

Family Life and Ethnic Attitudes

Huijnk, W.J.J.

Family Life and Ethnic Attitudes. The role of the family for attitudes towards intermarriage and acculturation among minority and majority groups

Dissertation, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Cover design: Textcetera, Den Haag, The Netherlands

DTP: Textcetera, Den Haag, The Netherlands

ISBN 978-90-9025841-6

NUR 741

© Willem Huijnk, 2011

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system of any nature, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, microfilming, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission from the author.

Family Life and Ethnic Attitudes

The role of the family for attitudes towards intermarriage
and acculturation among minority and majority groups

Familieleven en etnische houdingen

Houdingen ten opzichte van interetnische huwelijken en acculturatie
onder minderheids- en meerderheidsgroeperingen
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Utrecht
op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof. dr. J.C. Stoof,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
vrijdag 14 januari 2011 des middags te 4.15 uur

door

Wilhelmus Johannes Jacobus Huijnk
geboren op 21 maart 1979, te Eindhoven

Promotor: Prof. dr. M. J. A. M. Verkuyten
Co-promotor: Dr. M. T. A. Coenders

This dissertation is based on data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, which was financially supported by grant 480-10-009 from the Major Investments Fund of NWO, the Dutch science foundation, and by the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI), Utrecht University, the University of Amsterdam, and Tilburg University.

Manuscript committee: Prof. dr. A. E. Komter (Utrecht University)
Prof. dr. A. C. Liefbroer (Free University Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. P. L. H. Scheepers (Radboud University Nijmegen)
Prof. dr. F. Van Tubergen (Utrecht University)
Prof. dr. W. A. M. Vollebergh (Utrecht University)

