin, kuka sopii joukkoon, ja toiseksi, onko joukkoon mahdollista sopia sekä kolmanneksi, mitkä tekijät ennustavat, miksi toiset ovat tiukempia kuin toiset hyväksyäkseen maahanmuuttajan osaksi sisäryhmää. Tutkimuksen teoreettinen tausta rakentuu John W. Berryn akkulturaatiotutkimuksille. Tässä tutkimuksessa teoreettinen lähtökohta ovat Berryn akkulturaatiomallista johdettu Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) ja Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM). Tulosten analysoinnissa on käytetty lisäksi erilaisia hypoteettisia malleja, esimerkiksi Allportin (1954) kontaktihypoteesia, samanlaisuus-attraktio-hypoteesia ja kulttuurisen distanssin teoriaa tukemaan keskustelua tuloksista.

Tulokset muodostuivat kolmesta kokonaisuudesta, joita ovat sosiokulttuurinen sopeutuminen, sosioekonominen sopeutuminen ja sosiaalipsykologinen sopeutuminen. Tulokset osoittavat suomalaisten vaativan maahanmuuttajilta eniten sosiaalipsykologisen sopeutumisen saralla, toiseksi eniten sosiokulttuurisen ja vähiten sosioekonomisen sopeutumisen saralla. Enimmäkseen suomalaiset uskovat maahanmuuttajan voivan helposti saavuttaa heidän asettamansa ehdot jokaiseen eritasoiseen sopeutumiseen. Lisäksi, tulokset osoittavat, että juuri tietynlaiset tekijät, kuten esimerkiksi koettu uhka, ovat yhteydessä korkeampiin akkulturaatio odotuksiin.

Avainsanat
Sosiaaliset erityispiirteet, kulttuuri, sopeutuminen, akkulturaatio, asenteet, odotukset, vaatimukset, suomalainen, maahanmuuttaja

Table of contents

1. Introduction

In your opinion, what qualities should an immigrant have in order for you to see her as a full member of your society? Where do you draw the line between being inside, included and one of us, and on the other hand being outside, excluded and one of them? These are the primary concerns of this study, examined in the Finnish context.

When studying adaptation to a new culture, i.e. the process of acculturation, the conditions, possibilities and limitations of this adaptation are most often studied, in one way or another, from the perspective of those who do the adapting, that is, immigrants. In contrast, the rationale of this study is to frame acculturation as a reciprocal interaction that involves, and also greatly depends on, the expectations and attitudes of the representatives of the culture into which an immigrant enters. In other words, the perceptions of the native population on how immigrants should go about adapting are an essential part of the acculturation process, affecting the outcomes of adaptation.

For the purposes of this study, Finnish society and its culture is considered as the recipient, whose views on who fits in, on what terms, and for what reasons, are analyzed through the responses of Finnish university students. Furthermore, it is by examining the importance of possessing certain social markers, i.e. features of behavior and ways of being which may be culture-specific or found across cultures, that inquiry on the views on acculturation is carried out. In addition, the sample group answers to questions about how easy it is for an immigrant to acquire such social markers. By establishing a hierarchy of what qualities it is important to possess and what qualities it is feasible to possess for an immigrant, as reported by the native population, I also establish a picture of the range of possibilities and unspoken duties that an immigrant has before her when settling in Finland.

Moreover, explanations to the respondents' views and demands of acculturation are drawn from a set of questions addressing the socio-psychological departure points of the respondents themselves. What attributes of the respondent may affect his or her views on acculturation for immigrants? Does the level of life satisfaction, for instance, bear consequences on how extensively one demands of the immigrant to adopt features of the new culture?

The theoretical framework of the study is inspired by the bi-dimensional model of acculturation by John W. Berry (1974, 1980), whose work in acculturation studies is of a foundational character. Other authors, presented in the theory section, have also provided important contributions to Berry's work.

The study is carried out through a questionnaire with the aim to study immigrants' acculturation and adaptation opportunities according to native-born Finns in Finland, from the social psychological perspective. The questionnaire is based on and further elaborated from the research projects in the Singaporean context by Leong (2014) and Leong and Yang (2015). There are specific social markers and attitudes to these markers in Finland that are unique to the Finnish circumstances, hence the need for elaboration. In this sense, every culture provides a specific framework in which to settle, or adapt.

Here are a few examples of the questions presented to respondents about requirements for immigrants found in the questionnaire to clarify the research idea on a more concrete level: *What do you think, how important is it for an immigrant to speak fluent Finnish? How easy is it to acquire this ability? Do you think it is important that immigrants look like Finns? Is it important that immigrants work for the government or get along well with neighbours? Do you think immigrants should forget their original culture and live their life in the way Finns do?*

In short, the research pursues to find criteria that an immigrant must fulfill in order to fit in. These criteria are evaluated by analyzing responses regarding the importance and ease of acquirement of each social marker given in the questionnaire, leading up to a portrait of Finnish attitudes on acculturation and immigration. Naturally, the sample group size and homogeneity do not render the results generalizable to the larger Finnish audience, but give some initial indications.

I hope to increase knowledge about Finnish culture-specific tendencies that may ease or, adversely, make it more difficult for immigrants to adapt. Moreover, it is assumed that there are most often some reasons for *why* someone has particular views and attitudes regarding any topic, in this case about immigrants and immigration in Finland. That is why particular socio-psychological factors are included in the study, hopefully deepening our understanding of the motives of the participants with respect to requirements they set for immigrants in the acculturation process. Socio-psychological factors include stereotypes and

prejudices that might have an influence on responses, and intergroup relations such as contact intensity between groups.

2. Finland and Immigration

Why should we study Finland from an acculturation point of view? Before the 1970s, Finland was known more as a country of emigration than immigration. Since then, emigration started to decrease (Heikkilä & Peltonen, 2002, p. 2). Nevertheless, Finland was an ethnically and culturally homogeneous, mono-cultural society largely until the 1990s. In the beginning of that decade, Finland underwent an economic depression, during which time unemployment rates rose to approximately 20 percent, compared to 3 percent before the depression (Honkapohja & Koskela, 1999, p. 401).

However, beyond economic turmoil the beginning of the 1990s constituted a turning point regarding Finland's ethnic diversity, or absence of it. The dissolution of the Soviet Union opened up the possibility for a large number of Ingrian Finns living in Russia to come to Finland. However, when ethnically more distant Somalis, Bosnians and Iraqis escaped wars in their home countries, immigration to Finland started to increase remarkably in the coming years. In 1990, when approximately 13 558 people migrated to Finland, there were slightly below 30 000 people with foreign citizenship (Statistics Finland, 2016).

From then on, immigration to Finland has become an established phenomenon. In the year 2012, approximately 31 278 people immigrated to Finland (Statistics Finland, 2016). Recently in the year 2015, Finland had approximately 229 765 people with foreign citizenship (ibid.). That is to say, the number of people with foreign citizenship in Finland has increased significantly over the last 20 years. Thus, Finland is ethnically and culturally much more diverse than earlier.

Magdalena Jaakkola' s (2009) studies on the attitudes of Finns towards immigrants indicates altogether more positive views in 2007 than on any other occasion during a time period from 1987 to 2003, during which the researcher has been carrying out her investigation. The least favorable views were recorded in 1993, during wide-spread unemployment and economic stagnation. (ibid.)

Alongside trends and changes in the patterns of immigration, since the 1990s, Finnish immigration policy has experienced a remarkable shift. Whereas the first larger influxes of immigrants to Finland were refugees (without prejudice to Ingrian Finns), there has been a growing tendency for work- and studies-related immigration to Finland; for example in 2015, despite that year marking the ignition of the European migration crisis, out of approximately 14 000 approved residence permits more than 10 000 were granted on the basis of work and studies, whereas asylum was granted to circa 3000 persons. (Migri, 2016 a, 2016 b.) In 1997, the main tool for immigration policy, the Finnish government's migration and refugee policy program, laid down a foundation for immigration to Finland, focusing on asylum issues (The Finnish Government, 1997). Entering the new millennium and onwards, reasons for foreign immigration to Finland had become much more diverse. In addition to the need of international protection and family reunification, there were growing numbers of people wishing to enter Finland for work and studies. This was reflected by the government's 2006 migration policy program, with the clear objective of promoting work-related immigration to Finland. (Ministry of Labour, 2006.) For the years 2012-2015, the Finnish government adopted a program on immigrant integration (Ministry of Employment and the Economy, 2012).

It was not until the end of 2015 that the major weight of immigration policy again focused on asylum practices and international protection, reflecting the 2015 migration crisis in wider Europe (The Finnish Government, 2015). The topic of this study is profoundly relevant considering unseen immigration flows from Syria and other countries in the Middle East due to war and poverty. Considering that the Finnish economy has been, after the global financial crisis that erupted in the years 2008 and 2009, one of the least growing economies in the European Union with rising unemployment and cuts on government spending, the pressures created by the migration crisis must be dealt with fast (Bank of Finland, 2015). To this end, we need more knowledge about the conditions, possibilities and limits on which the Finnish society can facilitate the adaptation of newcomers to Finland.

3. Key Concepts

Central concepts in the study are defined in this section.

3.1 Culture

There are multiple definitions of *culture,* although they are more or less related. Social constructivism and culture may be seen as related concepts in the way that people through socialization, in a specific context, grow into a specific cultural framework. People grow to *act* and to *be* in specific ways in specific situations, creating and upholding a particular framework of ideas, morals, behaviors and manners, among other things, in relation to other more or less different frameworks. As Herder put it already in the 18th century, culture is the totality of life (Inglis, 2004, p. 12). A particularly striking definition of culture is, among others, Inglis' (2004, p. 162) definition *"Culture, therefore, is a structure of values and of the feelings which belong to them, moving through a force field of social action"*.

It is important to mention that culture and society are overlapping concepts, but not the same. People form a society, whereas culture provides the framework for living in a specific way. (Berry, Poortinga, Segall & Dasen, 1992, p. 167.) One must not forget, however, that an individual also reproduces and therefore constantly (re-)defines culture, not only submits to it.

Two important dimensions within the concept of culture are *cultural relativism* and *cultural universals*. Cultural relativism refers to the idea that all cultures, including their cultural features, should be examined and approached without overlooking the culture's own normative use of terms and ideas. (ibid. 169.) This enables a better understanding of the particular culture. Cultural universals refers to the notion that there are unique and common cultural features in all cultures, but the focus is on psychological similarities and differences throughout the cultures (ibid. 170). That is to say, in this study the focus is on culture, and not just in society.

3.2   Social markers

Social markers are the features of expression of a specific culture, or the specific cultural patterns. In other words, social markers reflect the way of life in some particular cultural framework. In that sense, social markers represent the culture and show what is right and wrong in particular contexts, if there are such things within a culture that represent normality or acceptable issues of how people should live their lives. In other words, social markers signal to others that he or she belongs to the common ingroup in which people follow the same existing, visible and invisible, rules and patterns. An example of this can be about how people dress themselves, or that they speak a country's primary language(-s). That is to say, social markers bring people together and create a sense of social cohesion. These features consist of values, attitudes, behaviours and characteristics that citizens have in that particular cultural framework (Leong & Yang, 2015, p. 45). In this study, the meaning and function of culturally valid social markers is explored by investigating the views and attitudes of respondents.

3.3   Naturalized immigrant

The central research subject in this study is a *naturalized immigrant*. Naturalized immigrant refers to a person who has not obtained the citizenship of a country by birth but has obtained it later in the naturalization process, i.e. through a legal process by which citizenship along with citizen's rights and obligations are assigned to the person in question. In Finland, these rights involve e.g. the right to vote in elections, the opportunity to work as police officer and the opportunity to move freely within the European Union. On the other hand, obligations for citizens in Finland involve e.g. military service (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2016). An example is a foreign-born person with non-Finnish citizenship who is legally assigned the Finnish citizenship after applying it. All countries have their specific procedures that one must go through in order to gain citizenship. "*In some states naturalisation is perceived as involving not only a change in legal status, but also a change in nature, a change in political and cultural identity, a social transubstantiation that immigrants can have difficulty conceiving*" (UNESCO, 2016). In Finland, citizenship is possible to obtain by birth if one of the parents has Finnish citizenship, one's birthplace is Finland, through legitimation if the parents get married, through application or declaration.

To obtain citizenship via application refers to naturalization. In Finland a person can have multiple citizenships.

In other words, it is important to notice that the research focus is *not* on foreign-born people with other than Finnish citizenship in Finland - but on foreign-born immigrants with Finnish citizenship in Finland. Nevertheless, when distinguishing between immigrants or naturalized immigrants in the Finnish context, it can sometimes be impossible to totally evade associations to one another. That is why, mainly the word "immigrant" is used in this study to refer those who are naturalized immigrants in Finland. On one hand, this is anyway a thing that is hopefully noticed by the respondents, due to the introduction in the questionnaire that emphasizes naturalized immigrants as study *subjects* in the research. On the other hand, in the Finnish context citizenship has a different meaning compared to Singapore – where the original research questionnaire used in this study was prepared. In short, in Singapore people are either only Singaporean citizens or some other country's/countries' citizens, because in Singapore people are not allowed to have dual citizenship – whereas in Finland it is allowed. Nevertheless, even in Finland the situation is like Leong (2014, p. 123) puts it *"...only citizens are entitled to receiving comprehensive social security and in exercising political rights"*. That is to say, as a Finnish citizen one is entitled the all political rights. However, Finnish social security can be extended also to those who are not Finnish citizens while at the same time exclude the Finnish citizens out of the system. In the meanwhile, those who are Finnish citizens already by birth can be denied social security if living outside of Finland.

3.4   Native Finns

The sample group of respondents is composed of native Finns, i.e. the Finnish-born Finnish citizens, including Finnish-born Finnish citizens with dual citizenship. People with dual citizenship are included in the data due to the Finnish legal system which allows dual citizenship (The Finnish Immigration Service, 2016). It is anyway necessary for this study, that people with dual citizenship were born in Finland to potentially better understand Finnishness and the Finnish social markers. In the research framework I refer to Finnish host members, ethnic Finns or native Finns when referring to the Finnish-born Finnish citizens. When discussing ethnicity it is important to understand the concept used.

> *Ethnicity represents what we have learned within our families about the traditions, practices, and customs of their communities of origin. Our ethnic group is associated with special experiences in language, music, history, literature, food, and celebrations that are similar to that of others of the same background.* (Lott, 2010, p. 25.)

That is to say, depending on the ethnicity one inherits, there will automatically be some influences imposed on and adopted by the person.

3.5   Attitudes

The definition of attitudes has developed over the years. Changes to the definition mainly concern the stability of the content. In other words, nowadays attitudes are assumed to be much more unstable and depending on context than earlier. Also, their implicit, i.e. indirect, and explicit, i.e. direct, nature is highlighted (Schwarz & Bohner, 2001). Allport (1954, p. 810; Schwarz & Bohner, 2001) defined the concept as *"a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive and dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related"*. Whereas, later in the 1990s, the concept of attitude became familiar more as reflecting one's views about what one prefers and not prefers (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Schwarz & Bohner, 2001).

4. Theory

The research framework, main theories, previous research, background in the study, purpose of this study and research questions are presented in the theory section.

4.1 Research Framework

The study is based on the framework of *Integration/Acculturation* in Finland. In literature, acculturation and integration are seen as multidimensional phenomena addressing different issues depending on the framework on the study. Integration and acculturation can be used concurrently or as separate concepts depending on the researcher. In acculturation studies and literature, the term acculturation is largely preferred to integration, i.e. researchers in the

area seem to favour the use of acculturation over integration. On the other hand, others outside this particular research direction, may use integration to address the same content as acculturation. In literature, the concept of integration often refers to social cohesion and something positive in describing the social change process that occurs when immigrants adapt into a new society (e.g. Berry, 1997). The concept of acculturation is often associated to John W. Berry's (1974, 1980) definition of the concept, i.e. to a reciprocal cultural change arising from first-hand contact between two different cultures; for instance, an encounter of two individuals or of two groups from different cultures may come under the definition (Berry et al., 1992, p. 271). At the individual level, acculturation indicates changes that occur psychologically, for instance, in values, attitudes and identity. At the group level, changes are more collective and take place, for instance, in social structures. (ibid. 272.) Nevertheless, changes on both levels have an influence on individuals. Here the focus is on group level changes. I prefer also to use the concept acculturation instead of integration due to its "closer nature" to cultural change and studies, i.e. the theme on which I will focus.

4.2 Acculturation and Adaptation

> *What happens to individuals, who have developed in one cultural context, when they attempt to live in a new cultural context?* (Berry, 1997, p. 6).

As already mentioned, Berry (1974, 1980) is known for his pioneering work on acculturation studies, and he is often referred to in the framework of acculturation. His model, the *bi-dimensional* model of acculturation, has dominated research on acculturation. The model is based on two dimensions. These two dimensions are *culture adoption* and *contact orientation*. Culture adoption refers to the extent to which an immigrant feels that he or she must adopt features of the host culture, and on the other hand to what extent a host society member feels that an immigrant must adopt features of the host culture. Contact orientation refers to the extent to which an immigrant feels that he or she ought to seek and be in contact with the host culture, and on the other hand to what extent a host member feels that an immigrant ought to be in contact with the host culture. How a person positions herself in these two dimensions, regardless of whether she is an immigrant or a host member, indicates her acculturation orientations divided into four acculturation strategies. Although acculturation is a reciprocal process reflecting the input from both the immigrant

and the host member, both parties are concerned with the relationship of the immigrant to the host culture.

The four acculturation strategies are: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. Integration refers to willingness for a kind of symbiotic, balanced relationship between original culture maintenance and adoption of host culture. Assimilation refers to willingness for an exclusive adoption of the host culture and giving up of the original culture maintenance. Separation refers to the immigrant's willingness to maintain the original culture but not get involved in the host culture. Marginalization refers to an orientation in which the immigrant will not maintain the original culture nor adopt the host culture. (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault & Senècal, 1997, p. 377.) On a more concrete level, it is nevertheless good to remember that for instance social context has an influence on how one's "willingness" to acculturate might become inconclusive in "reality" (Berry, 1997, pp. 9-10).

Integration-like orientation is related to the most successful acculturation orientation (Berry, 1997; Berry, 2001, p. 623). There are, however, a few conditions for integration to be possible; for instance, both immigrants and host members must agree with integration as an acculturation orientation, i.e. *mutual accommodation* must be found (Berry, 2001, p. 619). This is the way both groups can have all the rights of being culturally different, yet being part of the same society. In addition, the integration acculturation strategy is not possible without multicultural ideology being embraced in the society, because it consists of a requirement of positive views towards culturally divergent groups. On the other hand, there are even conditions in order to achieve multiculturalism. (ibid. 619.) These conditions include, for instance, low levels of prejudice and discrimination, but even integration as the aimed ideology (ibid. 628). However, integration is the best alternative for acculturation, and multiculturalism as the reigning ideology, if the aim is to ease immigrants' adaptation into the new society.

In Berry's (1974, 1980) acculturation model, the concept *adaptation* is a central term of the cultural change process, i.e. adaptation is about the change that occurs during the acculturation (Berry, 1997, p. 13). Acculturation adaptation can be studied on different levels. These are *psychological*, *economic* and *sociocultural adaptation*. (ibid. 6.) In addition, even *social psychological adaptation* has been proposed as a part of acculturation by Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti and Mähönen (2012, p. 203) in their study on immigrant youth. Psychological adaptation refers to psychological changes, but even emotional and

psychological well-being. Sociocultural adaptation refers to cultural competence and skills needed in a specific cultural context, i.e. the "ability to ´fit in´". (Ward & Kennedy, 1999, p. 660.) Personality and other related characteristics have an influence on psychological adaptation, while culture-learning linked to the knowledge of particular social skills in that specific cultural context have an influence on sociocultural adaptation. (ibid. 661.) Sociocultural and psychological adaptation are related concepts, but still greatly different. That is to say, they are evaluated by different variables (Ward & Chang, 1997, p. 526). Thus, Ward and Kennedy (1996; Demes & Geeraert, 2014, p. 92; Motti-Stefanidi et al., 2008) highlight the importance of studying these concepts separately due to their obvious differences.

Then, socioeconomic adaptation refers to the social dimension on the aspects regarding general participation in society, for instance participation in the labour market and in politics in the host society (Berry, 1997, p. 14). Social psychological adaptation refers, among other things, to cognitive, emotional and behavioural factors, for instance to attitudes and relations with the host members (Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti & Mähönen, 2012, p. 203).

The social psychology of intercultural encounters deals with communication styles or communication competence, and sociocultural adaptation is more about the ability to fit in and negotiate with the host members (Sam & Berry, 2006, p. 59). It is argued that social psychological adaptation is more focused on the quality of the intercultural contact, while sociocultural adaptation is mainly focused on overt communication behaviours such as language fluency (ibid. 60).

Ward, Bochner and Furnham (2001; Sam & Berry, 2006, p. 182) have developed the acculturation ABC model. A means affective, B behavioural and C cognitive; the goal of this model is to examine the change that happens in new immigrants due to acculturation. The model is based on the assumption that immigrants have an influence on the host members and vice versa. (ibid. 183.) Such influences can be negative or positive, i.e. contribute to or hinder the creation of positive attitudes towards one another. Contact, time frame, purpose of stay, cultural attitudes to the outgroup members, sojourners' emotional involvement, and culture distance. (ibid.) It is also mentioned that contact does not necessarily lead to more positive attitudes if the quality of contact is more negatively loaded – or if it is full of misunderstanding. (ibid. 184.)

