

1 Introduction to Mutual Intercultural Relations

John W. Berry

*Queen's University, Canada, and Higher School of Economics,
Russian Federation*

1 Introduction: Understanding Cultural Diversity and Equity

There is probably no more serious challenge to social stability and cohesion in the contemporary world than the management of intercultural relations within culturally plural societies. Successful management depends on many factors including a research-based understanding of the historical, political, economic, religious and psychological features of the groups that are in contact. The core question is: 'How shall we all live together?' (Berry, 2003a).

In the project on which this book is based, we seek to provide such research by examining three core psychological principles in seventeen culturally plural societies. This project is entitled Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies (MIRIPS). A description of the project is available on line at www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips.

The first goal of the project is to evaluate three hypotheses of intercultural relations (multiculturalism, contact and integration) across societies in order to identify some basic psychological principles that may underlie intercultural relations across cultural contexts. Second, in order to understand the *mutual* character of intercultural relations, these hypotheses are examined in both the dominant (national) populations and in the non-dominant (immigrant and ethnocultural) communities. These goals are pursued by repeatedly examining some features of intercultural relations in a number of societies that vary in their intercultural contexts. The third goal is to relate the pattern of findings to the contextual features of these societies, including a country's extant cultural diversity and their policies that deal with their diversity. These societies also vary in their history, political and economic characteristics with respect to the relationships among groups. These contextual factors provide background information within which to interpret the

psychological findings. The fourth goal is to employ the findings and relationships to propose some policies and programmes that may improve the quality of intercultural relationships globally.

The design of the project is an exercise in replication across contexts in order to discern what may be culturally universal and what may be culturally specific in how diverse groups of peoples engage in their intercultural relations. If there are consistencies in the empirical findings across these contexts, then they may serve as a basis for promoting more positive intercultural relations more generally in many societies.

Many of the ideas, concepts and research instruments used in this project are derived from two earlier studies: The International Study of Attitudes Towards Immigrants and Settlement (ISATIS; see Berry, 2006) and the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY; see Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder, 2006a and b).

The core ideas are that are addressed in the MIRIPS project are:

1. *Multiculturalism hypothesis*: When individuals feel secure in their place in a society, they will be able to better accept those who are different from themselves; conversely when individuals are threatened, they will reject those who are different.
2. *Contact hypothesis*: When individuals have contact with, and engage with others who are culturally different from themselves, they will achieve mutual acceptance, under certain conditions.
3. *Integration hypothesis*: When individuals identify with, and are socially connected to, both their heritage culture and to the larger society in which they live, they will achieve higher levels of well-being than if they relate to only one or the other culture, or to neither culture.

These three hypotheses will be elaborated in section 6 of this chapter.

1.1 *Outline of the Book*

This book has three main parts. First, this chapter outlines some core ideas in the study of intercultural relations and acculturation, including an elaboration of these three hypotheses. In the second part, evidence relating to these hypotheses will be provided in reports of empirical research in 16 chapters. There are 17 societies studied, each with at least one non-dominant (ethnic/immigrant) group and a dominant (national) group sampled: Australia, Azerbaijan, Canada, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong (China), India, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain and Switzerland. These societies provide the varying contexts for the evaluation of these three hypotheses. The third part of the book provides a chapter summarising and

interpreting the various empirical findings and suggesting some policy applications of the findings.

1.2 *Diversity and Equity Around the World*

Ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic diversity are commonplace in most countries. This project includes societies in which many of these forms of diversity are present, but to varying degrees. These variations allow the examination of contexts for intercultural relations.