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 13 |
| 1.1.1 | Ethnic boundaries | 13 |
| 1.1.2 | Ethnic distance | 13 |
| 1.1.3 | Family and intermarriage | 15 |
| 1.1.4 | The acculturation of immigrants | 15 |
| 1.1.5 | The main research question | 16 |
| 1.2 | Ethnic attitudes: common explanations and the role of the family | 17 |
| 1.2.1 | Common explanations for ethnic attitudes | 17 |
| 1.2.2 | The role of the family for ethnic attitudes | 19 |
| 1.2.3 | Limitations and neglected questions of previous studies | 21 |
| 1.2.3.1 | Family influences in adulthood | 21 |
| 1.2.3.2 | Assessing the role of the family of origin | 23 |
| 1.2.3.3 | The minority perspective and acculturation attitudes | 24 |
| 1.3 | Research questions and outline of the dissertation | 25 |
| 1.3.1 | Family relations and attitudes towards interethnic marriage | 26 |
| 1.3.2 | Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis | 26 |
| 1.3.3 | The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics for ethnic attitudes | 27 |
| 1.3.4 | Intermarriage attitudes among ethnic minority and majority groups | 27 |
| 1.3.5 | Family life and acculturation attitudes | 28 |
| 1.4 | The Dutch context | 28 |
| 1.4.1 | Migration history and immigrant groups | 28 |
| 1.4.2 | Receiving context: changing ethnic attitudes and more restrictive policies | 29 |
| 1.5 | Data sources | 30 |
| 1.5.1 | Data: the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study | 30 |
| 1.5.2 | The immigrant sample | 31 |
| 1.5.3 | The use of the data in the empirical chapters | 31 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2 | Family relations and the attitude towards ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage | 33 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 35 |
| 2.2 | Theory and hypotheses | 36 |
| 2.2.1 | Family cohesion | 36 |
| 2.2.2 | Family warmth | 38 |
| 2.2.3 | Different ethnic minority groups | 39 |
| 2.2.4 | Other correlates of ethnic minority attitudes and family life | 40 |
| 2.3 | Method | 41 |
| 2.3.1 | Sample | 41 |
| 2.3.2 | Measures | 41 |
| 2.3.3 | Method of analysis | 43 |
| 2.4 | Results | 45 |
| 2.4.1 | Interethnic marriage attitudes | 45 |
| 2.4.2 | Predicting the attitude towards interethnic marriage | 45 |
| 2.4.3 | Different ethnic minority groups | 47 |
| 2.5 | Conclusion and discussion | 47 |
| 3 | Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis in the Netherlands | 51 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 53 |
| 3.2 | Theory and hypotheses | 55 |
| 3.2.1 | Assessing the influence of the family of origin: sibling models | 55 |
| 3.2.2 | Explaining the influence of the family of origin | 56 |
| 3.2.3 | The transmission of attitudes | 56 |
| 3.2.4 | Shared circumstances and the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions | 57 |
| 3.2.5 | Additional explanations: current family characteristics | 58 |
| 3.2.6 | Family characteristics and the transmission of intermarriage attitudes | 59 |
| 3.3 | Method | 60 |
| 3.3.1 | Sample | 60 |
| 3.3.2 | Measures | 61 |
| 3.3.3 | Method of analysis | 64 |
| 3.4 | Results | 66 |
| 3.4.1 | Multilevel sibling models | 66 |
| 3.4.2 | Sensitivity analyses | 69 |
| 3.5 | Conclusion and discussion | 70 |
| 4 | Attitudes towards interethnic marriage: The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics | 73 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 75 |
| 4.2 | Theory and hypotheses | 76 |
| 4.2.1 | Partners' opposition to interethnic marriage | 76 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.2.2 | Partner characteristics: socio-economic status and ethnicity | 77 |
| 4.2.3 | Cohesive relationships | 78 |
| 4.2.4 | Relationship warmth | 78 |
| 4.2.5 | Structural relationship characteristics | 79 |
| 4.2.6 | Conditional associations between partners' ethnic attitudes | 80 |
| 4.2.7 | Control variables | 81 |
| 4.3 | Method | 82 |
| 4.3.1 | Sample | 82 |
| 4.3.2 | Measures | 82 |
| 4.3.3 | Method of analysis | 84 |
| 4.4 | Results | 85 |
| 4.4.1 | Descriptive results | 85 |
| 4.4.2 | Regression analyses: main effects | 86 |
| 4.4.3 | Conditional associations | 89 |
| 4.5 | Conclusion and discussion | 89 |
| 5 | Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands: The role of family relations and immigrant characteristics | 93 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 95 |
| 5.2 | Theory and hypotheses | 96 |
| 5.2.1 | Immigrants in the Netherlands | 96 |
| 5.2.2 | Interethnic marriage | 97 |
| 5.2.3 | Ethnic attitudes in the Netherlands | 97 |
| 5.2.4 | Family relations and intermarriage attitude | 98 |
| 5.2.5 | Immigrant characteristics and intermarriage attitudes | 100 |
| 5.2.6 | Correlates of intermarriage attitudes | 102 |
| 5.3 | Method | 102 |
| 5.3.1 | Sample | 102 |
| 5.3.2 | Measures | 103 |
| 5.4 | Results | 106 |
| 5.4.1 | Descriptive findings | 106 |
| 5.4.2 | Family relations and the resistance to interethnic marriage | 107 |
| 5.4.3 | Immigrant characteristics and the resistance to interethnic marriage | 109 |
| 5.5 | Conclusion and discussion | 111 |
| 6 | Family life and acculturation attitudes: A study among four immigrant groups in the Netherlands | 115 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 117 |
| 6.2 | Theory and hypotheses | 118 |
| 6.2.1 | Acculturation attitudes | 118 |
| 6.2.2 | Parents and acculturation attitudes | 118 |
| 6.2.3 | Family context in adult life: warmth and cohesion | 119 |
| 6.2.4 | Host language usage within the family | 120 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 6.2.5 | Transnational family relationships | 121 |
| 6.2.6 | Controls | 121 |
| 6.3 | Method | 121 |
| 6.3.1 | Sample | 121 |
| 6.3.2 | Measures | 122 |
| 6.3.3 | Method of analysis | 125 |
| 6.4 | Results | 125 |
| 6.4.1 | Preliminary findings | 125 |
| 6.4.2 | Socio-cultural maintenance attitude | 128 |
| 6.4.3 | Socio-cultural adaptation attitude | 129 |
| 6.4.4 | Additional analyses | 131 |
| 6.5 | Conclusion and discussion | 131 |
| 7 | Conclusions and discussion | 135 |
| 7.1 | Introduction | 137 |
| 7.2 | Summary of findings | 138 |
| 7.2.1 | Family relations and attitudes towards interethnic marriage | 138 |
| 7.2.2 | Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis | 139 |
| 7.2.3 | The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics | 140 |
| 7.2.4 | Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups | 140 |
| 7.2.5 | Family life and acculturation attitudes | 141 |
| 7.3 | Main conclusions and contributions to the literature | 142 |
| 7.3.1 | Family relations in adulthood | 142 |
| 7.3.1.1 | Family warmth | 142 |
| 7.3.1.2 | Family cohesion | 143 |
| 7.3.1.3 | Beyond the parent-child bond: partner (relationship) effects | 144 |
| 7.3.1.4 | The minority perspective | 145 |
| 7.3.2 | Assessing the influence of the family of origin | 145 |
| 7.3.3 | Family relations and acculturation | 146 |
| 7.4 | Strengths, limitations, and directions for future research | 148 |
| 7.4.1 | Causality | 149 |
| 7.4.2 | Underlying mechanisms and omitted determinants | 150 |
| 7.4.3 | Conceptualizations and measures of the family constructs | 151 |
| 7.4.4 | Interethnic marriage | 152 |
| 7.4.5 | Generalizability of the findings | 153 |
| 7.5 | Final conclusion | 153 |
| | Samenvatting in het Nederlands | 155 |
| | References | 167 |
| | Acknowledgements | 185 |
| | Curriculum Vitae | 187 |
| | ICS Dissertation Series | 189 |