An advantage of the culture learning approach is its implications for remedial action. It follows that the key to successful sojourn is the person's ability and willingness to attain those culturally relevant social skills which facilitate the achievement of the goals of the assignment. (ibid. 185.)

Oppedal (2006) developed the ABC model adding a developmental aspect on it – proposing an ABCD model, a dynamic contextual model of acculturation development. The idea in the model is to expand the concept of culture competence as the basis of acculturation development along the lines of the following argument: culture competence originates in the psycho-social dynamics of inter-personal relationships. (ibid. 97.) Immigrant children have been studied upon their adoption of cultural roles and ethnic identity formation. An ethnic identity crisis may arise. Acculturation development refers to a competence within two distinct cultural domains, i.e. to the ability to successfully participate in two domains (Sam & Oppedal, 2002; Oppedal, 2006, p. 97). The concept of acculturation development has been proposed to accommodate the particular circumstances of children and adolescents with an ethnic minority background (Berry & Sam, 1997; Oppedal, 2006, p. 97). Developmental niche (Super and Harkness, 1986, 1994; Oppedal, 2006, p. 98) refers to various aspects of culture that guide the developmental process.

4.3   Culture Distance and Common ingroup identity Model

Through a series of studies, Ward and her colleagues have demonstrated that immigrants and sojourners who perceive more similarities between the host culture and their own generally experience higher levels of sociocultural adaptation. (Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001; Sam & Berry, 2006. p. 71.)

As mentioned earlier, Finland is an ethnically and culturally rather homogeneous society. Against this background, it is worth mentioning the concept of *culture distance,* which refers to the differences and similarities between two cultures (Demes & Geeraert, 2014, p. 93). Multiple authors have achieved results supporting the view that culture distance plays an important role in predicting the adaptation abilities and well-being of the newly arrived (ibid. 93). There is evidence in literature that sociocultural adaptation is better and more easily achieved when cultural or ethnic uniformity between two cultures can be found (Ward & Kennedy, 1999, p. 671). Demes and Geeraert (2014, p. 93) claim that cultural distance

and sociocultural adaptation are closely related concepts, in the sense that only those dimensions or aspects that differ from the culture in the country of origin, compared to the new culture, need adoption and learning. That is to say, *"The larger the difference between two cultures, the greater the challenge to adapt"* (ibid. 93).

Bogardus (1925; Weinfurt & Moghaddam, 2001, p. 108) presents the *scale of social distance*, which is based on the idea of "social hierarchy". Social hierarchy is based on measurements that indicate to what extent individuals prefer more those similar in nationality, ethnicity, religion, and politics in comparison to other people with differences in the aforementioned features. Responses form a hierarchical distinction between people from the same or different backgrounds/cultures. In Weinfurt and Moghaddam's (2001, p. 107) research, the results show that one's own culture and the cultures which are more similar to one's own culture are at the top of the hierarchy, and cultures which are less similar to one's own culture are at the bottom. This is, nonetheless, the case only among respondents from individualistic western cultures, i.e. the order of hierarchy does not function correctly when respondents are from collectivistic cultures. Thus, this kind of hierarchy might not be reliable in non-western societies, or in other societies that are high in collectivism. That is to say, social hierarchy is most reliable in societies inclined to individualism. According to Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2000, p. 11) individualism refers to a cultural feature that leads to competition between individuals and even self-interest and personal goals. Communitarianism (collectivism) on the other hand leads to cooperation and common goals.

The idea of a*ttraction-similarity hypothesis* is in the line of predicting that "similarity leads to attraction" (Van Oudenhoven, Ward & Masgoret, 2006), much like the scale of social distance. If one perceives the other having belief similarity, it may contribute to the attraction towards this "other". In addition, this can even support the idea of common ingroup membership. Van Oudenhoven et al. (2006, p. 643) specify this view saying that *"Similarity may reduce insecurity in interpersonal and intergroup relations. Cultural similarity, in particular, may be rewarding because it confirms that our beliefs and values are correct"*. The question that arises is if the concepts of similarity regarding the immigrants in Finland are supported by Finns. If that is the case, at which level do Finns expect immigrants to adopt the Finnish culture specific social markers in order to perceive them as fitting in as co-nationals?

Bourhis, Montaruli, El-Geledi, Harvey and Barrette (2010, p. 780) claim that using the term host, the majority divides the population into us and them, in which us refers to the host majority.

Nevertheless, regardless of the differences between culture groups it is possible to have a common ingroup identity. Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman and Rust (1993, p. 1) propose that it is important to change perceptions of *us* and *them* to a recategorized *we* instead, thus reducing intergroup bias. Therefore, the idea of the common ingroup identity model (CIIM) is that the borders of sub-groups should be faded out with the aim to create a recategorized common ingroup identity. That is to say, the CIIM supports the idea that immigrants may become accepted as co-nationals, promoting the notion of a common identity. The CIIM is based on the assumptions that contact is a crucial tool that must be used to ease the merger of the different groups as a we (Gaertner et al., 1993, p. 3). Ingroup favoritism is linked to a categorized ingroup (us) while it does not necessarily mean that an outgroup (them) is regarded as something negative, but merely less positive (Gaertner et al., 1993, p. 3). Nonetheless, The CIIM proposes personalization and individuation of the people from an outgroup through contact.

4.4 The Relative Acculturation Extended Model

Navas et al. (2005, p. 21) proposes the *domain specificity* approach to acculturation in the model of Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM). According to this model, immigrants can shift between different acculturation strategies, proposed by Berry (1974, 1980) and other acculturation researchers such as Bourhis et al. (1997), depending on their attitudes and views on a specific acculturation domain, i.e. situation or context. Here, the term *domain* refers to public and private domains in one's life, for instance work and family, but even to more abstract domains such as political, religious, social, and economic ways of thinking (Navas et al., 2005, p. 21).

The RAEM highlights five significant points. Firstly, it addresses consistency and divergence between natives' and immigrants' acculturation strategies based on hypotheses of Bourhis et al. (1997); in this, consistency in acculturation orientations between ingroup and outgroup supports a harmonious relationship as a consequence, whereas divergence in orientations supports the opposite, i.e. a relationship of discord. Secondly, the model indicates that it matters to which ethnic group an immigrant belongs, i.e. there is variation in

attitudes in consideration of the different immigrant groups in different contexts (e.g. cultural, political). Thirdly, there are various psychosocial factors e.g. intergroup contact, prejudice, similarity and group status, which might have an influence on natives' and immigrants' acculturation attitudes. According to the RAEM, adaptation is a complex and relative process where the fourth point addresses the ideal and real acculturation orientations one may possess. That is to say, in the ideal situation an immigrant can freely and voluntarily choose the acculturation orientation based on his or her attitudes and views. On the other hand, the real situation refers to an acculturation strategy that is actually put into practice. The fifth point indicates the central phenomenon in the model, i.e. the domain specificity in attitudes and the choice of acculturation orientation depending on the domain. (Navas et al., 2005, p. 26.)

To conclude, the *Domain Specificity* approach can widen the idea of acculturation orientation as a multidimensional concept which is difficult to categorize into four or five strategies - or into a specific orientation related to a certain person or group, or a certain context and domain. In other words, according to RAEM attitudes are not stable with movements into one direction, but rather relative, context-bound and lively.

The different domains are divided into *seven secondary domains.* Regarding these domains the immigrants and natives/host members can choose which acculturation strategy they want to apply in each domain, and thus these strategies can vary across domains. (Navas, Rojas, García & Pumares, 2007, 67.) The domains are shortly presented. The first domain refers to political and government systems. The second domain refers to labour. The third domain refers to economic. The fourth domain refers to the family. The fifth domain refers to social, e.g. relationships. The sixth domain is ideological, and the seventh domain is about religious beliefs and customs. (Navas et al., 2005, p. 28.) In other words, the domain range is between material elements and the symbolic ones. (ibid. 27.)

That is to say, each of us possess a view regarding the specific domains the RAEM proposes, but our view can vary without any specific categorization onto the "assimilationist" or "separationist" acculturation orientation, for instance. The RAEM supports, thus, a relative view on acculturation orientations. To link this idea to this research framework, the evaluations on the social markers can reveal in which domains the host members set the greatest requirements for immigrants regarding the RAEM as basis.

Nevertheless, there are results indicating that minority and majority members favour integration or assimilation strategy in the public domains. Whereas, minorities favour separation as an adaptation strategy in the private domain, while majorities in turn would prefer them instead to assimilate. (Navas et al., 2007, p. 68.) In other words, the relationship seems to be challenging, considering the private sphere aspect. If these "preferences" are just based on ideal orientations and not on real ones, it is possible that the relationship is challenging also in the public domain.

4.5   The Interactive Acculturation Model

There are constant incongruities and negotiations between immigrants and hosts due to their differing options in acculturation strategies – even direct conflicts. Thus, "what is enough" is a leading question in these negotiations. As a result of these perceived challenges and conflicts, there are continuous debates on policies, requirements for more strict and limiting or loose and welcoming immigration laws and a general atmosphere including dissatisfaction among both immigrants and the host members causing challenges in the interindividual and intergroup relations (Bourhis et al., 2010, p. 781). Nonetheless, in the end the host majority has the power to determine how one should acculturate and adapt into the society based on the dominance in that specific society (ibid. 782). Nevertheless, it is worth noticing that the receiving society often includes different cultural groups and is, thus, not simply homogeneous in its population. This makes it possible for the newly arrived to identify themselves with a preferable group of choice, and in this way construct one's new cultural framework including the adoption level into the host culture. (ibid. 782.) In the Finnish context, the population is rather ethnically and culturally homogeneous, thus culture groups from which to choose are scarce. In addition, the identification with some culture group brings along the perceived status that this particular immigrant group has in the society.

The previous acculturation models, that were merely unidimensional – for instance Gordon's (1964; Navas et al., 2005, p. 23) assimilation model, proposed that immigrants wholly assimilate and adopt the new host culture. These models were however widened by the proposition of the bidimensional model in which even the original culture maintenance was possible when adapting into the host society – these two dimensions were seen rather independent of each other (Berry, 1997; Bourhis et al., 2010, p. 782). The interactive

acculturation model (IAM) proposed by Bourhis et al. (1997) emphasizes the importance, not only of immigrants' acculturation preferences, but also of host country nationals' acculturation preferences. In other words, the adaptation orientations into the new society can be divided into separate and independent dimensions on how the natives and immigrants experience how one should adapt into the society. (ibid. 376.) Thus, the IAM addresses adaptation and the minority-majority relations found in acculturation strategies. Regarding the host members acculturation orientations, it matters also which group of immigrants is talked about, i.e. it matters where the immigrants originate from (Navas et al., 2005, p. 24). That is to say, the expectations and requirements the host members have generally for all immigrants included, it is not possible to separate the different immigrant groups in this study. The IAM is based on a few assumptions that might have an influence for the adaptation strategies chosen. These are for instance, government decision makers who have an influence on the state immigration policies.

> *The external boundaries of the state are determined by its international frontiers, which in turn define who is categorized as a `fellow national` and who is labelled a `foreigner`* (Bourhis et al., 1997, p. 370).

In addition, state agencies have an influence on policy decisions and thus integration ideologies through their input on integration and immigration research. Through these processes it is possible to obtain the two spheres of core adaptation strategies presented in the IAM model. These two spheres are separated into two independent categories which consist of the immigrants' acculturation orientation strategies and the host members' acculturation orientations (Bourhis et al., 1997, p. 371).

In the IAM model the immigrants' acculturation orientations are divided into five different directions - integration, assimilation, separation, anomie and individualism. The questions asked of immigrants are somewhat similar concerning the desire of maintaining the original culture or becoming involved in the host culture. The second dimension of the IAM model, which is of particular interest to this study, indicates the host's expectations for immigrants' adaptation orientations. In this dimension, the hosts are asked two questions. Firstly, do you accept that immigrants maintain their original culture? Secondly, do you accept that immigrants adapt to the host culture? (Bourhis et al., 1997, pp. 379-380.) How one answers these questions indicates the expectations one has for immigrants. The results accumulated by these questions form a model of acculturation expectations, i.e. integration, assimilation, segregation, exclusion and individualism. (ibid.)

Integration comes in question when the answers are positive for the two related questions mentioned above, i.e. integrationists may represent multicultural ideologies. *Assimilationists* answer positively to the question related to the adoption of the host culture but negatively on maintaining the original culture. They support immigrants' similarity of culture with the hosts. *Segregationists* accept that immigrants maintain their original culture and stay in touch with groups of the same ethnic origin, and do not adopt the host culture. They may even avoid contact with immigrants. *Exclusionists* answer both questions negatively and expect immigration to stop. They do not see the opportunity for immigrants to ever become culturally similar to the natives. *Individualists* accept immigrants as they are, without highlighting the importance of maintaining the original culture or adopting the hosts' culture. (ibid. 380- 381.) The most positive results on a relational level between host members and immigrants have been found when both groups prefer integration, assimilation or individualism. (ibid. 383.) Whereas, the most challenging relationship emerges if the acculturation orientations are partially consistent, i.e. when host members prefer immigrants to assimilate while they want to integrate, or other way around. (ibid.)

In other words, the IAM model in this study is useful in predicting the Finns' acculturation expectations for immigrants and, in this way, provides a relevant basis for the research questions. It can even support the idea of Finns' attitudes and views towards immigrants, and the extent to which Finns accept immigrants as ingroup members/co-nationals. In other words, what do the Finns' acculturation expectations tell about the requirements that immigrants must fulfill or possess in order to fit in? Or to become accepted as co-nationals? The IAM is appropriate in the study because it highlights the hosts' attitudes and expectations for immigrants. This is exactly what this study aims to examine. Thus, it is worth noting that the culture-specific social markers create and reproduce social reality where acculturation takes place. Finnishness, as observed in this study, can be understood through social markers using the theory of IAM.

4.6   Background of the study

This study follows a rather new view on acculturation and adaptation studies, examining social markers as a predictor of hosts' requirements and acculturation expectations for immigrants. In other words, the study structure and settings are based on a frame in which hosts' attitudes are examined and not those of immigrants'. It is rarer to study what the

majority wishes or wants in acculturation studies. This approach should be considered important, as approaches from the minority point of view can sometimes needlessly limit the majority perspective. Considering the context of the Finnish society, this study can provide fruitful results for further studies using the same questionnaire or data collected.

Chan-Hoong Leong's (2014) study on "*Social markers of acculturation: A new research framework on intercultural adaptation*" examines majority attitudes towards immigrants' attitudes on a sociocultural and social psychological level. A second study with a related research topic is Chan-Hoong Leong and Wai Wai Yang's (2015) study on *"Social markers of integration: What matters most to Singaporeans?"*. Leong and Yang's (2015) study is a follow-up study for Leong's (2014) previous study mentioned above.

In Leong's (2014) study, he emphasizes the value of acculturation orientation linked to attitudes among majority and minority members, but does so through a new approach. Leong (2014, p. 121) asks*"how much must immigrants do in order to become a naturalized citizen of a country?"*. This question arises from the investigation on the social construction of acculturation that is the basic question his study originated from. (ibid.) Leong (2014) is interested in the existing gaps related to acculturation orientations and in the viewpoints between immigrants and native citizens. It is mentioned that the more similar orientations both of these groups have, the better the opportunities an immigrant has in her or his adaptation into the new society. However, different acculturation orientations predict a troubled relationship. (e.g. Bourhis et al., 1997.) These four acculturation orientations are assimilation, separation, marginalization and integration. (ibid. 120.)

 The new glance on acculturation studies is based on the assumption that culture-specific social markers measure social inclusiveness, and that certain markers are more important than others (ibid. 120-121). The more markers are experienced as important, the more demanding the requirements for immigrants to meet the expectations of natives (ibid. 122). The research data consisted of the input of 1001 native Singaporeans and 1000 naturalized citizens in Singapore, aged at least 21 years. The results showed that both natives and immigrants have a positive view on multiculturalism in Singapore. Nevertheless, there were markers that matter more compared to others (ibid. 129). In other words, social markers exposed extents to which the specific markers matter with regard to the adaptation of immigrants in the Singaporean context. Results indicate that higher education, living in

more expensive or larger houses, national pride, family ties and perceived immigrant threats are linked with more restrictive views on immigrants in Singapore. Those addressing the importance of immigrant contributions, have less strict and more open views on immigrants in Singapore. (ibid. 126.) All in all, indicating fewer social markers as necessary for naturalization is related to positive views on immigration, while indicating more social markers is related to stricter views on immigration. (ibid. 129.)

Leong and Yang's (2015) follow-up project resembles greatly Leong's (2014) previous study on social markers. This study focuses on social markers as an explanation of immigrant's opportunities for social integration and adaptation in Singapore. Leong and Yang (2015) investigate research questions like "At what point do Singaporeans regard immigrants as naturalized?" and "How do we measure successful integration, and what are the indicators of a naturalized citizen?" (Leong & Yang, 2015, p. 39.) The study continues its alternative take on acculturation studies, i.e. it provides also an alternative solution for the traditional way of studying acculturation and adaptation in its emphasis on social markers. The emphasis is on social integration trying to find the point where foreign-born ones are accepted and viewed as co-nationals, similarly with native-born ones. (ibid. 45.)

The study aims to find the gaps between natives and immigrants' views related to integration. This research, too, consisted of 1001 native Singaporeans and 1000 naturalized citizens in Singapore, aged at least 21 years. Results show that both groups have a positive view on multiculturalism in Singapore, although naturalized immigrants have at some level more inclusive attitudes towards future immigrants. Leong and Yang's (2015) study takes into account the contextual factors more extensively in their analysis as compared to Leong's (2014) study. That is to say, they associate their results more extensively to the local policies and public communication, but even to the different aspects of culture, thus also giving propositions for better decisions to make (Leong & Yang, 2015, pp. 58- 60). The results show that positive views on economic optimism and life satisfaction diminish the perceived threats. (ibid. 53.) Natives and immigrant citizens differ in that natives indicate more social markers than immigrants which means that natives have stricter views on immigration. Nevertheless, both groups mentioned appreciate multiculturalism, in general. (ibid. 57.)

To sum, acculturation and social adaptation are the central concepts in both of the above studies. Refreshing the concept of acculturation is the goal in both two. In addition, both studies present the idea of a *taxonomy of expectations* referring to host members'

expectations for immigrants in the acculturation process. That is to say, what are the expectations host members have for immigrants on maintaining their original culture, and on the other hand, what are the expectations concerning immigrants' involvement in the host society?. (Leong & Yang, 2015, p. 42.)

Social markers are used as research objects in defining host expectations. It is obvious that this new framework for acculturation studies might bring the crucial information and supplementary support to the traditional way of studying acculturation attitudes. In addition, the research hopefully succeeds at creating further knowledge on social markers, potentially contributing to policy-making on integrating new immigrants into the society. This is thus an actual and important topic to delve in. That is why the repetitive study in the Finnish context would also be optimal welcome, if not even necessary in prior to widen the knowledge about the minority versus majority relationships in Finland. In addition, considering that Singapore has been on its way to become a multicultural society since the 19th century (Leong, 2014, p. 123) – unlike Finland, which became a country of immigration as late as in the end of the 20th century, it would be interesting to make a repetition of the topic in the Finnish context.

At the moment, Leong et al. work with a research project linked to the previous studies discussed above. A new feature in their ongoing project is that each social marker is being measured also with regard to if they are easy or difficult to acquire as immigrants, according to hosts. The main focus in the project is to make comparisons between four culturally different countries which are Singapore, Finland, Canada and Japan, measuring the native born citizens' attitudes and expectations on naturalized immigrants. Therefore, the expectations native-born citizens have on each social marker intends to clarify at which level and "prior to-what" native citizens accept naturalized immigrants as their co-nationals like they do with any other native one. In other words, the aim is to find universal and culture-specific variations in each social marker in these above-mentioned countries. Professor Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti leads the project in Finland.

4.7   Purpose of this study

This research is a follow-up study based on Leong's (2014) and Leong and Yang's (2015) previous studies discussed above using the related procedure in data collection and a similar,

somewhat elaborated questionnaire, as is the case for all of the four above-mentioned countries which are participating in the project. Nevertheless, in this study the research topic takes its own angle and is not a repetition of the previous studies, and although the data will constitute a part of a greater research project, and although the acculturation-adaptation approach is valid even in my research, the focus and research questions have been chosen to better fit my goals and my interest for further studies.

For instance, I will not make comparisons between the four different cultures as will be the case in the greater ongoing research project. I am interested in looking at the Finnish culture-specific evaluations of a large number of social markers. All these different examinations listed above will certainly possess similar features with my study to some extent, due to the theoretical approach in the studies, i.e. acculturation/adaptation, and due to the basic, yet fine-tuned outline of the questionnaire. The acquirement level and importance level of the social markers are both taken into account, as well as the socio-psychological factors predicting the motives for evaluations on the social markers. The ambition of the study is to look for the most important social markers for Finns and thus predict the Finns' expectations or requirements for acculturation, based on the reported importance of the social markers. In addition, I will aim to predict whether it is possible for immigrants to fulfill the expectations and requirements set by host members. Additionally, the motives or reasons behind the set requirements will be cast light upon. To sum, acculturation/adaptation is a central concept in this study, but only the host members' acculturation expectations are on focus, and thus, not the immigrants' views and attitudes.