To illustrate the extent of this diversity, Alesina, Arnaud, Easterly, Kurlat and Wacziarg (2003) used data from a number of Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. They created two indexes, called *ethnic fractionalisation* and *linguistic fractionalisation index*. These are based on the probability that two randomly selected people in a society will not belong to the same ethnic group or speak the same language. This research shows that, according to this statistic, among industrial countries, the highest scores are found for Canada, Belgium and Switzerland; in the middle are France, Sweden and the UK; lowest scores are found for Japan and Denmark. More recently, Alesina, Harnoss and Rappoport (2016) constructed an index of population diversity for 195 countries. This index has two components: proportion of foreign born and diversity of origin of immigrants. This new index largely confirms the variation in diversity found in these earlier studies. In a similar approach, Fearon (2013) examined 822 ethnic groups in 160 countries and allocated them to a place on two indexes of *ethnic fractionalisation* and *cultural diversity*. In the present study, we distil these indicators to provide a single indicator that ranks the countries in the project. We refer to this index as the *ethnic diversity index*.

However, diversity is not the only focus of this project. In addition to diversity, there is the issue of equitable participation of all groups and their individual members in the life of the larger society (Berry, 2016). If there is diversity without all groups and individuals being able to interact and share their cultures, to have an equal role in the life of the plural society, then a form of segregation may come into existence. So, while these indexes portray the actual degree of ethnic and cultural diversity across societies, there are two other approaches that deal with the issue of participation. The first is the degree of migrant integration across 37 societies; this is the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX, 2010, www.mipex.eu/countries). It includes estimates of integration of migrants in a number of domains: labour mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination laws. Highest integration scores are for

Sweden, Portugal and Canada; in the middle are Germany, the UK and France; and the lowest scores are for Cyprus, Latvia and Turkey. In this study, we refer to this as the *integration index*.

A third approach is to describe and quantify the policy response to such diversity. This is done in the Multicultural Policy Index (MPI; Banting and Kymlicka, 2006–2012; www.queensu.ca/mcp/). The Multicultural Policy Index monitors the evolution of multiculturalism policies in a number of Western democracies. This index brings together both the diversity and equity issues. This policy project provides information about multiculturalism policies in a standardized format; it thus serves well as a basis for making of comparisons across societies in this project. The index includes a set of nine criteria to assess the degree of promotion of multiculturalism (by policy and practice) in plural societies. These include a government policy promoting multiculturalism; a multicultural ministry or secretariat; adoption of multiculturalism in the school curricula; ethnic representation in the media; exemptions of cultural groups from codes that are rooted in the dominant society (e.g., Sunday closing); allowing dual citizenship; funding of cultural organisations; and funding of bilingual or heritage language instruction). Highest scores for multicultural policy development in 2010 are for Australia, Canada, Belgium and Sweden; in the middle are the UK, the United States and the Netherlands; lowest are Switzerland, Japan and Denmark. In this study, we call this the *policy index*.

Related to this policy index are the reports of Bloemraad (2011; Wright and Bloemraad, 2012). Bloemraad (2011) examined the policies and practices of multiculturalism in various countries and tracked changes over the years from 1980 to 2010 using the MPI. The rankings on this index put Canada and Australia in first place, followed by Sweden, New Zealand, Belgium and the United Kingdom. Towards the middle are Spain, Portugal and the United States. Lowest placed are France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Denmark. Of particular interest is the Netherlands, which was rather high in 2000, but dropped to a low score in 2010. This earlier high position in the Netherlands was the result of longstanding ‘polarisation’ policies (Fleras, 2009), while the drop may reflect the assertions in the Netherlands that multiculturalism has failed there (Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2010).

Why are multicultural policies good for society and individuals? There is now substantial evidence that diversity policies produce positive outcomes for a society as a whole and for both dominant and non-dominant groups. For example, Alesina et al. (2015) found that diversity relates positively to economic prosperity for the society as a whole. Multicultural policies can also benefit dominant groups in society. Kesler and Bloemraad’s (2010) 19-country study showed that multicultural policies

increase a sense of belongingness, defined in terms of civic participation. Yet despite these positive outcomes, multicultural policies have often been misunderstood as exclusionary and perceived as threatening by members of the dominant ethno-cultural group (Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi and Sanchez-Burks, 2011).