CHAPTER 1

Introduction



1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Ethnic boundaries

Due to post-war migration the population of most Western European societies, including the Netherlands, has become culturally more diverse. Immigration has become a social, economic and policy concern across Europe. Migration to developed countries has been accompanied by a range of social problems, like tensions and conflicts between members of different ethnic groups, ethnic segregation in schools and neighborhoods, discrimination, and the deprived socio-economic situation of many immigrants. But positive interactions between ethnic¹ groups such as interethnic friendships and interethnic marriages, are also increasingly prevalent, indicating social cohesion between the different ethnic groups (Blau & Schwartz, 1984). Still, most ethnic minority groups predominantly have contacts within their own group. It is clear that there are cultural and social boundaries between ethnic groups and that it is of societal importance to enhance our understanding of the factors that influence these boundaries. Previous research has focused on behavioral expressions of interethnic boundaries, such as intergroup violence, discrimination, and interethnic marriage patterns, but also on ethnic attitudes (e.g., Allport, 1954; Blumer, 1958; Kinder & Sears, 1981; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The focus of this research is on the latter, more specifically, on attitudes regarding interethnic marriage.

1.1.2 Ethnic distance

In general, attitudes can be defined as tendencies that are expressed by evaluating a particular object with some degree of favor or disfavor (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Attitudes are supposed to guide one's behavior, or at least one's behavioral intentions. *Ethnic* attitudes are defined as the set of evaluative responses to members of ethnic outgroups. There have been many different conceptualizations of attitudes that people have towards other ethnic groups, like (ethnic) prejudice (Allport, 1954),

¹ Within the social science literature, there are pervasive debates about the nature and conceptualization of ethnicity. In this dissertation, ethnic background is based on the country of birth of the parents. Following the Dutch Government Central Bureau of Statistics, someone is classified as an ethnic minority member if at least one of the parents was born abroad. Hence, the focus is on ethnic minorities of migrant origin, and not on so-called national minorities (e.g. the Basques in Spain).

ethnocentrism (Sumner, 1959), stereotypic beliefs (Tajfel, 1969), perceptions of ethnic threat (Coenders, 2001), and ethnic or social distance (Bogardus, 1925).

Ethnic distance² refers to the preferred social contact with ethnic groups, and reflects people's degree of acceptance towards ethnic outgroup members (Bogardus, 1925). Ever since the work of Bogardus (1925), the concept of ethnic distance has commonly been used for studying the boundaries between ethnic groups. Bogardus constructed an instrument to study ethnic distance by developing a scale that assesses group members' evaluations of different types of social interactions. Typically, people are asked to indicate the extent to which they would like to have contacts with members of different ethnic groups, for example, as citizens in their country, neighbors in their street, and close kin by marriage. Kinship by marriage is the most intimate relationship and, therefore, the domain of life with the highest ethnic distance between ethnic groups. Once outgroup members are accepted as kin, other types of positive interethnic relations are also more likely (Bogardus, 1925; Tolsma, Lubbers, & Coenders, 2008).