Bochner (1982, p. 9) states that it is interesting when in monoculture societies the population has more or less the same ethnic identity. This is worth noticing when studying culture, or Finnishness, in Finland due to the more or less monoculture context and also ethnically and culturally homogeneous population. The greater the evaluation of importance in each social marker, the more the respondent expects from immigrants in order for the latter to fit in. In other words, the goal is to find out what the particular culture specific social markers are that determine who is an eligible member of the society in Finland. What are the requirements for immigrants to become accepted into "one of us", i.e. *who fits in*? It seems sensible to say that fulfilling those requirements is necessary for immigrants to be able to adapt in the eyes of host members. What are the challenges and opportunities? Is it for instance "very important" for an immigrant to have a knowledge of the Finnish language, dress like the natives do and go to the army? The presumption is that immigrants

who fulfill these prerequisites could have the best opportunities to fit in. It might also be, on the other hand, that none of the above qualities is deemed important. In addition, the respondents provide answers about how easy or difficult it is to obtain these requirements, which on the other hand demonstrate whether or not immigrants can even attain the opportunity of fitting in.

To conclude, the interest of the study is to find out what conditions Finns set to immigrants in the acculturation process, through a two-fold (importance and ease of acquirement) evaluation of social markers, and what the particular factors are that might explain the motives and reasons behind the respondents' views on social markers indicating their expectations or requirements on who is an eligible member in the Finnish society.

To clarify, the focus is on Finns' attitudes as a group, and not necessarily on the single individual evaluations of social markers or underlying factors on socio-psychological questions. The research interest is on correlations and causality among the individual responses, and the general view on what these responses together predict. In other words, the research might lend itself to expanding our knowledge about the minority and majority relations in Finland.

4.8   Research questions

1. Who fits in?

     How are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of importance, by members of the majority group?

2. Is it possible to fit in?

     How are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of ease of acquirement, by members of the majority group?
     What is the relationship between the perceived importance attached to different social markers and the perceived ease of their acquirement?

3. What factors predict the level of demands posed toward immigrants measured through social markers?

The study aims to find out what criteria make for an eligible member of the Finnish society according to native born Finnish citizens. To succeed in this objective, the study poses three related research questions. The first question is *who fits in*, a descriptive question that aims to examine which single social markers are the most important for immigrants to possess in order for them to be seen and accepted as acculturated according to host members. This question is analyzed descriptively, based on evaluations of the social markers, but also with a method of a paired-samples t- test to compare the mean values of different social markers.

The second question, *is it possible to fit in,* is divided into two sub-questions. The first one is similarly descriptive in its nature and aims to investigate if it is possible to fit in through an analysis of the ease of achieving the perceived social markers, which host members have evaluated as the most important. In other words, how easy – from the point of view of the majority group members – is it for immigrants to acquire the expectations that host members have set for them? The paired-samples t-test is used to compare the mean values of the variables measuring the acquirement opportunities an immigrant has on each perceived social marker. Thus, through this question it can be predicted why someone might fit in better. The second sub-question is aimed at, through comparing the perceived importance and perceived ease of acquirement of social markers, determining what possibilities of success there are for immigrants in the acculturation process in the Finnish context. How easy is it to acquire the social markers perceived as most important? Is there some kind of correlation between the two qualities, e.g. that the most important markers are the hardest to acquire? Although descriptive in its wording, the second subquestion lends itself to a prediction and thus, explanation, of the successes or shortcomings an immigrant may face in her acculturation process.

For the third research question, *what factors predict the level of demands posed toward immigrants measured through social markers*, a hierarchical (sequential) multiple regression analysis will be employed to test the predictors of the level of expectations toward immigrants. Results found for this question might provide information about the socio-psychological motives and reasons for why someone expects more than someone else.

Regarding the third question, it is hypothesized on the basis of previous research, that adaptation expectations and demands are related to a number of individual factors,

cognitive factors and intergroup related factors (more about these factors in the end of method section). Therefore it is assumed that respondents with more experiences of intergroup contact, less perceived intergroup threat, low national identification and higher satisfaction with their lives are more willing to accept immigrants, and thus demand less from the level of their cultural and socially assimilation. Whereas those who puts more emphasis on assimilation are assumed to demand more from immigrants, and thus emphasize the importance of the social markers. In addition, those with more perceived intergroup permeability, the more respondents emphasize the importance of social markers, while those who perceive immigrants as a source of contributions to a society as a criterion for viewing an immigrant as acculturated, the less respondents put emphasis on importance of the social markers. Family relations or economic optimism are hypothesized not to have any significant influence on more demands set for immigrants to assimilate. These associations will be studied controlling for the demographic factors on the adaptation demands. Due to the scarcity of previous research, no predictions are made for the possible differences in models predicting demands related to different dimensions of adaptation. All in all, it is hypothesized that endorsing more the social markers indicate more negative attitudes towards multiculturalism and cultural diversity, which can be assumed to predict stricter assimilationist acculturation orientation and expectations for immigrants to possess in order to fit in.

5. Method

In the method section, data collection, questionnaire, participants, research ethics, data summarized in factor analysis, regression assumptions, criticism and measures for the hierarchical multiple regression are presented.

5.1 Data collection

The research is based on quantitative methods. The data was collected, with a questionnaire, from a sample of university students from the University of Helsinki and Aalto University. SPSS Statistics version 21 is used to handle and analyze the data. Qualitative methods were used in the pre-research of the data. However, I will discuss

the qualitative part only shortly and only concerning the topic of the pre-research data collection, mentioning merely some central figures that the pre-research brought to the main data collection.

In the beginning of the research, the guideline for pilot interviews and the original questionnaire was translated from English to Finnish, and after the data collection, the data was translated back from Finnish to English in order for other researchers to be able to use the Finnish data in their investigations when making comparisons between countries.

In the beginning of the research project, which is based primarily on the data collection questionnaire, two pilot interviews were conducted. These interviews were qualitative semi-structured interviews with ten university students, five in each interview. The interviews included a particular guideline that determined the themes of discussions, although participants could discuss the given framework somewhat freely. The structure of the guideline consisted of five different themes to discuss, and they were all related to the topic of this study, e.g. culturally dependent social markers, expectations for immigrants who come to Finland, immigrant groups in Finland, but also views regarding the questionnaire itself and its content. The guideline for the discussions was based on the guideline made by Leong et al. leading the research project that my study originates from.

Based on the transcription and analysis of these interviews, two additional questions were added into the original version of the questionnaire. These two questions created their own scale among other scales in the questionnaire under the name "Finnish culture-specific questions". Both of these Finnish culture-specific questions reflect the features of Finnish culture. A guideline can be found in the Appendix 1: Guideline, and the two added questions in the questionnaire in the Appendix 2: Questionnaire.

To sum, the goal for these discussions was to clarify if there are some Finnish culture-specific social markers that need to be added into the original questionnaire, assuming that it might need some editing when changing the research framework from Singapore to Finland, for instance. The same questionnaire is used both in Finland, Japan, Singapore and Canada, but with culture-specific editing. That is why the piloting was an important tool to find out if there are some "cultural" gaps that need to be complemented with culture specific questions, or if some questions need to be removed or modified.

One question in the original version was for instance "…. is married to a Finnish citizen", but it needed to be changed to "… lives or is married to a Finnish citizen". That is, in some cultures/countries it is not appropriate to live with someone without being married – but that is generally not the case in Finland.

5.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire is formulated to measure and examine the Finns' attitudes and views about the naturalized immigrants through Finnish culture-specific social markers. The evaluations of the social markers reveal the attitudes that host members have regarding the acculturation of immigrants in Finland. Thus, the questionnaire does not reveal the immigrants' views or attitudes on any level, as their views are not explored. The questionnaire was controlled in the sense that it would better fit into the limitations and the needs of the sample group. On the first hand, the questionnaire was made only in Finnish to reach only the students with knowledge in Finnish. Swedish would possibly have been a second alternative, but it was assumed that the Swedish speaking population in Finland (in Helsinki) also has a knowledge of Finnish, if they are Finnish born Finnish citizens – which also was one controlled factor. That is to say, the questionnaire was purposefully aimed to be distributed to the Finnish-speaking and native born Finnish citizens with a motive based on the assumption that this group of people could possibly have the best knowledge of special cultural features and patterns in Finland. In other words, Finns are ethnically the major population in Finland; that is why their views are of interest in this study, as host members' attitudes and views are examined.

The questions in the questionnaire are divided into three parts, in which the first part includes questions that examine the respondents' views about the importance of various social markers - and to what extent these markers are easy or difficult to obtain. The second part investigates views on threats and contributions immigration and immigrants can evoke, the respondent's national pride, family ties, life satisfaction, economic optimism and acculturation orientation. In the third part, the respondent can tell his or her own previous, or possible future, experiences with immigrants. The questions in part two and three are called socio-psychological questions derived from the Leong and

Yang's (2015, p. 46) used specification. These socio-psychological questions are used to predict the motives for the evaluations on social markers of importance.

The data measurements scales measure the views and attitudes the respondents possess. The data is however treated as ordinal data in the SPSS statistics version 21 which is used here. There are some pro versus con arguments concerning whether the treatment is appropriate or not, because ordinal refers to something that can be measured as better or worse – and views or attitudes cannot. Furthermore, the mean number used in results about views and attitudes is not appropriate according to some researchers and statisticians, because views are seen as categorical instead of ordinal. On the other hand, there are arguments in favour of addressing the fact that mean values guide the direction of the views and are appropriate to use. (Taanila, 2015.) Thus, standard deviations measuring the variance of views are proposed to be presented with mean values. In this study, the data is treated as ordinal with continuous items included, with a sensitive approach and approach with research ethics taken into account.

5.2.1   Social markers- inventories of the questionnaire

There are all in all 41 social markers in the questionnaire. A 7-point Likert scale was used as a rating scale in measuring the views and attitudes of respondents. In the questionnaire, the scale of evaluation of the social markers looks like the following example: 1 (not at all important) to 7 (very important). In other words, respondents could choose between seven different points to best reflect their views. The 7- point Likert scale allowed a respondent to make evaluations in a wider range.

Even the acquirement level of the social markers was measured by asking respondents to evaluate their views on a 7-point Likert scale. In the questionnaire, the scale of evaluation of the social markers looks like the following example: 1 (almost impossible to acquire) to 7 (can be acquired very easily).

5.2.2   Socio-psychological- inventories of the questionnaire

Symbolic and realistic threats

The scale of symbolic and realistic threats includes 14 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the higher is the perceived threat level.

Immigrant contributions

The scale of immigrant contributions includes 5 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the higher is the perceived immigrant contribution level.

National pride

The scale of national pride includes 5 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the higher is the perceived national pride level.

Life Satisfaction

The scale of life satisfaction includes 5 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the higher is the perceived life satisfaction level.

Family Relations

The scale of family relations includes 3 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the better the family relations are.

Economic optimism

The scale of economic optimism includes 3 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the respondent agrees, the higher is the faith in economic optimism.

Host acculturation Orientation

The scale of host acculturation orientation includes 3 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. The more the

respondent agrees, the more the respondent supports the acculturation orientation in which the immigrants should adopt the Finnish culture and customs.

Contact

The scale of contact includes 5 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(Very little contact) to 7 (Very often) was used. The higher is the evaluation, the more often the respondent has had contact with immigrants.

Intergroup permeability

The scale of intergroup permeability includes 8 items. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Difficult) to 7 (Easy), 1 (lower in social status) to 7 (Higher in social status), 1 (Lower in economic status) to 7 (Higher in economic status), 1 (Finns have more access to social resources) to 7 (immigrants have more access to social resources), 1 (Finnish people have more political influence) to 7 (Immigrants have more political influence) and 1 (Finnish people have more work opportunities) to 7 (Immigrants have more opportunities) was used. The higher the respondent has evaluated each part in the scale, the greater is the perceived permeability.

Accept- item

There is a single item placed as the last question in the questionnaire, denoting the significance of citizenship with respect to being accepted as a co-national. The 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 7 (very important) was used, indicating that if the Finnish citizenship is very important for immigrants to have according to the respondent, the immigrant is better accepted as a co-national.

5.3 Participants

The sample group consists of 198 (N= 198) native-born Finnish citizens including a small size of people with dual citizenship, Finnish and some other country. Nonetheless, all respondents are native-born Finnish citizens. The questionnaire was sent to university students at the University of Helsinki and Aalto University. Only native-born Finnish citizens were accepted as respondents because of the goal in the greater research project, in which the data used in this study is based on, aims at capturing the native-born ones'

attitudes and views indicated through their expectations and requirements on acculturation of immigrants in Finland. For this study, in the Finnish sample, a small pool of dual citizens are kept along because it is seemingly not having any effect on the results. In addition, the sample group consisting of some dual citizens can on the other hand reflect the real picture of the Finnish population and thus contribute to a more realistic picture of the results. Otherwise, it was necessary for the purpose of the study to avoid multicultural dimensions on the sample group, which is one reason for why e.g. the questionnaire was only in Finnish. This does not necessarily constitute an optimal way to avoid multicultural dimensions, but it might work at least as an indicator.

The age was not meant to be controlled, but it was due to the fact that university students are on average around 20 and 30 years old. The average age is 26 years, but the greatest age group is from 19 to 24 years old, with 95 respondents and 48 % of all respondents. 31 % of the respondents are from 25 to 30 years old, and 17 % from 31 to 40 years old. The gender division among participants is remarkable; female respondents make up 73 %, and male respondents are only 25 % of all the respondents. 48 % of the respondents are unemployed and 43 % working part-time.

5.4 Research Ethics

It was made clear for respondents that they will be represented in the data with absolute anonymity. I cannot for instance find out at any level who is behind the particular response, although regarding the age, gender and employment status, I could speculate whether I know the person or not. Nonetheless, it is not meaningful to do so. To consider this in the results part, it is important not to publish too sensitive data if there is any risk of recognizing the person. In other words, the age division of respondents is mainly from 19-30 years, due to having students as a sample group. At the same time, it was asked if the respondent is female or male or what is one's major subject at university. Regarding these questions, it could be possible to recognize someone. This is a great risk to be avoided. Only information that will not give away any individual is published in results. The data will not be shared to others outside this research project.

I have to be careful when giving information about the respondents in the study. When making generalizations of the population or of Finns, it is good to remember that the

respondents are only university students and they absolutely do not represent the entire Finnish population. Also, the age division is mainly around the 20 and 30 years old female students – which makes it more sensitive to speak about Finnish native-born. That is why, in theory, it is acknowledged that the sample group was including native born Finnish citizens, but it is preferred to talk about the Finnish host members instead of the native Finns in the study. Some respondents did not mark their gender. This is, perhaps, due to ideological reasons or an unwillingness to categorize themselves in any of the possible categories, or just an error in giving the response.

5.5 Factor analysis

The list of social markers, the importance of which was measured, was summarized using the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in order to formulate suitable scales, with suitable items included, for follow-up analysis. The profound goal when factorizing is to find out the underlying factors that are composed when there is a set of items from the data which are intended to measure the same thing (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 397). The number of social markers was 41 before the factor analysis was performed. Social markers measuring the level of acquirement were summarized onto the scales, consistent with the factor loadings found in the social markers measuring the importance level. In other words, the separated and an additional factor analysis was not performed. In addition, the nine socio-psychological scales (symbolic and realistic threats, immigrant contributions, national pride, life satisfaction, family relations, economic optimism, host acculturation orientation, intergroup permeability and intergroup contact, including altogether 52 socio-psychological questions) were tested with EFA, in order to investigate the structure of the scales. Nonetheless, each scale was tested separately from each other, because the goal was not to find out onto which factors these socio-psychological questions are loaded (we already know the scales that will be used), but merely to test how they are loaded onto the factors, i.e. with which strength, they are loaded onto the factors and to find out if they are uni- or bi-dimensional. The same settings were chosen as in the EFA of the social markers.

In the EFA of the social markers, the chosen methods were maximum likelihood as the extraction method, and orthogonal varimax as the rotation style. Nummenmaa (2009, p. 410) claims that maximum likelihood is a potential general solution method for

achieving the greatest probability for produced factor loadings to demonstrate correlations found in the population. Maximum likelihood is recommended if there are more than 100 observations (Heikkilä. 2014, p. 4). Orthogonal rotation was chosen to cover the different factors that will be uncorrelated with each other. It is one of the most used rotation styles in EFA, which is also one reason why it was used in this study (Field, 2005, p. 637 reference). The limit of absolute value was set on .30, i.e. all items with factor loadings below .30 were automatically removed. Some guides propose .30 as the limit, while others propose .50 (Kvantimotv, 2003, p. 113). Due to the fussiness of interpreting the factor loadings, it was necessary to diminish and decide the amount of factors after the items achieved much better loadings onto the factors. Nevertheless, it is also preferable to choose the factor numbers due to the nature of the EFA, which propose to do so based on the theoretical assumptions, for instance (Ledesma & Valero-Mora, 2007, p. 2). The chosen amount of factors and the choice of the factor names are based on theoretical assumptions, as it is proposed to do with EFA. (ibid.) The preferable value for communality is above .30. The lower values of communality indicate that it is not possible to explain well enough the variance of the values of the variable in that particular factor solution. (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 403.)

Based on the factor loadings, sum scales were formed in order to have specific measurement scales for follow-up analysis. In addition, some items in the *socio-psychological* scales were reversed to measure the same instead of the contradictory issues. The reliability of the factor loadings/sum scales were checked with Cronbach's Alpha, which addresses how well these formed sum scales, including particular items, measure the same thing (Heikkilä, 2014, p. 10). The reliability of the scales on Cronbach's Alpha should not be below .7, and .8 is preferable (Pallant, 2010, p. 92).

Table 1

Exploratory Factor Analysis and communalities on each single social marker used in the data fixed in three separate factor divisions, in which 1. sociocultural adaptation, 2. socioeconomic adaptation and 3. social psychological adaptation.

Social marker	Factor			Communality
	1	2	3	
Dress like the local people do	. 79			. 73
Enjoys typical Finnish past times	. 70			. 63
Thinks like a Finn	. 68		. 36	. 62
Behaves like a Finn	. 68		. 45	. 67
Physically resembles Finn	. 67	. 39		. 60
Has a social circle comprising mostly native born Finns	. 65		. 37	. 60
Able to speak with local accent	. 64			. 45
Gives up foreign cultural norms or behaviour	. 64			. 51
Embraces Christianity	. 62			. 47
Able to write Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	. 58			. 41
Able to read Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	. 57			. 37
Able to eat local food	. 55			. 45
Able to speak conversational Finnish	. 54			. 37
Has Finnish roots	. 54	. 38		. 43
Enjoy or take part in local sports	. 50	. 32		. 39
Has lived in Finland for a period of time	. 43			. 21
Serves in the military	. 43	. 38		. 38
Works for a Finnish-based company		. 84		. 72
Invests in or sets up a Finnish-based company		. 79		. 67
Works for the Finnish government		. 79		. 64
Works in a field where there is a shortfall of labour in Finland		. 76		. 67
Considered a talent in their industry		. 64	. 47	. 65
Has at least a college degree		. 55		. 43
Marries/Lives with a native-born Finn	. 32	. 53		. 40
Participates in the work of local charity organizations		. 53		. 34
Has children who are Finnish citizens	. 36	. 52		. 49
Has a specific monthly income		. 48	. 32	. 37
Is a member of the local labour union		. 47		. 30
Owns residential property in Finland	. 34	. 45		. 39
Supports Finnish products and brands	. 37	. 39	. 39	. 44
Has retired or plans to retire in Finland		. 32		. 18
Participates in local politics				. 10
Gets on well with workplace colleagues		. 32	. 82	. 80
Gets on well with neighbours		. 31	. 81	. 79
Embraces a positive attitude to the host society	. 31		. 65	. 54
Follows local media	. 34		. 52	. 40
Their children attend(ed) local schools		. 37	. 50	. 44
Respects the private space of other people around			. 48	. 31
Is gainfully employed	. 30	. 40	. 47	. 47
Observes local laws and customs			. 42	. 23
Attends or attended local schools themselves	. 34	. 41	. 41	. 44

5.5.1   Importance of the Social markers

The fixed number of three factors was chosen based on the best factor loadings for each social marker.

Table 1 shows the factor loadings of each social marker in all the factors that the marker loaded. The table also shows communalities of each social marker that achieved the factor loading limit, i.e. above .30. Three social markers, *"Supports Finnish products and brands"*, *"Is gainfully employed"* and *"Attended local schools themselves"* were removed due to their vague factor loadings, including their loadings onto all three factors at the same time with good loadings, which made it more difficult to interpret the factor groups. Costello and Osborne (2005; Yong & Pearce, 2013, p. 84) present the term cross-loading, which refers to factor loadings above .32 in two or multiple factors. Some of the items included in the factors also have cross-loadings into two factors, but these items are kept along anyway. Thus, in these cases, the factor was chosen based on the strongest factor loading. Nonetheless, all the items loaded onto all three factors were removed. A fourth removed social marker *"Participates in local politics"* was automatically removed due to its factor loading below .30. In the end, all in all 37 social markers were included in the factors, 17 in the first factor, 13 in the second factor and 7 in the third factor.