For non-dominant groups, there are also some positive outcomes: anti-discrimination policies in diverse societies improve economic outcomes for immigrants (Aleksynska and Algan, 2010), and immigrant-native wage gaps are lower in countries with more favourable integration policies as defined by the Migrant Integration Policy Index (Nieto, Matano and Ramos, 2013). Immigrants also experience more belongingness in terms of citizenship acquisition, have higher levels of trust and report lower levels of discrimination in countries with more multicultural policies (Koopmans, Statham Giugni and Passy, 2005; Wright and Bloemraad, 2012). Multicultural models of diversity are associated with greater inclusiveness, less racial bias and more engagement from non-dominant groups (Plaut et al., 2011; Plaut, Thomas and Goren, 2009).

Overall, multicultural approaches have been shown to promote ‘positive psychological, educational and organisational outcomes for minorities and organisations’ (Plaut et al., 2011, p. 2). More generally, Bloemraad and Wright (2014, p. 292) have concluded ‘that multicultural policies appear to have some modest positive effects on socio-political integration for first-generation immigrants and likely little direct effect, positive or negative, on those in the second generation’.

For the present project, these findings of positive outcomes of diversity for economic, social and political indicators are important because they provide a basis for the hypotheses being evaluated in this project. As we shall see in the discussion of the three hypotheses next, we propose that when economic conditions are generally good in a society, there is more shared security for everyone; this likely means less competition and a lower sense of economic threat (see multiculturalism hypothesis). And when there are policies and practices that promote the equitable participation and inclusion of everyone, greater mutual acceptance and well-being are expected (on the basis of the contact and integration hypotheses).

These variations in cultural diversity and integration, and in a country’s policy response to their diversity, provide the contextual background for the psychological examination of intercultural relations among individuals within these 17 societies. That is, we will examine the patterns of findings across the country-specific chapters to see if there are any variations in adaptation outcomes that may relate to a society’s placement on these indexes. In addition to their actual placement on these indexes, we will also examine any large discrepancies between them. For example,

when cultural diversity is high, but the policy response to this diversity is low, there may be poorer outcomes for the quality of intercultural relations, and the adaptations made by individuals.

Not all the countries in the project are included in these indexes. However, we may rank the countries in the MIRIPS project on the three indicators, placing them on the three dimensions: diversity, integration and policy. In some cases, some of the countries do not appear on these published indices. In these cases, the country researchers have provided an estimate of their placement in the rank order (marked by an asterisk).

The 17 societies in the project may be classified into three levels on each of the three multiculturalism dimensions: high, medium and low. When this is done, we find for the diversity index that there are seven countries that are relatively high: Canada, Estonia, Latvia, Switzerland, India*, Australia and Spain. Five countries are medium: Russia, Germany, Greece, Azerbaijan and Finland. And five countries are relatively low: Italy, Hong Kong, Norway, Portugal and Malta. On the integration index, five countries are relatively high: Portugal, Finland, Norway, Canada and Australia. Six countries are medium: Germany, Spain, Italy, India*, Switzerland and Estonia. And six countries are relatively low: Greece, Malta, Russia*, Azerbaijan* and Latvia (Hong Kong was not estimated). Finally for the policy index, seven countries are relatively high: Australia, Canada, India, Finland, Norway, Portugal and Spain. Four countries are medium: Russia*, Germany, Greece and Azerbaijan*. And five countries are relatively low: Italy, Estonia*, Latvia, Switzerland and Malta* (* Indicates that the placement of the country is estimated).

It is clear that countries on the three indicators diverge in substantial ways. For example, Italy is low on diversity and policy, but middle on integration; and Portugal is middle on diversity and policy, but high on integration. We may conjecture that when there are disjunctions in the placements of a society on these indexes, there may be problems for intercultural relations there. For example, when actual cultural diversity is high, but the policy response to this diversity is low, this may present a poorer context for the quality of intercultural relations.

Nevertheless, we can provide the general placement of these societies with respect to the overall *climate* for their intercultural relations. Australia, Canada, Finland and to a lesser extent Portugal provide a positive context for diverse cultural communities. In contrast, Greece, Estonia, Italy, Switzerland, Latvia and Malta may provide a less positive climate. In the last chapter of this book, we will examine whether these variations on the dimensions of diversity, integration and policy, and disjunctions among them, have any association with the level of support for the three hypotheses.