Interethnic marriage is considered to be a key indicator of social integration (Gordon, 1964; Hwang, Saenz, & Aquirre, 1997; Lieberman & Waters, 1988) and marriages between members of different ethnic groups are often viewed as a sign of mutual group acceptance (Kalmijn, 1998). However, although intermarriage patterns tell us which groups interact, they do not tell us why. Moreover, when members of two groups do not marry one another this does not necessarily reflect a disapproval of interethnic marriages or a rejection of ethnic outgroups. Marriage patterns depend not only on preferences, but also on the opportunities of the local marriage market, such as the number of co-ethnics in the neighborhood, and on the role of third parties like the religious community and the family (Kalmijn, 1998). Similarly, marrying someone from another ethnic group is not always a sign of the acceptance of other ethnicities if one of the partners fully adjusts to the cultural and religious beliefs of the other ethnic group. Therefore, it is also important to study interethnic marriage attitudes.

Low levels of intermarriage are often viewed as a lack of integration of immigrant groups (Lieberman & Waters, 1988; Qian & Lichter, 2001). However, intermarriage does not only depend on the readiness of ethnic minority groups to integrate, but also on the openness and acceptance of the majority group. To improve our understanding of interethnic relations it is important to examine the views from both perspectives. In this dissertation, intermarriage attitudes of the ethnic Dutch towards ethnic minority groups as well as the intermarriage attitude of the four largest ethnic minority groups towards the ethnic Dutch are examined.

2 Bogardus used the more general concept of *social* distance (Bogardus, 1925). Social distance refers to the boundaries between social groups in general, such as groups defined by nationality, ethnicity, religion, or politics. Ethnic distance specifically pertains to the acceptance of *ethnic* outgroup members.

1.1.3 Family and intermarriage

Interethnic marriages have the potential to bridge the family and social networks of each spouse. In this way, interethnic marriages may weaken prejudice and stereotypes, and, as a consequence, foster relations *between* various members of different ethnic groups, and not only those who marry (Kalmijn, 1998). However, interethnic marriages can also turn out to be a possible source of conflict *within* the family (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000). Intermarriages increase the potential for intra-familial conflict because they can be seen as jeopardizing heritage culture continuity (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Uskul, Lalonde, & Cheng, 2007). Therefore, the family has traditionally been seen as a context opposing interethnic marriage (George & Yancey, 2004; Kalmijn, 1998; Mills et al., 1995). Despite an increase in the number of interethnic marriages and a greater tolerance of intimate relationships between members of different ethnic groups, many people still reject a (possible) marriage of their children with someone from an ethnic outgroup (George & Yancey, 2004; Kalmijn, 1998; Lewis, Yancey, & Bletzer, 1997; Tolsma et al., 2008). The opposition of family members to such a marriage can not only lead to family conflicts, but also to parental withdrawal of support, and in extreme cases, to family exclusion and ostracism (Clark-Ibanez & Felmlee, 2004; Gaines, 2001; Hohmann-Marriott & Amato, 2008; Zhang & Van Hook, 2009). In this way, the family constitutes an important context for the social interaction and mutual acceptance between ethnic groups in society, and may foster the maintenance of ethnic group boundaries.

A large part of this dissertation focuses on a specific indicator of interethnic marriage attitudes, namely the extent to which someone would (dis)approve of their (actual or imagined) children's decision to marry a person with a different ethnic background. Although parents in Western countries have limited formal control over their children's marriage decisions, they still have the ability to interfere and affect the formation and stability of their children's relationships via norm setting and social sanctions (Felmlee, 2003). Mok (1999) even argues that parental objection is the most prominent obstacle in pursuing and maintaining an interethnic relationship. Further, instead of asking respondents about their objections to personally marry a member of an ethnic outgroup, respondents were asked about their objections to an interethnic marriage of their child. It has been argued that posing this latter indirect question reduces social desirability bias and hence provides a more valid measure of the attitude towards interethnic marriage (SCP, 2005: 109).