As can be seen in table 1 three social markers which were not removed but instead taken along in the factor, have low communalities below .30. These items are: *observes local laws and customs*, *has lived in Finland for a period of time* and *has retired or plans to retire in Finland*. Going on with the analysis, albeit with weak communalities, is nevertheless possible. Yong and Pearce (2013, p. 83) propose that the limit of low communalities are below .20, and as it is shown in table 1 the lowest communalities are around .20, only one below .20. These items were anyway included in the factors, because they have factor loadings above .30, and they are perceived as important social markers for the follow-up analyses as predictors regarding research questions.

The results on factor loadings show that the total variance explained is 48.52 % (or 47.44% with the removed 4 items) of all three factors, i.e. it can be derived from the results that three factor solutions can explain approximately 48% of the variance, with

factor 1 providing 36.13% (or 36.03% with 4 removed items). (KMO = .92, Barlett's Test $p < .001$).

All the three factors were named based on previous research (see adaptation dimensions found in the theory section), because the social markers' factor loadings supported the theoretical assumptions regarding the content of the social markers which were placed under the same factor, in the sense that they measure the same underlying phenomenon. The first factor is called *sociocultural adaptation*, the second factor is called *socioeconomic adaptation* and the third factor is called *social psychological adaptation.*

The social markers included in the *sociocultural adaptation dimension* are: Dress like the local people do, Enjoys typical Finnish past times, Thinks like a Finn, Behaves like a Finn, Physically resembles Finn, Has a social circle comprising mostly native born Finns, Able to speak with local accent, Gives up foreign cultural norms or behaviour, Embraces Christianity, Able to write Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn, Able to read Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn, Able to eat local food, Able to speak conversational Finnish, Has Finnish roots, Enjoy or take part in local sports, Has lived in Finland for a period of time, Serves in the military (See table 1).

The social markers included in the *socioeconomic adaptation dimension* are: Works for a Finnish-based company, Invests in or sets up a Finnish-based company, Works for the Finnish government, Works in a field where there is a shortfall of labour in Finland, Considered a talent in their industry, Has at least a college degree, Marries/Lives with a native-born Finn, Participates in the work of local charity organizations, Has children who are Finnish citizens, Has a specific monthly income, Is a member of the local labour union, Owns residential property in Finland, Has retired or plans to retire in Finland (See table 1).

The social markers included in the *social psychological adaptation dimension* are: Gets on well with workplace colleagues, Gets on well with neighbours, Embraces a positive attitude to the host society, Follows local media, Their children attend(ed) local schools, Respects the private space of other people around, Observes local laws and customs (See table 1).

The next step was to formulate sum scales using the same factor loadings as a basis for summing the items. Sum scales are the ones of interest in this research, because there is no interest to focus just on one item at a time but simultaneously on the correlations and causality (links and relations) of the items.

That is to say, three sum scales were formed using the factor names. The reliability measured with Cronbach's Alpha is strong in all scales ($\alpha > .7$). In the sociocultural adaptation scale the Cronbach's Alpha is .93, in the socioeconomic adaptation scale the Cronbach's Alpha is .91, and in the social psychological adaptation scale the Cronbach's Alpha is .87. In addition, the scale including all the social markers that are composed in the three aforementioned sum scales (excluding iempl, ibrand, ipoli and isch) was formed in order to examine all the items simultaneously in the follow-up analyses. This scale has a high Cronbach's Alpha .95. All these four sum scales are treated as dependent, i.e. variables to be predicted in the follow up analysis.

5.5.2   Acquirement of the social markers

The acquirement of the social markers was summed up into three separate scales consistent with the importance variables, excluding four social markers: *"Supports Finnish products and brands"*, "*Is gainfully employed","Attended local schools themselves"* and *"Participates in local politics"*. Again, as in the examination of the importance of social markers, the first factor is called sociocultural adaptation scale, the second factor socioeconomic adaptation scale, the third social psychological adaptation scale and the fourth including all the social markers measuring the acquirement level simultaneously is called acquirement scale. The reliability of the acquirement scale measured with Cronbach's Alpha is .91. This indicates good reliability ($\alpha > .7$). The Cronbach's Alpha in acquirement of the social markers based on the sociocultural adaptation scale is .84, in acquirement of the social markers of the socioeconomic adaptation scale the Cronbach's alpha is .82, and in acquirement of the social markers of social psychological adaptation scale the Cronbach's Alpha is .74 indicating also good reliability. All these four sum scales provide an explanatory and independent basis for follow-up analysis.

5.5.3   Socio-psychological questions

There are nine unidimensional scales found to be linked to the possible reasons and motives for why a respondent may have either stricter or less strict attitudes regarding their evaluations of the importance and acquirement of social markers. These 9 scales measure the perceived symbolic and realistic threats, immigrant contributions, national pride, life satisfaction, family relations, economic optimism, host acculturation orientation, intergroup contact and intergroup permeability.

As already stated in the beginning of the factor analysis section, the items included in the scales were tested with EFA to see the structure of the scales, but also to see how well the items in the particular scales are loading onto the factors. The scales were tested separately from each other, because the analysis was not aimed at achieving new factors or scales for the items, but instead to see if the scales are uni- or bidimensional, how the items are loaded onto the factors and at which strength. This idea is based on the fact that these scales have already been used in previous studies (e.g. Leong & Yang, 2015), i.e. the scales are not tailor-made scales particularly for this study. In addition, the testing in the EFA was appropriate in order to see if, for instance, translations from English to Finnish have had any influence on the items composed in the scales. In other words, EFA is mainly done to visualize the items included in the scales, but also to demonstrate the strength of the particular item in the scale regarding the factor loadings and communalities, and yet, see the reliability level measured in Cronbach's Alpha.

After EFA a few items were removed from the data. These items are (Threat6) *Immigrants use Finland as a stepping stone to other countries*, (Contr5) *Immigrants shoulder the same amount of social responsibilities as the native born Finns*, (Perm1) *How easy would it be for you to be involved in work/school with immigrants,* (Perm2) *How easy would it be for you to be involved in social activities with immigrants,* and (Perm6) *How much access do you think immigrants in Finland have to the social resources that are available to the native one Finns*.

The item "*Immigrants use Finland as a stepping stone to other countries*" made the scale difficult to interpret when it was included into the factor analysis. Without the

item in question, all the items were strongly loaded onto the factor. The communality in that item was also below .20, violating the preferable limit of .30. The item "*Immigrants shoulder the same amount of social responsibilities as the native born Finns*" showed a negative connection to other items in the scale. After being reversed, the item the connection was positive, but it was still removed automatically, because of a factor loading below .30.

The items "*How easy would it be for you to be involved in work/school with immigrants*", "*How easy would it be for you to be involved in social activities with immigrants*", and the reversed item (due to its negative relation to other items in the scale) "*How much access do you think immigrants in Finland have to the social resources that are available to the native one Finns*" were removed automatically when the fixed factor number of one was chosen, due to their low factor loadings of below .30. Their communalities were also low, below .06 in each, violating greatly the preferable communality limit .30. On the other hand, the reversed item "*How much access do you think immigrants in Finland have to the social resources that are available to the native Finns*" seemed to be translated inaccurately from English to Finnish, so it was decided to take it off from the scale. After this decision made, the testing in EFA revealed that the scale is bi-dimensional, with two and five items in each scale. Because only two items, i.e. "*How easy would it be for you to be involved in work/school with immigrants*" and "*How easy would it be for you to be involved in social activities with immigrants*", were loaded onto one scale, they were removed from the analyses due to the small size of the scale.

In the end, the *symbolic and realistic threats* scale (threat) is composed of 13 items, after one (threat6) was removed, measuring the level of perceived threat. Four of the items were reversed (Threat11, 12, 13 and 14). Factor loadings were above .60 and the communalities of the items were above .30, mostly above .40 (KMO = .92, Barlett's Test $p < 001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .94. The factor solution of the scale can explain 54.09 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The *immigrant contributions* scale (contr) consists of 4 items (after contr5 was removed) measuring the level of perceived contributions immigrants can bring to Finland. Factor loadings were above .30, mostly above .70. The communalities of the

items were above .50, excluding the item (Contr3) *"Immigrants do the jobs that Finns do not want to"* which had a low communality of .15, violating the preferable limit. Nevertheless, due to its good factor loading above .30, it was included in the scale (KMO = .74, Barlett's Test $p < .001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .81. The factor solution of the scale can explain 55.95 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The *national pride* scale (pride) consists of 5 items. One item, (pride2), was reversed. The factor loadings were above .30, mostly above .40. Communalities were below .20 in the reversed item (pride2) and in (pride5) while the other items had ratings above .30. These items were anyway included onto the scale due to their good factor loadings, and to be avoided creating too small scales (KMO= .67, Barletts´s Test $p < .001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .63. The factor solution of the scale can explain 29.30 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The scale measuring the level of *life satisfaction* (life) includes 5 items. The items were loaded onto the factors with values above .50 and communalities above .30 (KMO = .84, Barlett´s Test $p < .001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .85. The factor solution of the scale can explain 57.82 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The scale of *family relations* (fam) includes 3 items. Factor loadings were above .60 and communalities above .40 (KMO = .69, Barlett´s Test $p < .001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .78**.** The factor solution of the scale can explain 60.16 % of the variance in the perceived variables. The scale is very small in size but high in factor loadings and reliability.

The *economic optimism* scale (fut) consists of 3 items. Factor loadings were above .60 and communalities above .30 (KMO = .68, Barlett´s Test $p < .001$). Cronbach's Alpha is .78. The factor solution of the scale can explain 56.27 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The *host acculturation orientation* scale (acco) consists of 3 items. The items (acco1)*"Immigrants should do more to preserve their heritage culture and customs"* and (acco3)*"It does not matter what culture immigrants engage because they have the right to pursue what they wish to do"* were reversed. Factor loadings were above .40, in

which the one reversed item (acco3) loaded better than .90. Communalities were below .30, but above .20 in acco1 and (acco2) *"Immigrants should do more to embrace Finnish culture and customs"*, but in acco3 the communality was high above .90 (KMO = .59, Barlett´s Test *p* < .001). Cronbach's Alpha is .64. The factor solution of the scale can explain 45.37 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

The *contact* scale (cont) consists of 5 items. Factor loadings were above .30. Communalities were below .20 in (cont1) *"How much contact do you have with immigrants in school/work situations"* and (cont3) *"How much contact do you have with immigrants as neighbours"* (KMO = .77, Barlett´s Test *p* < .001). Cronbach's Alpha is .81. The factor solution of the scale can explain 51.61% of the variance in the perceived variables. Due to the good reliability of the scale, factor loadings above .30 and the small size of the scale, low communality items are kept along in the scale.

The scale measuring *intergroup permeability* (perm) consists of 5 items after 3 items were removed. Factor loadings of the items are above .40. Communalities are below .30 in (perm3) *"Do you think it is easy or difficult for immigrants to make friends with people in Finland"*, (perm4) *"Compared to most people in Finland, immigrants as a group are generally: Lower in social status-Higher in social status"*, and (perm5) *"Compared to most people in Finland, immigrants as a group are generally: Lower in economic status – Higher in economic status"*. Regardless of the communalities below .30, these items are kept along due to the small size of the scale, good factor loadings and good reliability of the scale (KMO = .70, Barlett´s Test *p* < .001). Cronbach's Alpha is .71. The factor solution of the scale can explain 35.04 % of the variance in the perceived variables.

All in all, 5 items were removed and the total amount of the items divided into the 9 scales became 47. Despite low communalities on a few items, they are all included in the analysis either due to the small scale sizes already in the beginning, or due to the significant need for further analysis. The research question three in this study is observed and predicted using these 9 scales as socio-psychological variables and as independent, explanatory variables in relation to four dependent importance scales (sociocultural adaptation, socioeconomic adaptation, social psychological adaptation and the scale including all social markers of the three adaptation scales).

One item from the questionnaire, i.e. *how important is it for immigrants to become citizens of your country to be accepted as co-nationals* (accept) is not included in any scale mentioned above but is anyway included in the analysis as a single item, because the question is meant to reflect what significance citizenship for accepting an immigrant as part of an ingroup. The item is an independent, i.e. predictor in the analyses.

5.6 Regression assumptions

Generally, regression analysis makes it possible to examine the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables, i.e. what is the relationship between the independent, predictor variable(s) and the dependent, predicted variable (Kvantimotv, 2003, p. 99). Analysis is the test of a presented theoretical model, examining what influences what. In this research, the hierarchical multiple regression analysis is used to test the hypotheses. Multiple regression is a good choice of method when aiming to examine the relationship between numerous continuous predictor variables and one predicted variable at the time (Pallant, 2010, p. 148). Hierarchical multiple regression allows us to investigate the relations between the independent variables and the dependent variable in steps, by adding the variables step by step into the model in order of choice. (ibid. 149.) In other words, hierarchical regression allows us to examine if the independent predictor variables influence each other's presence. That is to say, it is possible to recognize if some predictor variable becomes stronger or less strong in explaining the predicted variable due to the presence of some other independent variable.

Nevertheless, there are regression assumptions that should be recognized in order to use the method in question. Otherwise, the results might not be reliable at all. These assumptions include normality of distribution and linear causality relationship between independent and dependent variables. In order to achieve statistical significance in a causality relationship between dependent and independent variables, the relation should be linear (Kvantimotv, 2003, p. 106). In addition, assumptions are made about homoscedasticity and multicollinearity.

5.6.1 Normal distribution assumption

It is important that the normality of distribution on data is fulfilled in regression, although a great sample size with other regression assumptions fulfilled does not highlight the normal distribution compared to smaller sample sizes with extreme accuracy (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 316). That is to say, regression is suitable even with a smaller sample size, i.e. a sample of at least 50 cases. (ibid., 316.)

The data was tested for normality distribution with visualizing the variables in graphical histograms and with a p-p plot. The distribution regarding these models indicates normally distributed data. Nevertheless, the normality distribution was also examined in observing the skewness, referring to symmetry of the distribution, and kurtosis, referring to the peakedness of values, because according to Pallant (2010, p. 57) it is appropriate to observe the skewness and kurtosis if the goal is to use parametric statistical techniques. Skewness and kurtosis values of 0 indicate perfectly normal distribution, but it is quite common to violate this value into a negative or positive direction. (Ibid. 57.) There are a few propositions for the limit on normality of distribution measured with skewness and kurtosis. According to Nummenmaa (2009, p. 155) the values of skewness and kurtosis should be below 1.00 as a thumb rule. As it can be seen in table 4, the skewness and kurtosis values in the variables used in this study are mainly below 1.00, with a few violations, regarding e.g. the importance of the social markers on the social psychological adaptation variable (ispsya), the ease of acquirement of the social markers on the sociocultural adaptation variable (ascula) and the family relations variable (fam). In other words, the social psychological adaptation variable and the family relations variable in question seem to be somewhat negatively skewed to the right with a tail to the left, and even slightly peaked, whereas the sociocultural adaptation variable in question seems to be somewhat peaked (Pallant, 2010, p. 57). Nonetheless, the visualization of the variables seems to be within the limit of a "normal look" and the deviation is still not all too significant in violation. Yet, Curran, West and Finch (1996; Vigoda-Gadot & Drory, 2016, p. 76) propose that the limit of skewness is 2.00 until the distribution can still be recognized within the limits of normality. The conclusion is that the assumption of the normality distribution is fulfilled within the given limits in the data. Nonetheless, because there are various

claims on the limit of normality, it is appropriate to secure the reliability of the results by interpreting them with sensitivity.

5.6.2 Linearity Assumption

The most significant regression assumption is that there is a linear relationship between the variables (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 315). That is to say, *"the residuals should have a straight-line relationship with predicted dependent variable scores"* (Pallant, 2010, p. 151). The linearity between variables on this data was tested on scatterplots and p-p plots showing that the variables are seemingly having a linear relationship

5.6.3 Homoscedasticity assumption

In regression, the homoscedasticity assumption should be fulfilled and heteroscedasticity to be avoided. Pallant (2010, p. 151) refers to the homoscedasticity assumption as in "*the variance of the residuals about predicted dependent variable scores should be the same for all predicted scores".* Fox (1991; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014, p. 163) claims that if the data indicates a serious heteroscedastic assumption, the spread in variance of the residuals of predicted values are spread three times higher for the widest spread than for the most narrow spread. In the data, the homoscedasticity assumption is met.

5.6.4 Multicollinearity assumption

In regression analysis, it is acceptable if predictor – predictor variables correlate together. Nevertheless, it can become problematic if multicollinearity is above .90 ($r >$ .90) highlighting the difficulty to interpret coefficients and to achieve statistical significance in results. (Berry, 1993; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014, p. 161.) That is to say, multicollinearity refers to the high collinearity in the relationship between two independent variables and it must be avoided, in order to be able to use regression analysis credibly. In addition, singularity between two predictor variables must be avoided. Singularity refers to an event in which one independent variable is a combination of the all other independent variables. (Pallant, 2010, p. 151.) In this data, the multicollinearity or singularity between the independent variables does not exist ($r <$

.90). It is also appropriate to make observations about the tolerance and VIF values to better secure the previous predictions about the correlations between the variables. In general, the tolerance value should not be below .10 and the VIF value should not be above 10 (Pallant, 2010, p. 158). In this data these values come within these limits.

5.7 Criticism

There are some things I would do differently if I started to work with the thesis now. These concerns apply mainly to the questionnaire. First, the translation of the questionnaire from English to Finnish should have been done with greater accuracy. Second, the concepts presented to respondents in the introduction part in the questionnaire should have been defined with greater accuracy. Third, the specific questions should have been edited to better fit into the Finnish context.

The first issue regarding translation refers to bad translations in the sense that, when translating something from English to Finnish, the real message of the question was missing and the question became unclear and almost impossible to really understand. At the same time, it would not have been clever to examine the responses to those questions, so those items were dropped off in summarizing the data.

The second issue mentioned above refers to the definition of a naturalized immigrant as the study subject; people are generally not familiar with the concept. The definition of a naturalized immigrant was shortly presented in the beginning of the questionnaire, but not well enough. That is to say, it might have been unclear which group of immigrants the study is concerned with. On the other hand, if respondents have thought about immigrants on a more general level when giving their answers, it does not necessarily matter because in Finland it is accepted to be a dual citizen, i.e. citizenship is not as big a deal as it is in Singapore. Nevertheless, some respondents might have associated the research question directly to certain ethnic groups due to their great visible existence in Finland. In the data this is anyway going to be invisible, although in reality the data might have been based on views and attitudes about certain immigrants in Finland. At the moment, Finland's circumstances for studying naturalized immigrants can be complicated because respondents might have faultily associated the questions to refugees and other newly arrived immigrants. And as already mentioned, the study does

not specify which group of immigrants is studied – at least not better than shortly referring to naturalized immigrants.

The third issue refers to the content of the questions. It would have been appropriate to better speculate what is the meaning of some questions in the Finnish context and after edit the question to better fit into the context so that respondents could better associate to ideas that the question aims to measure. It was also confusing to ask if it is easy or difficult to acquire Finnish roots.

The term "native-born Finnish citizen" does not necessarily refer to individuals who know more about Finnishness or identify themselves as Finnish compared to other Finnish residents born somewhere else. Patterns of self-identification might be different from the features that others assign to a person. A native-born Finn might feel less a Finn than a foreign-born, naturalized Finn. In addition, there was no question about the respondent's residential status during their lives regarding both Finnish and dual citizens.

5.8 Measures for the hierarchical multiple regression analysis

After all the social markers, clustered into three adaptation dimensions in line with findings in previous research, and the socio-psychological questions, forming nine socio-psychological scales, have been tested in EFA and the different adaptation dimensions are run through further analysis, the nine socio-psychological scales are divided into three sub-groups to be able to have a nice five steps hierarchical multiple regression analysis. The sub-groups are based on the theoretical findings. In other words, depending on what these socio-psychological questions pursue to explain, theoretical concepts found in previous studies are applied to cluster these questions into groups. Previous studies are used to argue for the choices that have been made regarding the choice of grouping the scales.

5.8.1   Social markers

The social markers used in this study are evaluated by their importance and by the ease to acquire them. This twofold evaluation of the markers helps us to explore which

social markers are most for the Finnish host members concerning the acculturation process of immigrants.

The list of the social markers in this study is composed of items that can be met in individual and private spheres, and in more relational and public spheres as well as in different areas of life. Therefore, the differences in the contents of the social markers motivate a division into three dimensions, i.e. the sociocultural, the socioeconomic and the social psychological. In addition, these dimensions were chosen for analysis based on their prevalence in acculturation literature and in previous studies. The idea is to give greater descriptive power to the evaluations: it would seem futile and irrelevant to say that, for instance, it is important for immigrants to *own residential property* - this is one of the social markers examined - whereas the significance and relevance of presenting the importance of the greater *socioeconomic adaptation dimension*, to which the above evaluation of the marker belongs and contributes together with a set of other markers, is much more easily understood. Additionally, there is a single item outside of the adaptation dimensions, dealing with citizenship – i.e. respondents are asked whether having Finnish citizenship is important for an immigrant to be considered as a co-national.

Host members providing evaluations on the importance level and on the ease of acquirement level of the social markers can thus increase our understanding of the acculturation opportunities that an immigrant has when operating in the Finnish society and cultural context.

These adaptation dimensions, along with their particular social markers, are based on the exploratory factor analysis and theoretical assumptions derived from previous studies. The reason for why these particular adaptation dimensions were chosen was made after the content of the social markers was explored through, but also because the goal was to construct categories based on theoretical assumptions found in acculturation studies.