2 Psychological Approaches to Intercultural Relations

The Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies project is focused on the psychological aspects of intercultural relations, but it takes into account some of the social and political contextual features of the larger societies and of the interacting groups within them. It is situated within the broad field of *cross-cultural psychology*, which addresses the question: how can we account for similarities and differences in human behaviour across cultural contexts? It has two core principles (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelsmans, Chasiotis and Sam, 2011). First, individual behaviours should be understood within the cultural contexts in which they have developed and are now being displayed. And second, individual behaviours should be examined and compared across a number of cultural contexts in order to distinguish those that are specific to particular groups from those that might have more general validity. With these two principles in mind, the ultimate goal of cross-cultural psychology, and also of this project, is to eventually achieve a set of universal principles that underlie human behaviour everywhere. These universals are the common substrate of psychological functioning; they are the processes or capacities that all human beings share at birth. During the course of development, cultural experiences shape these basic qualities into competencies and performances. For example, all human beings have the capacity to acquire language; the culture in which they are socialized influences which language(s) they will acquire; and the intercultural setting will influence which language they will actually use. Knowledge of these features of human behaviour is essential if we are to understand intercultural relations as a set of pan-human, but culturally situated, phenomena. If there are some general principles to be found, then broadly applicable policies may be possible to develop on the basis of these general principles. More generally, it may eventually be possible to achieve a 'global psychology' (Berry, 2013).

The project is also situated in the field of *intercultural psychology* (Sam and Berry, 2016). This field deals with the question: 'If individual behaviours are shaped in particular cultural contexts, what happens when individuals who have developed in different cultural contexts meet and interact within a society?' There are two domains of psychological interest here: (1) ethnocultural group relations and (2) acculturation. The study of ethnocultural group relations has usually examined the views and behaviours of the dominant group(s) towards the non-dominant ones, using concepts such as *ethnic stereotypes*, *attitudes*,

prejudice and *discrimination*. These views have been assessed with respect to a number of specific topics, such as attitudes towards specific ethnocultural groups, immigrants, or the value of cultural diversity for a society. This 'one-way' view of ethnocultural relations has usually missed examining the important reciprocal or mutual views held by non-dominant groups towards dominant group(s). However, an early study in Canada (Berry, Kalin and Taylor, 1977) took the point of view that all groups (including dominant and non-dominant groups) in a culturally plural society need to be examined in order to have a comprehensive understanding of their mutual relationships. This early study set the stage for a number of follow-up studies and further analyses, including the *reciprocal mutual attitudes* among dominant and non-dominant groups (Kalin and Berry, 1996), and the development of scales assessing the intercultural views of a number of interacting groups (Berry and Kalin, 2000). The ISATIS project extended research on these issues internationally (Berry, 2006). Many of these earlier scales and specific items have continued to be used in national surveys in various countries. The MIRIPS project continues this approach.

The second domain of psychological interest is that of acculturation, defined as 'the process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between cultural groups and their individual members' (Berry, 2005, p. 698). Early views from anthropology about the nature of acculturation are a useful foundation for contemporary discussion. Two formulations in particular have been widely quoted. The first, from Redfield, Linton and Herskovits (1936, p. 149), defines acculturation as follows:

Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups . . . Under this definition, acculturation is to be distinguished from culture change, of which it is but one aspect, and assimilation, which is at times a phase of acculturation.