1.1.4 The acculturation of immigrants

In this dissertation ethnic attitudes of both majority and minority group members are considered. It is often assumed that positive intermarriage attitudes of

immigrants' indicate acculturation in the private (family) domain (Kalmijn, 1998). In addition, there is a large body of acculturation research that is concerned with the broader question to what extent immigrants become part of the country of residence (socio-cultural adaptation) and remain involved in their ethnic culture (socio-cultural maintenance) (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). The perceived lack of acculturation or integration of ethnic minorities is extensively discussed in Dutch politics and the media, and is considered a likely cause of (potential) economic, social, political and cultural problems (Entzinger, 2003). Therefore, it is important to improve our understanding of the factors and processes that hamper or facilitate the acculturation of immigrants.

Key elements in the acculturation process are the acculturation attitudes adopted by immigrants, because these shape individuals' behavioral intentions and their motivation to change their behavior in various spheres of life (e.g., Bourhis et al., 1997; Sam & Berry, 2006). Acculturation attitudes can, for instance, be expressed in the importance attached to having contacts with natives or the importance attached to participating in typical majority group activities. The family is believed to be an important context for individuals' participation in society, particularly for immigrants. It is argued that the socio-cultural orientations are developed, shaped and reinforced in continuous and dynamic interaction with both the context of the family and the society of residence (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Some even view acculturation as a process that occurs within families rather than on the individual level (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Tseng & Fuligni, 2000). Although most scholars agree that the family is a critical context for the integration of immigrants, there is much debate on whether the family impedes or enhances the integration of immigrants in the host society (see for instance, Alba & Nee, 1997; Portes & Zhou, 1993).

1.1.5 The main research question

The research presented in this book examines the ethnic boundaries between ethnic Dutch and the four largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. More specifically, the focus is on the parental acceptance of interethnic marriage of ethnic Dutch and ethnic minority groups, and on the acculturation attitudes of immigrants. In this dissertation, both attitudes are viewed as specific forms of ethnic attitudes. Improving our understanding of these ethnic attitudes is of societal relevance as both pertain to important group boundaries, and therefore to the social cohesion of society. This dissertation addresses several research questions on the role of the family for these attitudes. Questions on the role of the family for ethnic attitudes are not new (see for instance, Allport, 1954; Brown, 1995; Duckitt,

3 As stated before, the ethnic minorities under consideration in this dissertation are all first or second generation immigrants. When their interethnic marriage attitudes are discussed the label 'ethnic minorities' will be used. The label 'immigrants' is more appropriate in the field of acculturation, and therefore this label is used when specific questions on acculturation are concerned.

1992), but there are important issues which remain unresolved. In focusing on the role of the family, this study aims to contribute to the examination of contextual micro processes that might hamper or facilitate positive ethnic relations (Bobo & Fox, 2003). The overarching research question in this dissertation reads:

What is the role of family life for attitudes towards interethnic marriage and acculturation among minority and majority groups?

In the next sections, this overarching research question will be unfolded into more specific subquestions. In addition, the scientific and theoretical relevance, as well as the empirical contributions of this research will be elaborated on.

1.2 Ethnic attitudes: common explanations and the role of the family

In paragraph 1.2.1 a short overview of theoretical approaches for understanding ethnic attitudes is presented, followed by an introduction of more specific theories which emphasize the role of the family. In paragraph 1.2.3 a number of limitations of previous family research on ethnic attitudes is discussed. These limitations form the starting point of the research questions addressed in this dissertation which are formulated in paragraph 1.3.

1.2.1 Common explanations for ethnic attitudes

The study of ethnic attitudes is characterized by different theoretical approaches. One of the earliest approaches focused on personality characteristics, of which the theory of the authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) was most prominent. The theoretical notions of this approach followed a psychodynamic framework. Adorno et al. (1950) disclosed a broad ethnocentric pattern that involved generalized negative attitudes among individuals towards various outgroups. This pattern could be explained by basic factors within the individual's personality (e.g., conventionalism, authoritarianism, and aggression) (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Nowadays, a personality approach is less often used because it cannot account for sudden changes in prejudice, for the pervasiveness of prejudice in some times and places, nor for its absence in others (Duckitt, 1992). A focus on personality traits tends to ignore the importance of the immediate social situation in shaping people's attitudes.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the emphasis in research on explaining ethnic attitudes shifted to the role of social and intergroup influences. Allport (1954) saw conformity as a primary cause of prejudiced behaviors and beliefs, and reckoned that people adapt their behavior to the social norms of the situation. It was argued and found that people's opinions and behavior are influenced by the attitudes of others surrounding them, the norms of their groups, and the relationship between their group and other groups.