The three adaptation dimensions are seen as dependent variables in relation to the three consistent independent adaptation variables, i.e. the acquirement level of the social markers, instead of importance.

5.8.2   Socio-psychological Sub-groups

In addition, nine independent socio-psychological predictor scales are included in the analyses, made up of a large number of questions. All these nine scales originate from previous research (e.g. Leong & Yang, 2015). With regard to these previous studies, there are indications found that social and acculturation expectations differ depending on the factor that is measured. That is why these nine socio-psychological scales are divided into three subgroups of factors for the further analysis.

The first subgroup is *individual factors* such as life satisfaction, family relations and economic optimism, which might affect how the respondents emphasize the importance level of the social markers. Thus, it is hypothesized that the more the respondents are satisfied with their lives, the less they emphasize the importance of the three adaptation dimensions of social markers. This assumption is based on results derived from multiple studies which show that life satisfaction predicts more favorable attitudes towards immigrants. For instance McLaren (2003, p. 919) proposes that unhappiness or worries about one's own future cause individuals to speculate that out-group members increase their unhappiness. Regarding economic optimism, it is hypothesized that variations in economic optimism for Finland's future do not cause any emphasis on the importance of the social markers. This assumption is based on the results derived from Sides and Citrin's (2007, pp. 499-500) research on European opinion about immigration, concluding that views regarding immigration are not affected by concerns of economic circumstances, basically, if the country can be categorized as "wealthier" in measuring GDP per capita. Economic optimism is nevertheless tested in the analyses. In addition, it is hypothesized that perceptions about meaningful family relations do not have an influence on the emphasis on importance of the social markers. This hypothesis is based on Leong and Yang's (2015, p. 53) results on Singaporeans endorsing more markers if they have evaluated family relations as meaningful. Finnish culture may nevertheless be perceived as belonging to a larger context of individualistic western cultures compared to collectivistic Singapore, which is the reason why a contradictory assumption is set. This is also tested in the analyses.

The second subgroup is *cognitive factors* such as stereotypes, prejudice and categorization, which might influence the respondents' evaluations of the social markers. The scales called *immigrant contribution* and *national pride* are part of this factor. It is hypothesized that the higher the perceived value of immigrant contributions to a society as a criterion for viewing an immigrant as acculturated, the less the respondents emphasize the importance of the social markers. This assumption is based on the presumption that if immigrants are perceived more as an advantage than as threat, the less is required of them. Tseung-Wong and Verkuyten (2010, p. 623) present the concept of category indispensability which supports the assumption that if the host members favor their own national ingroup, and categorize themselves more as an indispensable and prototypical national group, it is expected that they evaluate immigrants less positively, and their ingroup more positively.

On the other hand, if an immigrant group is perceived more as an indispensable entity, their existence and their cultural rights are evaluated more positively by host members (Verkuyten, Martinovic & Smeekes, 2014, p. 1484). That is to say, immigrants perceived as an indispensable entity is linked to the acceptance of immigrants with their rights to be as they are, and in this sense there are not requirements set for immigrants. (ibid. 1490.) On the other hand, national pride is hypothesized to predict one's emphasis on greater importance of the social markers in general. This assumption is based on the results found in Leong and Yang's (2015, p. 53) study on social markers of integration, in which both immigrants and host members evaluated social markers more important if they experience more national pride. Mayda's (2006, p. 525) results support Leong and Yang's (2015) results and assumptions; Mayda (2006) found that national pride can be negatively related to attitudes towards immigration.

The third subgroup is *intergroup factors*, e.g. how perceived threats and the amount of contact can have an influence on how one evaluates the level of importance of the social markers for immigrants' acculturation. In addition, host acculturation orientation and intergroup permeability belong to this dimension. It is hypothesized that limited contact and greater perceptions of threats are linked to prejudices, and thus, respondents emphasize more the importance of social markers as a condition for immigrants' acculturation. These assumptions are based on Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis which highlights contact as a mediator in intergroup relations. Moreover, also results

found in Leong and Yang's (2015, p. 53) study on social markers of integration show that perceived threat is linked to emphasis on importance of the social markers.

Also, results found in Stephan, Renfro, Esses, White Stephan and Martin's (2005, p. 6) study show that perceived threat can contribute to negative attitudes towards immigrants. It is hypothesized that the more the respondents agree, in this study, with the items measuring the level of host acculturation orientation, i.e. perceive that immigrants should embrace more Finnish culture, the more the level of importance of social markers is emphasized. This assumption is based on Bourhis' et al. (1997) IAM model on acculturation expectations, in which assimilationist acculturation views make respondents emphasize the importance of social markers more. Leong's (2008, p. 120) results support that more exclusion-oriented acculturation strategies, e.g. assimilation, predict less positive attitudes towards immigrants. It is also hypothesized that the higher the level of perceived intergroup permeability, the more respondents emphasize the importance of social markers. This assumption is supported in the study made by Leong and Ward (2011, p. 58) in which results show that higher perceived permeability might cause higher levels of perceived threat, and thus more negative attitudes towards immigrants. The study context was a culturally pluralist society, which is not seen here as a problem, but merely all the more convincing, that even in less culturally plural societies the results would be the same.

There is also a single item in the analysis, measuring the importance of becoming a Finnish citizen in order to become accepted as a co-national. This item is based on the research subject that the study is based on, i.e. naturalized immigrants, and that is why the item is included in the analyses (to see if it, i.e. that an immigrant is accepted better if he/she is a citizen, has some influence on emphasizing the importance of social markers). It is hypothesized, that the higher the importance of having Finnish citizenship, the stronger the emphasis on the importance of social markers for acculturation.

Additionally, the respondents self-evaluate whether their requirements are possible to be acquired, evaluating in each question how important a particular social marker is, and how easy that social marker is to achieve. To summarize, who fits in and do

immigrants have the opportunity to fit in? In addition, why are the given evaluations/definitions of fitting person as specified?

6 Results

The results section is divided into two sub-sections, preliminary analysis and main analysis. In the preliminary analysis, the evaluations of adaptation dimensions and the socio-psychological factors plus the single item, measuring the acceptance of an immigrant based on the citizenship, are presented. Correlations between the all variables used in the study are examined. In addition, the research questions, i.e. *who fits in - how are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of importance, by members of the majority group,* and the sub-question *is it possible to fit in - how are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of ease of acquirement, by members of the majority group,* are presented under the preliminary analysis due to their descriptive nature. In the main analysis, the research questions *is it possible to fit in – what is the relationship between the importance attached to different social markers and perceived ease of their acquirement* and *what factors predict the level of demands posed toward immigrants measured through social markers* are analyzed with hierarchical (sequential) multiple regression analysis.

6.1 Preliminary analysis

First, the correlations between the variables are presented (see table 2 and 3). After, all the variables used described by observing important details, such as the mean value, related standard deviation and distributions (see table 4). To remind the reader of the reliability of the scales, the Cronbach's Alpha of each variable is shown in table 4. Additionally, the whole list of social markers is presented with their mean value, related standard deviation and distributions; the whole list of these details of the social markers is found in appendices (see Appendix 3 and Appendix 4).

The skewness value tells if the distribution is skewed, and towards which direction. If there is a positive skewness value found, it indicates that the greater amount of the observations are smaller than the mean value of that specific distribution, and it is

visually skewed towards the right. If the skewness value is negative, the greater amount of the observations are greater than the mean value of that particular distribution, and it is skewed to the left. (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 71.)

On the other hand, the kurtosis value tells how peaked the distribution is. Again, a positive kurtosis value indicates that the distribution is peaked, while a negative kurtosis value indicates that there is no peak at all, i.e. the distribution is flat peaked. (Nummenmaa, 2009, p. 72.)

6.1.1   Correlational analysis

Correlations were tested with Pearson's r and with a two-tailed test of significance. Cohen's (1988) guideline is used for interpreting the strength of the correlations (Pallant, 2010, p. 134). That is to say, a small correlation is the r-value between .10 to .29, medium correlation is the r-value between .30 to .49, and a strong correlation is the r-value above .50 and up to 1.00. (ibid. 134.)

Table 2

In table 2 (Appendix 5: Table 2: Correlations between the independent variables), all the correlations between the fourteen independent variables are shown. Once more, the independent variables are *symbolic and realistic threats* (threat), *immigrant contributions* (contr), *national pride* (pride), *life satisfaction* (life), *family relations* (fam), *economic optimism* (fut), *host acculturation orientation* (acco), *contact* (cont) and *intergroup permeability* (perm), as well as *acquirement of the social markers of sociocultural adaptation* (ascula), *acquirement of the social markers of socioeconomic adaptation* (asecoa), *acquirement of the social markers of social psychological adaptation* (aspsya) and *acquirement of all social markers in all adaptation dimensions* (acquirement).

It can be derived from the results shown in table 2 (see Appendix 5) that *immigrant contributions* has a strong negative correlation with the *symbolic and realistic threats* variable (r = -.79, p < .01). Whereas, the *host acculturation orientation* variable has a strong positive (r = .75, p < .01), and the *national pride* variable has a positive medium (r = .47, p < .01) correlation with *symbolic and realistic threats*. *Host*

acculturation orientation also has a strong negative correlation with *immigrant contributions* variable (r = -.67, p < .01). Correlations between the variables of the ease of acquirement of the social markers, drawn from the three adaptation dimensions, along with the variable of acquirement drawn from all the dimensions together, are not worthy of attention, because each variable of the acquirement of social markers in the different adaptation dimensions are analyzed separately, as is done with the different variables of importance of social markers of the adaptation dimension, shown in table 3.

Table 3

In table 3, correlations between the dependent and independent variables are presented. The dependent variables in this table are: importance of the social markers of the sociocultural adaptation (iscula), importance of the social markers of the socioeconomic adaptation (isecoa), importance of the social markers of the social psychological adaptation (ispsya) and importance of all social markers the all adaptation dimensions (importance).

Table 3

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. ISCULA	1			
2. ISECOA	. 62**	1		
3. ISPSYA	. 62**	. 61**	1	
4. IMPORTANCE	. 91**	. 86**	. 79**	1
5. THREAT	. 62**	. 42**	. 47**	. 60**
6. CONTR	-.47**	-.28**	-.31**	-.43**
7. PRIDE	. 47**	. 31**	. 44**	. 47**
8. LIFE	. 07	-.02	. 01	. 03
9. FAM	. 08	. 06	. 11	. 09
10. FUT	-.09	-.03	-.13	-.08
11. ACCO	. 56**	. 34**	. 54**	. 55**
12. CONT	. 16*	. 16*	. 07	. 16*
13. PERM	. 19**	. 19**	. 20**	. 22**
14. ACCEPT	. 28**	. 29**	. 25**	. 32**
15. ASCULA	. 49**	. 32**	. 29**	. 45**
16. ASECOA	. 24**	. 24**	. 32**	. 29**
17. ASPSYA	. 35**	. 33**	. 57**	. 44**
18. ACQUIREMENT	. 44**	. 34**	. 41**	. 46**

* p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

As seen in table 3, *life satisfaction*, *family relations* and *economic optimism* have small correlational strength with the four predicted variables, i.e. *importance of the social markers of sociocultural adaptation*, *importance of the social markers of socioeconomic adaptation, importance of the social markers of social psychological adaptation*, and *importance of the social markers of all adaptation dimensions*. The small r- value close to 0 indicates that there is no significant linear relationship between the variables (Valtari, 2006, p. 33). These variables are nonetheless included in the analysis because small correlations with predicted variables are recognized. Moreover, the other independent variables have much better correlational strengths, varying mostly between medium and strong correlations. For instance, the correlations between *importance of the social markers of sociocultural adaptation* and *acquirement of the social markers of sociocultural adaptation* have 24% of shared variance (.49 x .49 = .24), and the correlation between them is (r = .49, p < .01). The variables *importance of the social markers of socioeconomic adaptation* and *acquirement of the social markers of socioeconomic adaptation* only have 6% of shared variance (.24 x .24 = .06). On the other hand, the variables *importance of the social markers of social psychological adaptation* and *acquirement of the social markers of social psychological adaptation* have 32% of shared variance (.57 x .57 = .32), and the correlation between them is (r = .57, n = 197, p < .01).

6.1.2   Characteristics of each variable

Table 4 describes each predicted (dependent) and predictor (independent) variable included in the study. Regarding every individual item, the table of the social markers in the order of importance and in the order of ease of acquirement shows their descriptive details all at once (see Appendix 3: The order of importance of the social markers, and Appendix 4: The order of ease of acquirement of the social markers).

Table 4

In table 4, all the variables taken along to the analyses are presented, including key properties, i.e. the mean, standard deviation, distributions of skewness and kurtosis, and Cronbach's Alpha (α). These variables are the importance of social markers in the sociocultural, socioeconomic and social psychological adaptation dimensions, and the importance of social markers of all the dimensions together, as well as the ease of acquirement in all the aforementioned dimensions, and the ease of acquirement in all the dimensions together. In addition, nine socio-psychological scales are included, and also one single item measuring the acceptance of immigrants. (N=198).

Table 4

Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
Sociocultural adaptation (importance)	3.23	1.11	. 43	-.06	. 93
Socioeconomic adaptation (importance)	2.79	1.09	. 03	-.96	. 91
Social psychological adaptation (importance)	5.15	1.15	-1.07	1.13	. 87
Each social marker (importance)	3.44	. 97	-.14	-.27	. 95
Sociocultural adaptation (acquirement)	3.65	. 65	. 72	1.63	. 84
Socioeconomic adaptation (acquirement)	4.10	. 62	. 04	. 07	. 82
Social psychological adaptation (acquirement)	5.27	. 65	-.10	-.43	. 74
Each social marker (acquirement)	4.12	. 55	. 48	. 48	. 91
Symbolic and realistic threats	3.41	1.16	. 51	. 03	. 94
Immigrant contributions	4.46	1.15	-.66	. 40	. 81
National pride	4.08	. 92	. 11	. 21	. 63
Life satisfaction	5.00	1.13	-.55	-.04	. 85
Family relations	5.81	1.07	-1.40	3.03	. 78
Economic optimism	3.71	1.08	. 17	. 09	. 78
Host acculturation orientation	4.27	. 98	. 66	. 56	. 95
Contact	3.23	1.35	. 28	-.84	. 81
Intergroup permeability	2.59	. 72	. 20	-.60	. 71
Citizenship and acceptance (single item)	4.92	1.34	-.79	. 34	-

The distribution of the individual social markers are mainly recognized as normal concerning the skewness and kurtosis values (skewness around the value 0.00 to 2.00) (see tables 5 and 6 below, and the whole list of the social markers in Appendix 3 and in Appendix 4). Nevertheless, the social marker *observes local laws and customs* (skewedness = -3.43, kurtosis = 16.55) is violating the assumption of normality, with distribution high peaked and negatively skewed, i.e. clustered to the right. This non-normality of distribution concerning the social marker in question is so strong, that it

should be recognized as a possible problem in the analysis. Also, the social marker *respects the private space of other people around* (skewness = -1.76, kurtosis = 4.25) is peaked and negatively skewed clustered to the right, as is the marker *embraces a positive attitude to the host society* (skewness = -1.50, kurtosis = 1.94) which is not as much peaked or skewed as the former two. The data was summarized regarding the individual social markers, but the violations of normality regarding the single items must be recognized in the analysis, because these items were anyway taken along into the parametric analysis. Pallant (2010, p. 111) instructs by using good references from other researchers and statistics authors to support this claim, while she herself advocates for a good sample size, in case violations of the assumptions are found. An ideal sample size is over 150 cases. In addition, summing the items into scales often improves the distribution, although even important data can be lost when summarizing. On the other hand, the data might become easier to handle if the data is summarized. Nonetheless, the data was summarized regarding the social markers, based on the great amount of the items; social markers.

Thus, as it can be seen in table 4, violations of the normality of distributions are next to meaningless after summarizing the data despite that a few cases might be recognized. All in all, it is noticed that skewness and kurtosis values come closer to the preferable value around 1.00 when the social markers are summarized into scales (See table 4).

6.1.3 Who fits in?

Table 5

This table 5 consists of the ten most important social markers in order of importance as evaluated by Finnish host members, presented with their mean, standard deviation and distribution of skewness and kurtosis. The whole list of social markers in order of importance is found in the Appendix 3.

Table 5

Social marker	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
1. Observes local laws and customs	6.50	. 93	-3.43	16.55
2. Respects the private space of other people around	6.12	1.18	-1.76	4.25
3. Embraces a positive attitude to the host society	5.61	1.52	-1.50	1.94
4. Able to speak conversational Finnish	5.60	1.27	-.99	1.13
5. Has lived in Finland for a period of time	4.98	1.59	-.94	. 19
6. Follows local media	4.58	1.55	-.67	-.18
7. Gets on well with neighbours	4.44	1.89	-.50	-.92
8. Their children attend(ed) local schools	4.42	1.76	-.54	-.69
9. Gets on well with workplace colleagues	4.40	1.82	-.59	-.82
10. Behaves like a Finn	4.25	1.76	-.25	-.94

How are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of importance, by members of the majority group? Results (see table 5) show that the Finnish host members have evaluated social markers of the social psychological adaptation dimension as the most important individual markers among the top ten for immigrants to possess in their path of acculturation, in order for the latter to become accepted as co-nationals, or to fit in. Only three out of the ten most important social markers are included in an adaptation dimension other than the social psychological one. These three markers are from the sociocultural adaptation dimension: *able to speak conversational Finnish*, *has lived in Finland for a period of time* and *behaves like a Finn*. Social markers of the socioeconomic adaptation dimension are less important for immigrants to possess, according to Finnish host members (the whole list of social markers in order of importance is found in the Appendix 3). In other words, the most important social markers are centered upon the common sphere in which the encounters and communications between immigrants and host members take place.

To compare, the five social markers evaluated as the most unimportant are the following: *enjoys or takes part in local sports* (M = 1.97, SD = 1.28), *embraces/converts to Christianity (*M = 1.97, SD = 1.55*), has at least a college degree* (M =1.98, SD = 1.26*), is able to speak with local accent* (M = 2.00, SD = 1.23) and *has Finnish roots* (M = 2.15, SD = 1.50). In this list, only one social marker, i.e. *has at least college degree,* is a marker of the socioeconomic adaptation, while the others are markers of sociocultural adaptation. That is not the entire picture, however, as it can be seen in the whole list that social markers of the socioeconomic adaptation dimension are evaluated as the least important for Finnish host members.

6.1.3.1 The order of importance of the social markers adaptation levels

The paired-samples t-tests were performed to find out the order of importance of social markers of all three adaptation dimensions. The paired-samples t-test makes it possible to compare data using the same respondents, but on different occasions (Pallant, 2010, p. 204). The comparison was made between the social psychological and the sociocultural adaptation dimension, social psychological and socioeconomic adaptation dimensions, and sociocultural and socioeconomic adaptation dimensions. The adaptation dimensions measuring the importance level were compared against each other as pairs (and the adaptation scales measuring the ease of acquirement level were compared against each other as pairs, see 5.1.4.1).

The results support the order of importance of the individual markers shown in table 5. That is to say, the social markers of the social psychological adaptation dimension are evaluated as the most important according to host members. The observation is made from the results derived from the comparisons. Comparing the reported importance levels of social psychological adaptation and sociocultural adaptation, the mean is 5.15 in social psychological adaptation, and 3.23 in sociocultural adaptation. The mean difference 1.92 (SD = .99) is statistically significant between these variables (t (197) = 27.36, p < .001).

When comparing social psychological adaptation and socioeconomic adaptation, the mean in social psychological adaptation is still highest. The socioeconomic adaptation scale has a mean of 2.79, and the difference of the means between social

psychological and socioeconomic adaptation is 2.37 (SD = .99). This difference is statistically significant (t (197) = 33.63, p < .001).

Comparing sociocultural (M = 3.23) and socioeconomic adaptation (M = 2.79), the results show a statistically significant difference between these dimensions' means M = .44 (SD = .96) (t (197) = 6.51, p < .001).

The conclusion is that the respondents have evaluated the social psychological adaptation dimension as the most important for immigrants to pursue in their acculturation process. Social markers related to the socioeconomic adaptation dimension are deemed as least important. In other words, the host members require least from immigrants with respect to the socioeconomic adaptation, compared to the other adaptation dimensions in the study.

6.1.4   Is it possible to fit in?

Table 6

The table presented here consists of the same ten social markers as in table 5, i.e. those reported as most important for immigrants' acculturation in Finland, but here, instead of importance, the ease of acquirement of these most important markers is analyzed. These social markers are also presented with their mean, standard deviation and distribution: skewness and kurtosis. The list of social markers in order of ease of acquirement is found in the Appendix 4.

Table 6

Social marker	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Observes local laws and customs	5.72	1.01	-.90	1.77
Respects the private space of other people around	5.76	1.02	-.49	-.36
Embraces a positive attitude to the host society	5.02	1.02	-.00	-.23
Able to speak conversational Finnish	3.62	1.28	. 29	-.76
Has lived in Finland for a period of time	4.51	1.13	-.27	-.04
Follows local media	5.27	1.17	-.31	-.39
Gets on well with neighbours	4.76	1.04	-.47	-.16
Their children attend(ed) local schools	5.39	1.16	-.09	-1.10
Gets on well with workplace colleagues	4.98	. 86	-.36	-.31
Behaves like a Finn	4.15	1.18	. 00	-.19

Note. This table does not show the social markers in order of ease of acquirement.