In another formulation, the Social Science Research Council (1954, page 974) defined acculturation as:

culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems. Acculturative change may be the consequence of direct cultural transmission; it may be derived from non-cultural causes, such as ecological or demographic modification induced by an impinging culture; it may be delayed, as with internal adjustments following upon the acceptance of alien traits or patterns; or it may be a reactive adaptation of traditional modes of life

In the first formulation, acculturation is seen as one aspect of the broader concept of culture change (that which results from intercultural contact), is considered to generate change in ‘either or both groups’, and is distinguished from assimilation (which may be ‘at times a phase’). These are important distinctions for psychological work and are pursued later in this chapter. In the second definition, a few extra features are added, including change that is indirect (not cultural but rather ‘ecological’), is delayed (internal adjustments, presumably of both a cultural and a psychological character, take place over time), and can be ‘reactive’ (i.e., rejecting the cultural influence and changing towards a more ‘traditional’-way of life rather than inevitably towards greater similarity with the dominant culture). Much contact and change occur during colonization, military invasion, migration and sojourning (i.e., tourism, international study and overseas posting). This process continues after the initial contact in many settler societies where ethnocultural communities maintain and evolve features of their heritage cultures. Over time, groups and individuals from both sides make various adaptations, involving mutual accommodations, in order to live in the culture-contact settings. This process can occasionally be stressful, but it often results in some form of mutual accommodation that both parties have created in order to live together in relative harmony.

Following an initial period of anthropologists working with indigenous peoples, recent acculturation research has focused on how immigrants (both voluntary and involuntary) changed following their entry and settlement into receiving societies. Most recently, research has examined how ethnocultural groups and individuals (those who have become established in generations following immigration) relate to each other and change as a result of their attempts to live together in culturally plural societies (see Sam and Berry, 2016 for an overview of this literature). Nowadays, as globalization results in the growth of trade and the need for political relations, all peoples in contact play important roles in facilitating this development: Indigenous national populations (First nations, Metis and Inuit) are experiencing continuing colonization as new waves of immigrants, sojourners (especially guest workers) and refugees gather to establish large ethnocultural populations in these countries.

Graves (1967) introduced the concept of psychological acculturation. This refers to individuals who are participants in a culture-contact situation, and who undergo changes induced by both the external (usually dominant) culture and the changing culture (usually non-dominant) of which individuals are members. These psychological changes include such rather superficial domains as what food is eaten and what clothes

are worn, through to more deep-rooted psychological features of individuals, such as their identities and values.

There are two reasons for keeping the cultural and psychological levels distinct. The first is that cultural settings set the stage for individual behavioural development. The psychological features brought to the acculturation process, and the psychological changes that take place following migration, can only be understood by also understanding their cultural and intercultural roots. In order to discern the links between these cultural and psychological phenomena, both levels need to be studied and understood in their own terms. The second reason for studying the two levels independently is that not every individual enters into, participates in, or changes in the same way during the acculturation of his or her group. There are vast individual differences in psychological acculturation, even among individuals who have the same cultural origin and live in the same new acculturative arena. Some individuals may conform to the way of acculturating of their community and family, but others may not. In short, there is no simple relationship between cultural and psychological features of acculturation: not every group, nor every individual, engages the process in the same way, nor evidences the same outcomes.

Although these early anthropological definitions still serve as the basis for much work on acculturation, there are some more recent dimensions that have been proposed. First, it is no longer considered necessary for acculturation to be based on ‘continuous first-hand’ contact. With growing use of telemedia, acculturation may take place remotely, in line with earlier work on cultural diffusion, in which aspects of culture flow across boundaries without actual intercultural contact. For example, research by Ferguson and Bornstein (2012) has shown that Jamaican youth are taking on U.S. American cultural and psychological attributes without ever having been in direct personal contact with that society. Rather, they are exposed to U.S. culture through telemedia and tourism.

The second new dimension examines acculturation that takes place over the long term. Rather than being a phenomenon that occurs within the lifetime of an individual or in a few generations, acculturation can take place over centuries or even millennia. This long-term aspect of acculturation has been examined by Gezentsvey-Lamy, Ward and Liu (2013) with Jewish, Maori and Chinese samples, all communities that have remained as ethnocultural groups over centuries following intercultural contact.

A third dimension has become prominent with the increasing cultural diversity of many migrant-receiving societies, where there is no longer one single dominant group with which migrants and ethnocultural groups can