Following this, influential approaches emerged on how people cognitively categorize and process intergroup differences (see for a review, Duckitt, 1992). A basic

cognitive mechanism underlying intergroup processes is social categorization: the perceptual classification of individuals into discrete categories or groups. This classification implies a distinction between an ingroup, or the group people consider themselves to be a member of, and outgroups. Given a basic human desire to establish and maintain positive self-esteem and the fact that part of one's self-concept is derived from meaningful group memberships, it was argued that individuals will try to view their ingroup as positively as possible (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Favoring one's own group above other groups is one strategy to attain positive ingroup attitudes. The degree to which ingroup favoritism relates to outgroup negativism depends, among others, on the extent to which individuals identify with their group, the extent to which the prevailing context provides ground for comparison between groups, and the perceived relevance of the outgroup (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Individuals are more likely to display ingroup favoritism (and outgroup negativity), when an ingroup is central to their self-definition and a given intergroup comparison is meaningful.

Another line of work built on this intergroup framework and focused on notions of outgroup threat. The underlying idea is that competitive interdependence can lead to the perception of threat, which in turn can lead to hostility towards members of the threatening group (Kinder & Sears, 1981; Levine & Campbell, 1972). The perception of symbolic or realistic threats, for example, can lead to negative ethnic attitudes, regardless of whether or not the threat is real (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Symbolic threats primarily involve perceived group differences in values, standards, beliefs, and attitudes (Stephan & Stephan, 2000: p25). Realistic threats relate to the political and economic power of the ingroup, and the physical and material well-being of the ingroup or its members. For instance, perceived economic threat evoked by perceptions of ethnic competition increases negative attitudes towards ethnic outgroups (Olzak, 1992; Quillian, 1995).

The attitude towards an interethnic marriage of one's child can be seen as an aspect of a more general evaluation of ethnic outgroup members. The aforementioned general explanations for ethnic attitudes can therefore be used for understanding attitudes towards interethnic marriages. Some of these explanations are specifically relevant for ethnic distance in general, and the interethnic marriage attitude in particular. For instance, symbolic or cultural threat is often used to explain ethnic distance towards different ethnic outgroups (Hagendoorn, 1995). And perceived threat to the group status helps to understand why majority group members tend to have more negative interethnic attitudes than minority group members. Due to the on average lower social status of minority groups, majority group members may be reluctant to interact with minority groups because of status concerns. Minority group members on the other hand may be more in favor of interacting with majority group members which have generally higher social status (Blumer, 1958).

Also with respect to acculturation attitudes these different explanations of ethnic attitudes have been found to be important (Alba & Nee, 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997; Nesdale, 2002; Ward, Leong, & Low, 2004; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). For instance, one of the most important processes shaping acculturation attitudes is the

social influence via contacts with majority group members and members of the own ethnic community (Alba & Nee, 1997; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). Predominantly having ties with members of one's own ethnic group can result in a lack of socio-cultural adaptation (Chiswick & Miller, 1996), whereas interaction with natives is instrumental for socio-cultural adaptation (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). Further, threat in the form of perceived discrimination has been found to be an important predictor of immigrants' socio-cultural adaptation (Berry et al., 2006). When immigrants feel discriminated against, they are less likely to orient themselves to the larger society and tend to distance themselves from it (Berry et al., 2006; Bourhis et al., 1997).

1.2.2 The role of the family for ethnic attitudes

In recent years, there has been increased attention to different social contexts, such as the nation state, municipalities, neighborhoods, schools, and workplaces, for understanding ethnic attitudes (e.g., Evans & Need, 2002; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2003; Quillian, 1995; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997; Taylor, 1998; Wagner et al., 2006). Traditionally, the family is believed to be an important setting for ethnic attitudes as well (Allport, 1954). Different theoretical arguments have been developed on why the family can be important for individual's ethnic attitudes.

Most studies have examined the role of the family through processes of socialisation and social influence. The earliest theories state that the acquisition of (negative) ethnic attitudes begins in childhood. For instance, the theory of the authoritarian personality (Adorno et al., 1950), argues that children's negative ethnic attitudes stem from emotional maladjustment arising from a repressive and strict upbringing. Authoritarian parenting would result in children's authoritarian personality which is related to their negative ethnic attitudes (Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009).