How are different social markers of immigrant acculturation evaluated, in terms of ease of acquirement, by members of the majority group? In table 6, the order of the social markers, from highest to lowest, is based on the order of importance of the social markers. Yet, the values in the columns are those of their ease of acquirement, in order for the reader to visualize the mean values and hence the opportunities to acquire them, according to the host members' preferences the most important social markers. Are the most important social markers evaluated by host members also easy to acquire? Or perhaps on the contrary, are they among the more difficult ones to acquire?

Examining immigrants' opportunities to achieve the most important markers, as given by respondents, it seems to be within reachable limits for immigrants to acquire the

expectations in all of the most important social markers (see table 5 and 6). It is, however, worth noticing that the mean in the ease of acquirement of the individual most important social markers is lower the means addressing the importance of the same markers. For instance, the social marker *able to speak conversational Finnish* is important to possess, but it seems to be a borderline case, between easy and difficult to acquire.

6.1.4.1 The order of ease of acquirement of the social markers in the adaptation dimensions

The paired-samples t-tests were performed to find out the order of the ease of acquirement of social markers of all three adaptation dimensions. The comparison was made between the social psychological and the sociocultural adaptation dimension, social psychological and socioeconomic adaptation dimensions, and sociocultural and socioeconomic adaptation dimensions.

The results derived from the paired-samples t-tests measuring the ease of acquirement level of the social markers for immigrants, evaluated by Finns, indicate that it is easiest to acquire the social markers included in the social psychological adaptation dimension, and it is least easy to acquire the social markers included in the sociocultural adaptation dimension. The first compared pair was social psychological and sociocultural adaptation. For social psychological adaptation, the mean is 5.27, and for sociocultural adaptation, the mean is 3.65. The mean difference between these adaptation dimensions is 1.62 (SD = .64), which is statistically significant (t (196) = 35.69, p < .001).

The second compared pair was social psychological adaptation and socioeconomic adaptation. The mean for socioeconomic adaptation is 4.10. The mean difference between social psychological and socioeconomic adaptation is 1.17 (SD = .63) which is statistically significant (t (196) = 26.03, p < .001).

The last compared pair was socioeconomic (M= 4.10) and sociocultural adaptation (M= 3.65).
The mean difference .45 (SD = .55) in this pair is statistically significant (t (197) = 11.63, p < .001).

The conclusion is that the respondents have evaluated the social markers of the social psychological adaptation dimension as the easiest for immigrants to acquire. The least easy to acquire are the social markers related to the sociocultural adaptation dimension.

6.2 Main Analysis

Hierarchical multiple regression is used to test the hypotheses and two of the research questions. The sub-question *what is the relationship between the perceived importance attached to different social markers and perceived ease of their acquirement*, i.e. is it possible for immigrants to acquire the expectations set by host members in the sociocultural, socioeconomic and social psychological adaptation dimensions, is one analyzed question. The other research question that will be tested in regression analysis is *what factors predict the level of demands posed toward immigrants measured through social markers?*

All in all, four hierarchical multiple regression analyses was performed in order to analyze all the three dependent adaptation dimensions separately from each other, but additionally simultaneously. In other words, the level of importance of all 37 social markers included in the three adaptation dimensions were predicted with 5 predictors: individual, cognitive and intergroup factors, including altogether 47 items predicting the socio-psychological motives an individual might have regarding the evaluations of the importance level of the adaptation dimensions. In addition, one single item measuring the importance level regarding the citizenship of an immigrant in order of him/her to become as accepted co-national, was included in the analyses as predictor. The fifth predictor, measures the ease of acquirement of the social markers being composed of the adaptation dimension which is predicted at a time.

In the *first* analysis, the sociocultural adaptation dimension (see iscula in Appendix 6: Table 7 Hierarchical multiple regression) was predicted. In the *second* analysis, the socioeconomic adaptation dimension (see Appendix 6: Table 7) was predicted. In the *third* analysis, the social psychological adaptation dimension (see Appendix 6: Table

7) was predicted. In the *fourth* analysis, the all adaptation dimensions included in one predicted variable were predicted simultaneously (see Appendix 6: Table 7).

The hierarchical structure was chosen based on the theoretical assumptions, in order to see how the explanatory power increases when adding the predictor factors step by step into the model that are assumed to have influence on the predicted adaptation variable(s). Standardized Beta values are presented, instead of unstandardized Beta values, because the study was mainly theoretical and not applied (Pallant, 2010, p. 166). In the first step of the hierarchy, the individual factors, i.e. life satisfaction, family relations and economic optimism are added. These are so called controlling factors, because they are present in all five steps included in the model. The order of factors, and of variables entered into the chosen steps, was chosen on the basis of the assumption that the individual-based factors predict significantly one's attitudes, and are thus in a remarkable position in relation to predicted social markers in the study. That is the motive for why they were entered in the model first.

In the second step, to follow the same motivation as regarding the individual factors, the cognitive factors such as immigrant contributions and national pride were added. In the third step, intergroup factors such as symbolic and realistic threats, host acculturation orientation, contact and intergroup permeability were added. In the fourth step, the variable that measures the acceptance of immigrants as co-nationals based on the citizenship was added. In the fifth, and last step, the variable that measures the acquirement level of each social marker included in the adaptation level in question were added. This variable was added last, due to its meta-analytical continent, i.e. respondents could in that variable analyze themselves how difficult their set expectations and requirements for immigrants actually are. In other words, the model proceeds from a more individual dimension to more relational dimensions.

6.2.1 Sociocultural adaptation

As one may derive from table 7 (see Appendix 6), when adding the individual factors in the *first step*, none of the predictors have statistically significant influence on sociocultural adaptation. The individual factors explain 1.9 % of the variance in perceived sociocultural adaptation.

In step 2 the whole model can explain 34.5 % of the variance. Both added items from the cognitive factors have a statistically significant influence as predictors in sociocultural adaptation. Immigrant contributions have negative ($\beta = -.35$, $p < .001$) and national pride positive ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$) influence. In addition, life satisfaction improved and became marginally significant, or a statistical trend ($\beta = .11$, $p < .084$) (the words marginal significance and statistical trend refer to the *p*- value between .05 and .10, which points out that these scales can be recognized as somewhat good in predicting the importance of the social markers on social psychological adaptation, still, with variance of 5 to 10 % possibility that the predictor scales and the predicted scale do not have any relationship (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989; Abrams, 2007). In addition, the cognitive factors, added in step 2, explain an additional 32.6 % of the variance in sociocultural adaptation (R square change = .326, F change (3.190) = 47.20, p < .001).

In *step 3*, the whole model can explain 48.2 % of the variance in perceived sociocultural adaptation. Four intergroup factors were added in which threat ($\beta = .43$, p < .001) and contact ($\beta = .19$, p < .001) were statistically significant. The significance level of life satisfaction and national pride are the same compared to results in step 2, while immigrant contribution is not significant anymore ($\beta = -.02$, p = .865). In addition, the intergroup factors entered into the model explain an additional 13.7% of the variance in sociocultural adaptation (R square change = .137, F change (3.186) = 12.34, p < .001).

In *step 4*, the whole model can explain 50.0% of the variance. There is a statistical significance found between sociocultural adaptation variable and the added single item that measures the importance level of having a Finnish citizenship in order to become accepted as co-national ($\beta = .14$, $p = .011$). From the intergroup factors, symbolic and realistic threats, and contact variables are at the same level of significance compared to step 3. From the cognitive factors, national pride is still

statistically significant, although on a slightly decreased level of significance ($\beta = .20$, $p = .004$). From the individual factors, life satisfaction is still marginally significant with just a slight improvement ($\beta = .11$, $p < .051$). The added variable, the acceptance of immigrants as co-nationals regarding citizenship explains an additional 1.8% of the variance in sociocultural adaptation (R squared change $= .018$, F change $(3.185) = 6.59$, $p = .011$).

In the *final step*, the results show that the whole model can explain 53% of the variance in perceived sociocultural adaptation $R^2 = .530$, (F $(11.184) = 18.88$, $p < .001$). The final results indicate that there is a positive statistical significance found regarding the added variable of acquirement opportunities of the social markers included in the predicted sociocultural variable ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$). This added variable also explains an additional 3.0% of the variance in the perceived sociocultural adaptation scale (R square change $= .030$, F change $(3.184) = 11.870$, $p < .001$). Also, frequent contact with immigrants ($\beta = .16$, $p = .004$), perceived symbolic and realistic threats ($\beta = .37$, $p < .001$), national pride ($\beta = .15$, $p = .022$), life satisfaction ($\beta = .14$, $p = .016$) and the importance of becoming a citizen to become accepted as co-national ($\beta = .12$, $p = .022$), have a positive, statistically significant relationship with perceived sociocultural adaptation variable. Family relations, economic optimism and immigrant contributions did not have even close to a significant relation to the sociocultural adaptation variable in the last model ($p > .67$ in each of these variables).

In other words, the more often host members have had contact with immigrants, perceive immigrants or immigration to Finland as a symbolic or realistic threat, possess high levels of national pride, are satisfied with their lives and accept immigrants with Finnish citizenship more as co-nationals compared to those without, the higher they evaluate the level of importance on the social markers in the sociocultural adaptation variable, or in other words, the more they expect from immigrants. Nevertheless, the statistical significance, found in the relationship between sociocultural adaptation variable (measuring importance level) and the sociocultural adaptation variable (measuring the acquirement level), indicate that the social markers evaluated high in importance were also evaluated, in a statistically significant way, high to acquire in the variable in question. In other words, it might be easy for immigrants to acquire the social markers required or expected for sociocultural adaptation, according to host members.

6.2.2   Socioeconomic adaptation

As it can be derived from table 7 (See Appendix 6), it is noticed that when adding the individual factors in the *first step*, none of the predictors have statistically significant influence on socioeconomic adaptation. The individual factors explain 0.6% of the variance in perceived socioeconomic adaptation.

In step 2, the whole model can explain 12.9 % of the variance. Both added items from the cognitive factors have a statistically significant influence in relation to socioeconomic adaptation; immigrant contributions negative (β = -.19, *p* < .018) and national pride positive (β = .24, *p* < .002). In addition, the cognitive factors added can explain an additional 12.3% of the variance in socioeconomic adaptation (R square change = .123, F change (3.190) = 13.40, p < .001).

In *step 3*, the whole model can explain 23.6 % of the variance in perceived socioeconomic adaptation. Four intergroup factors were added in which threat (β = .42, p < .001) and contact (β = .17, p = .015) were statistically significant. The significance level of national pride became marginal (β = .14, p = .081). In the meanwhile, immigrant contribution is not significant anymore (β = .09, p = .425). The intergroup factors added in step 3 can explain an additional 10.7% of the variance in socioeconomic adaptation (R square change = .107, F change (3.186) = 6.48, p < .001).

In *step 4*, the whole model can explain 27.1% of the variance in the perceived socioeconomic adaptation scale. The variable of acceptance of the immigrants as co-nationals regarding citizenship was added with positive statistical significance in relation to the perceived variable (β = .20, *p* = .003). What is more, the added variable can explain an additional 3.6% of the variance in socioeconomic adaptation scale (R square change = .036, F change (3.185) = 9.04, p = .003). The significance level of the perceived symbolic and realistic threats changed a bit (β = .38, *p* = .002) but it is still, with a contact variable, statistically significant in relation to perceived socioeconomic adaptation scale. On the other hand, national pride is not even marginally significant anymore in step 4.

In the *final step*, the results show that the whole model can explain only 27.4 % of the variance in perceived socioeconomic adaptation R^2 = .274 (F (11.184) = 6.32, p <

.001. The variable measuring the acquirement level of the social markers, included in the predicted socioeconomic variable, was entered into the model with non-significant influence ($\beta = .06$, $p = .384$). It can, nevertheless, explain an additional 0.3% of the variance in the perceived predicted variable (R square change $= .003$, F change $(3.184) = .763$, p $= .383$). The positive statistical significance is found in relation to perceived symbolic and realistic threats ($\beta = .37$, $p = .003$), contact with immigrants ($\beta = .16$, $p = .018$), the importance of becoming a citizen to become accepted as a co-national ($\beta = .20$, $p = .003$). Host acculturation orientation, life satisfaction, intergroup permeability, immigrant contributions and economic optimism did not reach even close to statistical significance in socioeconomic adaptation ($p > .61$ in all of these variables).

In other words, the more a respondent perceives immigrants or immigration as threat to Finland, has regular contact with immigrants and accepts immigrants with Finnish citizenship more as co-nationals compared to those without, the higher they evaluate the level of importance on the social markers in the socioeconomic adaptation, or in other words, the more they expect or require from immigrants. The socioeconomic adaptation variable (the one measuring importance level of the social markers) and the socioeconomic adaptation variable (the one measuring the acquirement level of the social markers) do not have a statistically significant relationship, which might indicate that the ease of acquirement for the expected socioeconomic requirements or expectations are not easy to achieve, at least regarding the socioeconomic requirements investigated for this study.

6.2.3 Social psychological adaptation

As it can be derived from table 7 (see Appendix 6), when adding the individual factors in the *first step*, economic optimism (β = -.14, *p* = .054) is negatively, and family relations positively (β = .14, *p* = .082), but also marginally significant in relation to social psychological adaptation. The individual factors explain 3.3% of the variance in perceived social psychological adaptation.

In step 2, the whole model can explain 24.6% of the variance. The added immigrant contributions (β = -.12, *p* = .088) have a negative marginal significance in relation to social psychological adaptation. Whereas, the other added item, national pride (β = .40, *p* < .001), is positively statistically significant in perceived social psychological adaptation. Yet, the added cognitive factors in the model can explain an additional 21.3% of the variance in the perceived variable (R square change = .213, F change (3.190) = 26.88, p < .001).

In *step 3*, the whole model can explain 37.6% of the variance in perceived social psychological adaptation. Four intergroup factors were added, of which symbolic and realistic threats (β = .23, p = .046) and host acculturation orientation (β = .37, p < .001) were statistically significant. The significance level of national pride changed just slightly (β = .22, p = .004). All the while, immigrant contributions improved greatly and became positively significant (β = .22, p = .027). The intergroup factors added can explain an additional 13.0% of the variance in perceived social psychological adaptation variable (R square change = .130, F change (3.186) = 9.67, p < .001).

In *step 4*, the whole model can explain 38.9% of the variance in the perceived social psychological adaptation scale. The added variable of the acceptance of an immigrant as co-national regarding citizenship has a marginally positive relationship (β = .12, p = .055) with the perceived variable. The variable explains also an additional 1.2% of the variance in perceived variable (R square change = .012, F change (3.185) = 3.74, p = .055). The significance level of the host acculturation orientation, immigrant contributions, family relations and national pride did not change in step 4. Symbolic and realistic threats became marginally significant (β = .21, p = .069).

In the *final step*, the results show that the whole model can explain 47.9% of the variance in the perceived social psychological adaptation variable $R^2 = .479$, (F (11.184) = 15.37, p < .001). The added variable, measuring the acquirement level of the social markers, included in the predicted social psychological adaptation variable, was entered into the model with a positive significant influence ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$). The positive statistical significance is found in the scale measuring host acculturation expectations which predict in higher values immigrants' adoption into the Finnish culture ($\beta = .29$, $p < .001$). The scales of social psychological adaptation (the one measuring importance of the social markers) and social psychological adaptation (the one measuring acquirement of the social markers) also had a positive, statistically significant relationship ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$). Contact with immigrants, economic optimism, intergroup permeability or life satisfaction did not have statistical significance in social psychological adaptation at any close level ($p > .40$ in all these variables). The perceived symbolic and realistic threats ($\beta = .19$, $p = .077$), immigrant contributions ($\beta = .18$, $p = .059$) and the importance of becoming a citizen to become accepted as co-national ($\beta = .11$, $p = .056$) were marginally significant, or a "statistical trend".

The more host members expect from immigrants to adopt into the Finnish culture, the higher they have evaluated the social markers measuring importance, but also the social markers measuring the acquirement for the social psychological adaptation. In addition, even the social psychological adaptation, measuring the importance level of social markers, and the social psychological adaptation, measuring the acquirement level of social markers, have a statistically significant relationship. This might indicate that it is easy for immigrants to acquire the expectations or requirements for social psychological adaptation, according to host members. It is even confusing to notice that the perceived threat and immigrant contributions, which are measuring the contradictory things, are both found to be in marginal, a statistic trend, in relation to social psychological adaptation.

6.2.4   All adaptation dimensions simultaneously

As it can be derived from table 7 (see Appendix 6), one may notice that when entering the individual factors in the *first step*, none of the predictors have statistically significant influence on all adaptations levels measured simultaneously, i.e. on sociocultural, socioeconomic and social psychological adaptation. The individual factors explain 1.7% of the variance in perceived adaptation levels.

In step 2, the whole model can explain 30.9% of the variance. Both added items from the cognitive factors have a statistically significant influence as predictors. Immigrant contributions have a negative (β = -.29, $p < .001$) and national pride has a positive (β = .37, $p < .001$) influence. Yet, the cognitive factors added into the model explain an additional 29.2% of the variance in all the adaptation levels (R square change = .292, F change (3.190) = 40.11, p < .001).

In *step 3*, the whole model can explain 46.3% of the variance in perceived adaptation levels. Four intergroup factors were added, in which threat (β = .45, p < .001) and contact (β = .18, p = .002) were positively statistically significant. The significance level of national pride is almost the same compared to results in step 2 (β = .22, p = .002).Yet, the intergroup factors added can explain an additional 15.4% of the variance in adaptation levels (R square change = .154, F change (3.186) = 13.34, p < .001).

In *step 4*, the whole model can explain 49.2% of the variance in the perceived variable. The variable measuring the acceptance of an immigrant regarding citizenship was added. This variable had a statistically significant influence on the model (β = .18, p < .001). Furthermore, it explains an additional 2.9% of the variance in all adaptation levels included in the one predicted variable (R square change = .029, F change (3.185) = 10.67, p < .001). From the intergroup factors, the perceived symbolic and realistic threats and the influence of the contact variable are at the same level statistically significant compared to step 3. From the cognitive factors, national pride is still statistically significant although on a decreased level of significance (β = .19, p = .005).

In the *final step*, the results show that the whole model can explain 50.7% of the variance in perceived adaptation levels R^2 = .507, (F (11.184) = 17.221, p < .001). The

final results indicate that the added variable of the acquirement opportunities in the social markers included in the predicted adaptation scales had a significant influence (β = .16, p = .019). The variable of acquirement level explains additionally 1.5% of the variance (R square change = .015, F change (3.184) = 5.56, p = .019). A positive statistical significance was also found in relation to perceived symbolic and realistic threats (β = .39, p < .001), regular contact with immigrants (β = .16, p = .004), national pride (β = .15, p = .032) and the acceptance of immigrants with Finnish citizenship as co-nationals better than those without (β = .17, p = .002). Economic optimism, immigrant contributions and intergroup permeability variables do not come close to a significant relationship of the importance scale that measures all adaptation levels simultaneously (p > .61 in all of these variables).

To sum up, national pride, perceived threat, intergroup contact and the importance of the Finnish citizenship were systematic significant predictors of the adaptation demands posed by majority group members towards the integration of immigrants in order for the latter to be accepted by the former. Hence, regarding the hypotheses set in beforehand, results show that they are confirmed partly. The hypothesis that a higher perceived intergroup threat explains greater emphasis on importance of the social markers is confirmed. On the other hand, the more the respondents have experiences of intergroup contact, the more they endorse the importance of social markers in this study, i.e. the hypothesis set in beforehand is not confirmed. High national identification is related to more markers endorsed, at least in the sociocultural adaptation dimension and when analyzing all the adaptation levels simultaneously, thus the hypothesis set beforehand is partly confirmed. Family relations and economic optimism did not have any significant relation to a higher emphasis on importance of the social markers as predicted, but neither has intergroup permeability, i.e. the hypothesis regarding this was not confirmed. Moreover, higher life satisfaction is related to emphasis on the importance of the social markers in sociocultural adaptation dimension, although not in other dimensions. Even this indicates partial confirmation based on the hypothesis about the relationship between higher life satisfaction and less markers endorsed. The emphasis of the importance on the social markers of the social psychological adaptation dimension was related to assimilationist, or integrationist, acculturation orientations, but not in other adaptation dimensions. Perceived immigrant contributions had neither a negative nor a positive relationship on the

emphasis of the importance of the social markers. The last hypothesis set in beforehand about the relationship between the emphasis of the importance of social markers and related negative attitudes towards multiculturalism and cultural diversity is dealt with in the discussion section.

7 Discussion

The results obtained in this study show consistency with Leong and Yang's (2015) study on social markers of integration (discussed in the theory section under the topic background). Leong and Yang (2015) obtained a statistically significant relationship between national pride and higher evaluations on the markers, as reported by local born Singaporeans, establishing a correlation between national sentiment and greater demands on the features of the naturalized immigrant. In the Finnish context, too, national pride is linked to higher evaluations on social markers in the sociocultural adaptation scale and in the importance scale, including all measured adaptation levels. In addition, as in Leong and Yang (2015), there is a statistically significant relationship between perceived threat and greater expectations on social markers (higher evaluation of the importance level), here, in all but the social psychological adaptation scale.

On the other hand, the strength of family ties does not have any statistical significance found in the Finnish context, in contrast to Leong and Yang's study (2015, p. 129).

Furthermore, Leong and Yang's (2015, p. 52) study shows how local-born Singaporeans have evaluated the same markers at the same level of importance as the native Finns have done in this study (for the whole list of social markers in order of importance, see Appendix 3). Both Finns and Singaporeans have evaluated markers such as *Gets on well with neighbours, Able to speak conversational Finnish/English* and *Has lived in Finland/Singapore for a period of time* in the top ten of the most important markers. Other markers, such as *Has children who are Finnish/Singapore citizens, Has a social circle comprising mostly native born Finns/local-born Singaporeans, Has retired or plans to retire in Finland/Singapore* and *Marries/Lives with a native born Finn/Singaporean* exist approximately in the middle in both countries' lists, i.e. these markers are not perceived as the most important, but neither as non-important.

However, there are some obvious divergences in the responses. These are for instance, *Behaves like a Finn/Singaporean* and *Gives up foreign cultural norms or behavior,* in which Singaporeans do not think these markers are important almost at all compared to other markers, whereas the Finnish respondents have evaluated these markers more or less important (the social marker denoting behavior similar to that of the Finns is in the list of top ten most important markers). It seems that Finns appreciate multiculturalism less, when it comes to activity in the public domain together with other citizens, whereas in Singapore cultural diversity in the public domain is not a concern. The marker *Owns residential property in Finland/Singapore* was more important to Singaporeans than to Finns. Nevertheless, both Finns and Singaporeans evaluate many social markers regarding the socioeconomic adaptation lower in importance.

7.1 Who really fits in?

As one can derive from the results (see Appendix 6: Table 7), the perceived symbolic and realistic threats have a systematic positive and significant influence on the endorsements of the social markers of nearly all adaptation dimensions. In previous studies, perceived symbolic and realistic threats are strongly linked to more negative attitudes towards out-group members, which is also often linked to difficulties to pursue a successful multicultural ideology at the societal level (Berry, 2011, p. 625). Ward and Masgoret (2006, p. 673) support that claim: "*Berry confirmed that multicultural ideology and a sense of economic and cultural security led to greater acceptance of immigrants*". On the other hand, Berry's confirmation also leads to the notion that it is more difficult to achieve an integration approach (out of the set of acculturation orientation strategies) when threats are experienced, and thus a harmonious reciprocal relationship between the ingroup and outgroup is largely beyond reach (Bourhis et al., 1997, p. 384). In the context of the responses of this study, the more one experiences threats from immigrants, the greater is the demand for assimilation, i.e. a total adoption of host culture characteristics in all, or in particular, life domains. Nevertheless, based on the previous research, demands for assimilation do not necessarily stem from negative attitudes towards immigrants (e.g. Bourhis, 1997), and thus they should not be automatically likened to one another.

Thus, the study does not necessarily indicate that more extensively endorsed social markers are purely based on more negative attitudes towards immigrants.

Additionally, *regular contact* is also linked to more endorsed social markers in this study – therefore it is too daring to conclude with certainty what the "more endorsed social markers" actually indicate. With regard to regular contact between host and immigrant, according to Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, contact with immigrants in certain conditions can diminish intergroup bias – and there are multiple studies which support this notion. Even the Finnish researcher Jaakkola's (2009) study investigating the Finns' attitudes towards immigrants supports this theory. However, she also mentions that the Finns' attitudes and the amount of contact did not have a significant correlation in the year 1993 during the economic depression. (Jaakkola, 2009, p. 29.) It is relevant to notice that contact itself does not improve the relationship between ingroup and outgroup members, but contact *might* contribute positively to relations in particular conditions (Allport, 1954). Thus, it depends on the quality of contact and on other related elements. According to Allport's (1954; Pettigrew, 1998, p. 66) theory of contact hypothesis, only contact itself is not enough to reduce bias towards outgroup members, or to contribute to sociocultural adaptation, but contact requires elements such as equal status between groups, cooperative ability, common goals and supportive laws or policies, for instance. Contact between the majority and minority members in these specific circumstances can lead to e.g. common goals and/or common understanding about the surrounding world. This can lead to a re-categorization of the common identity, i.e. "us" and "them" becomes "we", improving intergroup relations (Gaertner et al., 1993).

In other words, it is unfounded to draw a link between regular contact with immigrants and negative attitudes towards them, displayed through more endorsed social markers. It is not likely that all the respondents just have had "bad experiences" with immigrants (Allport, 1954). Other possibilities could be that those immigrants the respondents have had a regular contact with have been more similar to them, i.e. assimilated immigrants into the Finnish society, than immigrants generally, thus creating higher expectations or an inflated sense of normalcy to be expected of the immigrant's ability in the acculturation process. It must be remembered that the sample group of respondents consists of young, urban or urbanized university students living in the most immigrant-dense city of Finland. It is likely that their personal

encounters with immigrants are in line with their routines of studies and life at prestigious higher education institutions, carrying over the same social circles into leisure time; immigrants met in these contexts may have very different outlooks on acculturation than immigrants in other, perhaps more challenging contexts. Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker and Obdrzálek (2000, p. 5) claim that *"perceived similarity of the outgroup will lead to a greater acceptance, resulting in an integration or assimilation attitude, whereas perceived dissimilarity supports separation and marginalization".* Also, Ward et al. (2001; Sam & Berry, 2006, p. 71) have found consistent results among sojourners in which the higher similarity between the own and the host culture is linked to greater levels of sociocultural adaptation.

In this case, higher requirements do not necessarily mean directly more negative attitudes towards immigrants, but can instead support the similarity-attraction hypothesis, i.e. that the assimilated immigrant, with whom the native Finn has had greater contact than with a less assimilated immigrant, has become the definitive reference point for the native Finn, thus raising the demand bar even for other immigrants. Perceived threats could in such a scenario be linked, after all, to more negative attitudes towards immigrants who are perceived as outgroup members, yet based on the assumption that the perceived threat is associated to immigrants with dissimilarities. Then, it could well be that high expectations, indicated by high evaluations of the importance of social markers in order for immigrants to be full-fledged members of the host society, could actually be a result of a complex and diverse mix of positive and negative views on immigrants.

The results support also assumptions about the domain specificity regarding acculturation orientations, i.e. that acculturation orientations are not necessarily stable and the same, but rather unstable and changing depending on the context (Navas et al., 2007). For instance, experienced national pride correlates with more social markers endorsed in the sociocultural adaptation dimension, but does not correlate as strongly with the socioeconomic and social psychological adaptation dimensions. Whereas, the variable of host acculturation orientation correlates with more social markers endorsed only in the social psychological adaptation dimension, but not in others. Thus, the Finnish host members expect immigrants to assimilate or integrate with regard to social psychological adaptation, to be able to successfully adapt and fit in into the Finnish society in that particular dimension, while in the other adaptation dimensions

assimilation/integration orientation is not required. That is to say, Finnish host members with assimilationist or integrationist views might prefer immigrants to have a positive relationship towards Finnish society and get along well with Finnish people, but not necessarily look like Finns or think like them.

In the end, results show that the ease of acquirement of the social markers, reported by the respondents, has a positive influence on expectations that the Finnish host members set for immigrants. Those markers that are viewed as easy to acquire are also those that Finnish respondents require most from the immigrants. It would be interesting to assess these results against opinions that immigrants have about the ease of acquirement of the most crucial social markers in order to qualify in the ingroup. Would we find that, indeed, hosts and immigrants of the Finnish society, agree on what is easy to adopt, or on what ought to be adopted?

To sum up, demographic factors generally do not predict why someone requires of immigrants more than someone else as a criterion of successful acculturation. Cognitive factors and intergroup factors have a greater influence on the requirements determining who fits in and become accepted as a co-national. Nevertheless, Finnish host members generally think it is possible for immigrants to acquire the expectations they have. In other words, successful acculturation into the Finnish society is possible according to host members – although depending on the various socio-psychological factors it can be more difficult or easy for immigrants to achieve.

7.2 Research limitations and future propositions

Regarding the host members acculturation orientations, it matters also which group of immigrants is talked about, i.e. it matters where immigrants originate from (Navas et al., 2005, p. 24). That is to say, concerning the expectations and requirements that the host members generally have for all immigrants, it is not possible to separate the different immigrant group associations in this study. In addition, although the research was aimed at examining the Finnish host members' attitudes towards naturalized immigrants, it is not obvious that the respondents associated the questions only to naturalized immigrants. The concept may be difficult to internalize when studying only one phrase of its meaning in the introduction of the questionnaire.

Mayda (2006, p. 513) proposes that individuals who are better educated, living in a bigger cities or have foreign friends or other close connections with foreign people,

have generally more positive attitudes towards immigration. It is necessary to keep in mind that the sample group in this study consists of students who are living in the city (for the most part), and who are well-educated, or are aiming to become; these facts potentially influence the results of this study (judging by findings in previous studies). Therefore, this rather homogeneous sample in the study prohibits the results to be generalized to the greater population, as the factor of education is likely to bear an overly biased picture of attitudes to immigrant acculturation. Immigrants are usually not perceived as competing in the same labour markets as the well-educated native population, which is why immigration is not economically as threatening for that stratum of citizens. (Malchow- Moller, Roland Munch, Schroll & Rose Skaksen, 2008, p. 254.) At the same time the students are in a sensitive position regarding this claim, because they have not graduated yet, and trying to make a living alongside studies, often seek employment where little or no formal education is needed, thus actually competing with immigrants for this limited time-period in their lives.

It would be good to measure more clearly the realistic and symbolic threats through social markers in Finland to find out if the one (realistic) is more perceived than the other (symbolic). In this study, those threats dimensions were not distinguished from each other.

A similar research framework based on the social markers, but from the view of the immigrants in Finland, would be an interesting study context for the future.

7.3 Point of time

The point of time for the research was not the most optimal regarding the circumstances, in which uncontrollable refugee flows, the economic crisis and terrorism are the hot topics. These can influence for instance the perceived threats, and thus influence more negative attitudes and views towards multiculturalism and immigration. The country-specific evolutions in attitudes toward immigration are shown to coincide with national context factors, such as immigration flows and changes in unemployment rates (Meuleman, Davidov & Billiet, 2009). Although, on the other hand, it can be seen even as an advantage to research attitudes in these circumstances to be able to observe how the context influences people – but then a repetitive study in the future would be recommended to compare the results.

7.4 What have I learned?

Something I would have done differently would be a different regression model for the socio-psychological factors' influence on the social markers evaluated, and different for the ease of acquirement the social markers. These two predictors measure different things and it would, thus, be better to apply them separately into the study. Nonetheless, the way this is perceived in the study.

References

Abrams, D. R. (2007). Introduction to Regression. Retrieved 2.5.2016 from
http://dss.princeton.edu/online_help/analysis/regression_intro.htm

Allport, G. W. (1954). The historical background of modern social psychology. As
cited in multiple sources e.g. Schwarz & Bohner (2001), Pettigrew (1998).

Bank of Finland. (2015). Suomi jää yhä kauemmas euroalueen kasvusta. Retrieved in
28.4.2016 from http://www.eurojatalous.fi/fi/2015/3/suomi-jaa-yha-kauemmas-
euroalueen-kasvusta/

Berry, J. W. (1974). Psychological aspects of cultural pluralism. *Cultural Learning, 2,*
17- 22.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.),
Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings (pp.9-25). CO: Westview.

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

Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M.
H. Segall et al. (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 291- 326). Boston:
Allyn & Bacon. As cited in Oppedal (2006).

Berry. J. W. (2011). A psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Sciences, 57*(3),
615- 631.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross- cultural
psychology – Research and Applications*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Berry, W. D. (1993). *Understanding regression assumptions*. CA: Sage. As cited in
Tabachnick & Fidell (2014).

Bochner, S. (1982). *Cultures in Contact – Studies in Cross-Cultural Interaction*. UK:
Pergamon Press.

Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring social distance. *Journal of Applied Sociology, 9*, 299- 308. As cited in Weinfurt & Moghaddam (2001).

Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senècal, S. (1997). Towards an Interactive Acculturation Model: A Social Psychological Approach. *International Journal of Psychology, 32*(6), 369- 386.

Bourhis, R. Y, Montaruli, E., El-Geledi. S., Harvey, S-P., & Barrette, G. (2010). Acculturation in Multiple Host Community Settings. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(4), 780- 802.

Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. As cited in Pallant (2010).

Costello, A.B., & Osborne, J.W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 10*(7), 1- 9. As cited in Yong & Pearce (2013).

Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 16- 29. As cited in Vigoda- Gadot & Drory (2016).

Demes, K. A., & Geeraert, N. (2014). Measures Matter: Scales for Adaptation, Cultural Distance, and Acculturation Orientation Revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *45*(1), 91- 109.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias. *European Review of Social Psychology, 4*(1), 1- 26.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). Assimilation in American life. Nueva York: Oxford University Press. As cited in Navas et al. (2005).

Hampden-Turner, C. M., & Trompenaars, F. (2000). *Building Cross-Cultural Competence: How to Create Wealth from Conflicting Values*. UK: John Wiley.

Heikkilä, E., & Peltonen, S. (2002). *Immigrants and Integration in Finland*. Turku: Institute of Migration.

Heikkilä, T. (2014). Tilastollinen tutkimus (9th ed.). Helsinki: Edita.

Honkapohja, S., & Koskela, E. (1999). The economic crisis of the 1990s in Finland. *Economic Policy, 14(*29), 399- 436.

Inglis, F. (2004). *Culture*. UK: Polity Press.

Jaakkola, M. (2009). *Maahanmuuttajat suomalaisten näkökulmasta – asennemuutokset 1987 – 2007*. Helsinki: Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus.

Kvantimotv. (2003). Regressio rajoitteet. Retrieved 15.4.2016 from http://www.fsd.uta.fi/menetelmaopetus/regressio/rajoitteet.html

Ledesma, R. D., & Valero-Mora, P. (2007). Determining the Number of Factors to Retain in EFA: an easy-to-use computer program for carrying out Parallel Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation,* 12 (2), 1- 11.

Leong, C. H. (2008). A multilevel research framework for the analyses of attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32,* 115- 129.

Leong, C. H., & Ward. C. (2011). Intergroup Perceptions and Attitudes toward Immigrants in a Culturally Plural Society. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *60*(1), 46- 65.

Leong, C. H. (2014). Social markers of Acculturation: A new research framework on intercultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *38*, 120- 132.

Leong, C. H., & Yang, W.W. (2015). Social markers of integration – what matters most to Singaporeans?. 39- 64.

Lott, B. (2010). *Multiculturalism and Diversity – A Social Psychological Perspective.* UK: John Wiley.

Malchow- Moller, N., Roland Munch, J., Schroll, S., & Rose Skaksen, J. (2008). Attitudes towards immigration-perceived consequences and economic self-interest. *Economic Letters, 100,* 254- 257.

Mayda, A. M. (2006). Who is against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes towards Immigrants. *The Review of Economic and Statistics*, *88*(3), 510- 530.

McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants. *Social Forces, 81*(3), 909- 936.

Meuleman, B., Davidov, E., & Billiet, J. (2009). Changing attitudes toward immigration in Europe, 2002–2007: A dynamic group conflict theory approach. *Social Science Research, 38,* 352- 365.

Migri. (2016a). Retrieved 28.4.2016 from http://www.migri.fi/tietoa_virastosta/tilastot/oleskelulupatilastot

Migri. (2016b). Retrieved 28.4.2016 from http://www.migri.fi/tietoa_virastosta/tilastot/turvapaikka-_ja_pakolaistilastot

Ministry of Employment and the Economy. (2012). Valtion kotouttamisohjelma. Hallituksen painopisteet vuosille 2012 – 2015. Retrieved 28.4.2016 from https://www.tem.fi/files/33350/Valtion_kotouttamisohjelma_vuosille_2012-2015_1.6.2012_2.pdf

Ministry of Labour. (2006). Hallituksen maahanmuuttopoliittinen ohjelma. *Työhallinnon julkaisu, 371*, Helsinki.

Moghaddam, F. M., & Solliday, E. A. (1991). "Balanced multiculturalism" and the challenge of peaceful coexistence in pluralistic societies. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 3,* 51- 72. As cited in Piontkowski et al. (2000).

Motti-Stefanidi, F., Pablopoulos, V., Obradovic, J., & Masten, A. S. (2008). Acculturation and adaptation of immigrant adolescents in Greek urban schools. *International Journal of Psychology*, *43*, 45-58. As cited in Demes & Geeraert (2014).

Navas, M., Garcia, M. C., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernández, J. S. (2005). Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *29*, 21- 37.

Navas, M., Rojas, A., García, M., & Pumares, P. (2007). Acculturation strategies and attitudes according to the Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): The perspectives of natives versus immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31,* 67- 68.

Oppedal, B. (2006). Development and Acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J.W. Berry (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology: Acculturation psychology* (pp. 97- 112). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pallant, Julie. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual – A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.). NY: Open University Press.

Pettigrew, T. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65- 85.

Piontkowski, U., Florack, A., Hoelker, P., & Obdrzálek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24,* 1-26

Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2006). *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sam, D. L., & Oppedal, B. (2002). Acculturation as a developmental pathway. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel et al. (eds.), Online readings in psychology and culture (www.ac.edu/~culture), Western Washington University. As cited in Oppedal (2006).

Schwarz, N., & Bohner, G. (2001). The construction of Attitudes. In A. Tesser & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology*: *Intrapersonal Processes* (pp. 436- 457). UK: Blackwell.

Sides, J., & Citrin, J. (2007). European Opinion About Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information. *British Journal of Political Science, 37*(3), 477- 504.

Statistics Finland. (2016). Väestönmuutokset. Retrieved 16.4.2016 from http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/tup/suoluk/suoluk_vaesto.html#vaestonmuutokset

Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., White Stephan, C., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *29*, 1- 19.

Super, C. M., & Harkness, S. (1986). The developmental niche: a conceptualization of the interface of child and culture. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 9,* 545- 570. As cited in Oppedal (2006).

Taanila, Aki. (29.11.2015). 7 mielipideasteikon keskiarvo. Retrieved 2.5.2016 from https://tilastoapu.wordpress.com/2011/10/18/mielipideasteikon-keskiarvo/

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). Using multivariate statistics (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins. As cited in Abrams (2007).

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.)*. UK: Pearson.

The Finnish Government. (16.10.1997). Valtioneuvoston periaatepäätös hallituksen maahanmuutto- ja pakolaispoliittiseksi ohjelmaksi.

The Finnish Government. (2015). Hallituksen maahanmuuttopoliittiset toimenpiteet. Retrieved 28.4.2016 from http://valtioneuvosto.fi/documents/10616/334517/Hallituksen+maahanmuuttopoliittise t+toimenpiteet/186046e8-46c7-450c-98cf-45b2e2d19c2c

The Finnish Immigration Service. (2016). Citizenship of Finland. Retrieved 15.4.2016 from http://www.migri.fi/finnish_citizenship

Tseung-Wong, C. Ng., & Verkuyten, M. (2010). Intergroup evaluations, group indispensability and prototypicality judgements: A study in Mauritius. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13*(5), 621- 638.

UNESCO. (2016). Naturalisation. Retrieved 5.4.2016 from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/naturalisation/

Valtari, M. (2006). *SPSS- perusteet- SPSS:n versio 14*. Helsinki: TVT.

Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). Patterns of relations between immigrants and host societies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30,* 637- 651.

Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B., & Smeekes, A. (2014). The Multicultural Jigsaw Puzzle: Category Indispensability and Acceptance of Immigrants' Cultural Rights. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(11), 1480- 1493.

Vigoda- Gadot, E., & Drory, A. (2016). *Handbook of Organizational Politics: Looking back and to the future* (2nd ed.). UK: Edward Elgar.

Ward, C., & Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock.* London: Routledge. As cited in Sam & Berry (2006).

Ward, C., & Chang, W. C. (1997). "Cultural Fit": A New Perspective On Personality And Sojourner Adjustment. *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21*(4), 525- 533.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1996). *Crossing cultures: The relationship between psychological and sociocultural dimensions of cross-cultural adjustment.* In J. Pandey, D. Sinha, & D. P. S. Bhawuk (Eds.), *Asian.contributions to cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 289- 306). India: Sage. As cited in Demes & Geeraert (2014).

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The Measurement of Sociocultural Adaptation. *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*(4), 659- 677.

Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). An Integrative model of attitudes toward immigrants, *International Journal of Intercultural* Relations, 30, 671- 682.

Weinfurt, K. P., & Moghaddam, F. M. (2001). Culture and Social Distance: A case study of methodological cautions. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*(1), 101- 110.

Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A Beginner's Guide to Factor Analysis: Focusing on Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 9*(2), 79- 94.

Appendix 1: Guideline

Guideline for Focus Group Discussion on Social Markers of Acculturation

Step 1.

Discuss what is uniquely (country)

- personal values
- individual behaviors
- culture, customs, norms

Step 2.

Briefly and broadly discuss what is expected of immigrants to (country). Unguided Discussion

Step 3.

Show the list of markers to the focus group participants.

Step 4.

Solicit feedback on the list of social markers

- Does it capture the essence of immigrant naturalization in (country)?
- What other benchmark would you look out for as an indicator of adaptation?
- Realistically how difficult or easy can immigrants acquire or fulfill these criteria?

Step 5.

Solicit feedback on immigrant groups

- Would you use the same indicators for all immigrant groups?
- Would you expect more from certain immigrant groups than others?

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

SECTION 1. There are naturalized immigrants who are Finnish citizens. To distinguish these from local born people, we will still call them 'immigrants' from now. The following is a list of characteristics which local born people feel are important for an immigrant to have in order to be accepted and viewed as a full member of the society, like a native-born Finnish citizen is. As you read each characteristic, please indicate using the scale 1(not at all important) to 7(very important), whether you think it is important for the immigrant to have to be accepted and viewed as a Finnish citizen. For each item, please indicate how difficult or easy the immigrants can acquire using the scale 1(almost impossible to acquire) to 7(can be acquired very easily). For each scale, the midpoint of 4 means "neutral." There is no right or wrong answer.

Social Markers

1.   Is gainfully employed

2.   Belongs to one of (country)'s main ethnic groups

3.   Has at least a college degree

4.   Has a monthly income of at least $_____

5.   Physically resembles _____ (country)

6.   Has lived in (country) for a period of time (if yes: at least how many years?)

7.   Has retired or plans to retire in (country)

8.   Marries a native-born (country) people or is living with a native-born partner

9.   Owns residential property in (country)

10.   Works for the (country) government

11.   Works for a (country) -based company

12.   Works in a field where there is a shortfall of labour in (country)

13.   Considered a talent in their industry

14.   Invests in or sets up a (country) -based company

15.   Has a social circle comprising mostly native-born (country) people

16.   Has children who are (country) citizens

17.   Gets on well with workplace colleagues

18.   Gets on well with neighbours

19.   Embraces a positive attitude to the host society

20.   Attended local schools themselves (if yes, for how long _____)

21.   Their children attend(ed) local schools (if yes, for how long _____)

22.   Enjoy or take part in local sports

23.   Able to speak conversational (country)'s language

24.   Able to speak with local accent

25.   Able to read (country's language) at a similar level to a native (country's)

26.   Able to write (country's language) at a similar level to a native (country's)

27.   Dress like the way local people do

28.   Enjoys 'typical' (country) past times (give an example: _____)

29.   Embrace/convert to ____ as a religion

30.   Supports (country) products and brands (give an example: _____)

31.   Behaves like a 'country'-ian (give an example: _____)

32.   Thinks like a 'country'-ian (give an example: _____)

33.   Gives up foreign cultural norms or behaviour (give an example:_____)

34.   Observes local laws and customs

35.   Follows local media

36.   Able to eat local food

37.   Participates in the work of local charity organizations/NGOs

38.   Participates in local politics (e.g. votes in communal elections, join a political party)

39.   A member of the local labour union

Finnish culture-specific social markers

40.   Respects the private space of other people around

41.   Serves in the military

SECTION 2.

In each of the following sections, rate how much you agree with each statement using a scale from 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree). The midpoint of 4 means "neutral." There is no right or wrong answer.

Symbolic and Realistic threats

1. Having more immigrants will make our country less cohesive

2. Increase immigration to (country) will dilute our national identity

3. The immigrants coming to (country) have very different values

4. Job opportunities will be reduced for native-born (country) if we have more immigrants

5. Due to the large number of immigrants, access to good quality public services will be negatively affected for:

   i)   Public housing

   ii)   Medical health care

   iii) Education

   iv)   Public Safety

6. Immigrants are coming to (country) at the expense of the native-born (country) people (e.g. jobs, medical care, housing)

7. Immigrants use (country) as a stepping stone to other countries

8. Immigration to (country) (7-point likert scale from 1-strong disagree to 7-strongly agree):

   (1) threatens (country)'s workplaces – creates new workplaces here

      1(threatens workplaces) – 7(creates new workplaces)

   (2) threatens (country)'s way of life – enriches the (country)'s way of living

      1(threatens way of life) – 7(enriches way of life)

   (3) threatens (country)'s my family's safety – improve my family's safety

      1(threatens my family's safety) – 7(improves my family's safety)

   (4) threatens my understanding of other cultures –improves my understanding of other cultures.

      1(threatens my understanding) – 7(improves my understanding)

Immigrant Contributions

9. Immigrants contribute to (country)'s development as much as natives do

10. The benefits of having immigrants in (country) are obvious

11. Immigrants do the jobs that (country) people do not want to do

12. The skills that immigrants have are the types that (country) needs most

13. Immigrants shoulder the same amount of social responsibilities as the native-born (country)

National Pride

14. I would prefer to be a citizen of (country) than any other country in the world

15. There are some things about (country) that make me feel ashamed of (country)

16. The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like (country)

17. Generally speaking, (country) is a better country than most other countries

18. People should support their country even if the country is in the wrong

Life Satisfaction

19. In most ways, my life is close to my idea of perfection

20. The conditions of my life are excellent

21. I am satisfied with my life

22. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life

23. If I could live my life over, I would change nothing

Family Relations

24. My family is always there for me in times of need

25. I know that my family has my best interests in mind

26. In my opinion, the family is the most important social institution of all

Economic Optimism

27. (country) will continue to be economically prosperous in the next few years

28. There will be sufficient jobs and opportunities for every (country) people in the next few years

29. (country) can continue to attract good foreign investment into the country in the next few years

Host Acculturation Orientation

30. Immigrants should do more to preserve their heritage culture and customs

31. Immigrants should do more to embrace (country) culture and customs

32. It does not matter what culture immigrants engage because they have the right to pursue what they wish to do.

SECTION 3.

In the following section, please indicate your answer using the respective 7-point scale for each question. There is no right or wrong answer.

Contact

1.   How much contact do you have with immigrants in school/work situations?

$$1(\text{very little contact}) – 7(\text{very often})$$

2.   How much contact do you have with immigrants in social/leisure situations?

$$1(\text{very little contact}) – 7(\text{very often})$$

3.   How much contact do you have with immigrants as

· neighbours - 1(very little contact) – 7(very often)

· close friends 1(very little contact) – 7(very often)

· a visitor to their home 1(very little contact) – 7(very often)

Intergroup Permeability

4.   How easy would it be for you to be involved in work/school with immigrants? (e.g., working on same project) 1(Difficult)—4 (Neutral)—7 (Easy)

5.   How easy would it be for you to be involved in social activities with immigrants? (e.g., dinner, concert, leisure activities) 1(Difficult) –4 (Neutral)—7(Easy)

6.   Do you think it is easy or difficult for immigrants to make friends with people in (country)? 1(Difficult) – 4 (Neutral)—7(Easy)

7. Compared to most people in (country), immigrants as a group are generally:

1(Lower in social status) – 4(Equal status) – 7(Higher in social status)

1(Lower in economic status) – 4(Equal status) – 7(Higher in economic status)

8. How much access do you think immigrants in (country) have to the social resources (e.g., social welfare) that are available to the native (country) people?

1(Native (country) people have more access) – 4(equal access) – 7(immigrants have more access)

9. Do you think immigrants in (country) have equal political influence that is available to other native (country) people?

    1(Native (country) people have more influence) – 4(equal influence) 7(immigrants have more influence)

10. In general, comparing between other native (country) people and immigrants, do you think one group has more work opportunities than the other?

    1(Native (country) people have more work opportunities) – 4(equal work opportunities) – 7(immigrants have more work opportunities)

11. How important is it for immigrants to become citizens of your country to be accepted as co-nationals?" 1— (not at all important) –4 (Neutral)— 7 (very important)

DEMOGRAPHICS

Nationality:

Age:

Gender:

Are you a (country's citizen) by birth? Yes___ No____

If no, when did you arrive in this country? _____ years ago

Are you employed? 1. Yes full time or self-employed. 2. Yes part time. 3. No, not working

What is the degree program that you major in? (e.g., psychology, engineering) _____

Appendix 3: The order of importance of social markers

Social marker	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Observes local laws and customs	6.50	. 93	-3.43	16.55
Respects the private space of other people around	6.12	1.18	-1.76	4.25
Embraces a positive attitude to the host society	5.61	1.52	-1.50	1.94
Able to speak conversational Finnish	5.60	1.27	-.99	1.13
Has lived in Finland for a period of time	4.98	1.59	-.94	. 19
Follows local media	4.58	1.55	-.67	-.18
Gets on well with neighbours	4.44	1.89	-.50	-.92
Their children attend(ed) local schools	4.42	1.76	-.54	-.69
Gets on well with workplace colleagues	4.40	1.82	-.59	-.82
Behaves like a Finn	4.25	1.76	-.25	-.94
Able to read Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	4.16	1.72	-.18	-1.01
Able to write Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	4.06	1.65	-.11	-.92
Thinks like a Finn	3.69	1.69	-.06	-.94
Has children who are Finnish citizens	3.54	1.73	-.03	-1.17
Has a social circle comprising mostly native born Finns	3.52	1.71	. 10	-1.15
Considered a talent in their industry	3.49	1.80	. 02	-1.27
Gives up foreign cultural norms or behaviour	3.43	1.76	. 17	-1.09
Marries/Lives with a native-born Finn	3.19	1.74	. 30	-1.07
Has retired or plans to retire in Finland	3.13	1.47	. 00	-1.04
Is a member of the local labour union	2.89	1.69	. 56	-.67
Works in a field where there is a shortfall of labour in Finland	2.86	1.69	. 47	-1.07
Dress like the local people do	2.84	1.79	. 73	-.58
Enjoys typical Finnish past times	2.76	1.59	. 61	-.75
Serves in the military	2.73	1.80	. 69	-.72
Has a specific monthly income	2.72	1.61	. 67	-.62
Owns residential property in Finland	2.62	1.50	. 64	-.54
Works for a Finnish-based company	2.61	1.52	. 59	-.88
Invests in or sets up a Finnish-based company	2.59	1.58	. 62	-.81
Able to eat local food	2.55	1.46	1.02	. 60
Participates in the work of local charity organizations	2.36	1.31	. 88	. 42
Physically resembles Finn	2.22	1.65	1.38	1.05
Works for the Finnish government	2.22	1.46	1.08	. 13
Has Finnish roots	2.15	1.50	1.38	1.32
Able to speak with local accent	2.00	1.23	1.31	1.38
Has at least a college degree	1.98	1.26	1.30	1.27
Embraces Christianity	1.97	1.55	1.61	1.61
Enjoy or take part in local sports	1.97	1.28	1.50	1.96

Appendix 4: The order of ease of acquirement of social markers

Social marker	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Respects the private space of other people around	5.76	1.02	-.49	-.36
Observes local laws and customs	5.72	1.01	-.90	1.77
Dress like the local people do	5.43	1.16	-.45	-.32
Their children attend(ed) local schools	5.39	1.16	-.09	-1.10
Follows local media	5.27	1.17	-.31	-.39
Is a member of the local labour union	5.06	1.15	. 02	-.56
Works in a field where there is a shortfall of labour in Finland	5.04	1.05	-.23	-.19
Embraces a positive attitude to the host society	5.02	1.02	-.00	-.23
Participates in the work of local charity organizations	4.99	1.18	-.21	-.28
Gets on well with workplace colleagues	4.98	. 86	-.36	-.31
Able to eat local food	4.95	1.16	. 06	-.30
Enjoy or take part in local sports	4.90	1.08	-.12	-.08
Gets on well with neighbours	4.76	1.04	-.47	-.16
Enjoys typical Finnish past times	4.69	1.10	. 08	-.09
Has lived in Finland for a period of time	4.51	1.13	-.27	-.04
Considered a talent in their industry	4.39	1.00	. 07	-.03
Has children who are Finnish citizens	4.31	1.11	. 08	. 40
Serves in the military	4.21	1.25	. 03	. 51
Has retired or plans to retire in Finland	4.16	1.12	-.17	. 43
Behaves like a Finn	4.15	1.18	. 00	-.19
Marries/Lives with a native-born Finn	4.03	1.06	. 07	. 42
Works for a Finnish-based company	3.92	1.02	. 10	-.42
Has a specific monthly income	3.73	1.12	. 33	-.19
Owns residential property in Finland	3.70	1.26	. 06	-.76
Able to speak conversational Finnish	3.62	1.28	. 29	-.76
Embraces Christianity	3.50	1.45	. 10	-.11
Has a social circle comprising mostly native born Finns	3.46	1.21	. 17	-.21
Thinks like a Finn	3.41	1.28	. 32	. 14
Has at least a college degree	3.38	1.09	. 37	-.29
Invests in or sets up a Finnish-based company	3.33	1.18	. 10	-.55
Works for the Finnish government	3.30	1.17	. 36	-.34
Gives up foreign cultural norms or behaviour	3.26	1.41	. 31	-.52
Able to read Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	3.02	1.26	. 57	. 17
Able to write Finnish at a similar level to a native Finn	2.76	1.25	. 79	. 61
Able to speak with local accent	2.35	1.19	. 95	. 83
Physically resembles Finn	2.09	1.20	. 77	-.55
Has Finnish roots	1.72	1.12	1.63	2.38

Appendix 5: Table 2: Correlations between the independent variables

In the table below all the correlations between the fourteen independent variables are shown: symbolic and realistic threats (threat), immigrant contributions (contr), national pride (pride), life satisfaction (life), family relations (fam), economic optimism (fut), hos acculturation orientation (acco), contact (cont) and intergroup permeability (perm), but additionally acquirement of the social markers of the sociocultural adaptation (ascula), acquirement of the social markers of the socioeconomic adaptation (asecoa), acquirement of the social markers of the social psychological adaptation (aspsya) and acquirement of the all social markers of the all adaptation levels (acquirement).

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
1. THREAT	1													
2. CONTR	-.79**	1												
3. PRIDE	. 47**	-.36**	1											
4. LIFE	-.14*	. 17*	. 05	1										
5. FAM	-.04	. 06	. 10	. 39**	1									
6. FUT	-.25**	. 26**	. 14	. 20**	. 11**	1								
7. ACCO	. 75**	-.67**	. 51**	-.08	-.07	-.20**	1							
8. CONT	. 001	. 12	-.10	-.004	-.13	. 09	. 05	1						
9. PERM	. 26**	-.19**	. 18*	. 01	-.001	-.02	. 23**	. 11	1					
10. ACCEPT	. 17*	-.08	. 22**	. 01	. 07	-.003	. 16*	. 01	. 07	1				
11. ASCULA	. 44**	-.37**	. 37**	-.09	. 10	-.09	. 38**	. 10	. 39**	. 18**	1			
12. ASECOA	. 29**	-.16*	. 33**	-.12	. 05	-.06	. 26**	. 07	. 39**	. 11	. 63**	1		
13. ASPSYA	. 36**	-.27**	. 39**	.004	. 12	-.15*	. 41**	. 02	. 23**	. 14*	. 52**	. 51**	1	
14. ACQUIREMENT	. 44**	-.32**	. 42**	-.09	. 10	-.11	. 40**	. 09	. 42**	. 17*	. 91**	. 86**	. 71**	1

$*p < .05, **p < .01; ***p < .001$

Appendix 6: Table 7: Hierarchical multiple regression

	ISCULA			ISECOA			ISPSYA			IMPORTANCE		
	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β
STEP 1												
CONSTANT	2.92***	.52		2.64***	.51		4.95***	.53		3.20***	.45	
LIFE	.07	.08	.07	-.04	.08	-.05	-.02	.08	-.02	.01	.07	.01
FAM	.07	.08	.07	.08	.08	.08	.15	.08	.14	.09	.07	.10
FUT	-.11	.08	-.11	-.03	.07	-.03	-.15	.08	-.14	-.09	.07	-.10
STEP 2												
CONSTANT	2.55***	.57		2.24***	.65		3.67***	.64		2.65***	.51	
LIFE	.11	.06	.11	-.02	.07	-.02	.00	.07	.00	.05	.06	.05
FAM	.03	.07	.03	.06	.08	.06	.11	.07	.10	.05	.06	.06
FUT	-.08	.07	-.07	-.01	.07	-.01	.18	.07	-.17*	-.07	.06	-.08
PRIDE	.42	.08	.35***	.28	.09	.24**	.51	.09	.40***	.39	.07	.37***
CONTR	-.34	.07	-.35***	-.18	.07	-.19*	-.12	.07	-.12	-.24	.06	-.29***
STEP 3												
CONSTANT	-1.03	.79		-.68	.94		-.38	.90		-.80	.70	
LIFE	.11	.06	.11	-.02	.07	-.02	-.01	.07	-.01	.04	.05	.05
FAM	.07	.06	.07	.08	.07	.08	.15	.07	.14*	.09	.05	.10
FUT	-.03	.06	-.03	.02	.07	.02	-.11	.07	-.10	-.03	.05	-.03
PRIDE	.26	.08	.22***	.17	.10	.14	.27	.09	.22**	.23	.07	.22**
CONTR	-.02	.09	-.02	.08	.10	.09	.22	.10	.22*	.07	.08	.08
THREAT	.42	.10	.43***	.39	.12	.42***	.23	.11	.23*	.37	.09	.45***
ACCO	.13	.10	.11	-.00	.12	-.00	.44	.11	.37***	.14	.09	.14
CONT	.15	.05	.19***	.13	.06	.17*	.06	.05	.07	.13	.04	.18**
PERM	-.01	.09	-.01	.08	.10	.05	.08	.10	.05	.04	.08	.03
STEP 4												
CONSTANT	-1.23	.78		-.96	.92		-.56	.90		-1.03	.69	
LIFE	.11	.06	.11	-.02	.07	-.02	-.01	.07	-.01	.04	.05	.05
FAM	.06	.06	.06	.07	.07	.07	.14	.07	.13*	.08	.05	.09
FUT	-.03	.06	-.03	.02	.07	.02	-.11	.07	-.10	-.02	.05	-.03
PRIDE	.24	.08	.20**	.13	.10	.11	.25	.09	.20**	.20	.07	.19**
CONTR	-.04	.09	-.04	.05	.10	.06	.20	.10	.20*	.04	.08	.05
THREAT	.39	.10	.41***	.36	.12	.38**	.21	.11	.21	.35	.09	.41***
ACCO	.12	.10	.11	-.01	.11	-.01	.43	.11	.37***	.13	.09	.14
CONT	.15	.05	.19***	.13	.05	.16*	.06	.05	.07	.13	.04	.18**
PERM	-.02	.08	-.01	.07	.10	.05	.08	.10	.05	.03	.07	.03
ACCEPT	.12	.05	.14*	.16	.05	.20**	.10	.05	.12	.13	.04	.18***
STEP 5												
CONSTANT	-1.95*	.79		-1.19	.96		-2.46**	.90		-1.62*	.72	
LIFE	.14	.06	.14*	-.01	.07	-.01	-.00	.06	-.00	.06	.05	.07
FAM	.03	.06	.02	.06	.07	.06	.09	.06	.08	.06	.05	.06
FUT	-.02	.06	-.02	.03	.07	.03	-.05	.06	-.04	-.01	.05	-.01
PRIDE	.19	.08	.15*	.11	.10	.10	.13	.09	.11	.16	.07	.15*
CONTR	-.01	.08	-.01	.04	.10	.05	.18	.09	.18	.04	.08	.04
THREAT	.36	.10	.37***	.35	.12	.37**	.19	.10	.19	.32	.09	.39***
ACCO	.12	.09	.11	-.01	.11	-.01	.34	.10	.29***	.12	.08	.13
CONT	.13	.05	.16**	.13	.05	.16*	.04	.05	.05	.12	.04	.16**
PERM	-.11	.09	-.07	.04	.11	.03	.02	.09	.10	-.03	.08	-.02
ACCEPT	.10	.04	.12*	.16	.05	.20**	.09	.05	.11	.12	.04	.17**
ASCULA	.37	.11	.22***									
ASECOA				.11	.13	.07						
ASPSYA							.62	.11	.35***			
ACQUIREMENT										.27	.12	.16*

Note. Sociocultural adaptation $R^2 = .02$ for step 1, $R_{adj.}^2 = .33$ for step 2, $R_{adj.}^2 = .46$ for step 3, $R_{adj.}^2 = .47$ for step 4, $R_{adj.}^2 = .50$ for step 5. $\Delta R^2 = .326$ for step 2 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .137$ for step 3 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .018$ for step 4 (ps $= .011$), $\Delta R^2 = .030$ for step 5 (ps $< .001$). Socioeconomic adaptation $R^2 = .01$ for step 1, $R_{adj.}^2 = .11$ for step 2, $R_{adj.}^2 = .20$ for step 3, $R_{adj.}^2 = .23$ for step 4, $R_{adj.}^2 = .23$ for step 5. $\Delta R^2 = .123$ for step 2 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .107$ for step 3 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .036$ for step 4 (ps $< .004$), $\Delta R^2 = .003$ for step 5 (ps $= .384$). Social psychological adaptation $R^2 = .03$ for step 1, $R_{adj.}^2 = .23$ for step 2, $R_{adj.}^2 = .35$ for step 3, $R_{adj.}^2 = .36$ for step 4, $R_{adj.}^2 = .45$ for step 5. $\Delta R^2 = .213$ for step 2 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .130$ for step 3 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .012$ for step 4 (ps $= .055$), $\Delta R^2 = .090$ for step 5 (ps $< .001$). All adaptation levels together $R^2 = .02$ for step 1, $R_{adj.}^2 = .29$ for step 2, $R_{adj.}^2 = .44$ for step 3, $R_{adj.}^2 = .47$ for step 4, $R_{adj.}^2 = .48$ for step 5. $\Delta R^2 = .292$ for step 2 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .154$ for step 3 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .029$ for step 4 (ps $< .001$), $\Delta R^2 = .015$ for step 5 (ps $= .019$).
$*p < .05; **p < .01; *** p < .001$