However, a study of Mosher and Scodel (1960) indicated that parental influence takes the form of the direct socialization of attitudes rather than the indirect shaping of a prejudiced personality. Moreover, children supposedly adopt the attitudes expressed by their parents in different, both verbal and nonverbal, ways (see Fishbein, 1996). On the one hand, parents try to transmit their attitudes by teaching and informing their children about the content and importance of their views and beliefs. On the other hand, the transmission can also be more implicit, without the conscious intention of the parent, through processes of observation, imitation and identification (Bandura, 1986). Studies on socialization of ethnic and racial attitudes have shown that parents' racial and ethnic attitude are related to their children's attitudes (Hughes et al., 2006; Rodríguez-García & Wagner, 2009; Sinclair et al., 2005; White & Gleitzman, 2006), although there are mixed results for the strength and significance of this relationship (Fishbein, 2002; Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004; Rohan & Zanna, 1996).

Parents affect their children not only through their own attitudes and practices. Glass et al. (1986) for instance, stated that parents do not so much

transmit their attitudes but rather their social position and status. Scholars of status attainment have demonstrated that the family serves as an important locus for the social and cultural placement in society. Through the intergenerational transmission of structural and cultural positions (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Myers, 1996) parents influence their children's class, religious affiliation, and other prominent social statuses that structure life experience and mold social attitudes (Acock, 1984). Due to this intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions, the family of origin influences individual's social and cultural positions which in turn affect children's ethnic attitudes (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Vollebergh et al., 2001).

Besides being indirectly influenced through status transmission, people's attitudes and values are also shaped by the conditions that prevailed during their formative years (Inglehart, 1990). Children are raised in a particular context and period and exposed to the views and ideas that predominate in that context and period, which in turn might foster or hamper negative ethnic attitudes. Thus, parents can affect their children's attitudes because they determine the circumstances in which children grow up (Hello, 2003). For instance, highly educated parents have relatively highly educated friends and family members, and this might constitute an environment that emphasizes tolerance and positive ethnic attitudes. In addition, growing up in a high status family with relatively comfortable living conditions during one's formative years may lead to low levels of perceived threat from ethnic minorities, and thus to relatively favorable ethnic attitudes (Olzak, 1992).

A focus on the family seems particularly interesting and important for the ethnic attitudes which are considered in this dissertation. Family influences have been found to be particularly strong for attitudes which serve the ingroup, which concern salient topics, and for topics which might constitute a possible source of family conflict (Phalet & Schönplflug, 2001; Piquart & Silbereisen, 2004; Kalmijn, 2005). Differences between family members in attitudes towards intermarriage and acculturation can result in disagreements, tensions and conflicts (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Uskul, Lalonde, & Cheng, 2007). However, surprisingly little research has been done on the role of the family for interethnic marriage attitudes. The study of Hello et al. (2004) indicated that the attitude of the parents influences the preferred ethnic distance of their offspring. And a study of Tolsma et al. (2008) showed that parental education was negatively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage, whereas parental religiosity had the opposite effect. To our knowledge, no research has explicitly and extensively examined interethnic marriage attitudes in relation to the structure and functioning of the family.

More studies have been done on the influence of the family for acculturation attitudes. Acculturation studies have demonstrated important parental influences via socialization and status inheritance (e.g., Demo & Hughes, 1990; Pfafferoth & Brown, 2006; Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo, Mirsky, Rubinstein, & Nauck, 2009). For instance, it is argued that the socio-economic position of the family shapes the immediate social conditions for the cultural adaptation of migrants' children.

This position is one of the most crucial factors because it determines the type of neighborhood in which children live, the quality of schools they attend, and the group of peers with which they associate (Zhou, 1997).

1.2.3 Limitations and neglected questions of previous studies

While studies on actual intermarriage patterns have been numerous, relatively few studies have examined the attitudes towards interethnic marriage. Little is known about intermarriage attitudes in general, and even less on the attitude towards an interethnic marriage of one's child. In addition, although it is widely acknowledged that the family of origin plays an important role in the formation of attitudes, family research on ethnic attitudes can be characterized by several shortcomings and neglected questions. The next sections will elaborate on these issues. But first it needs to be clarified what is meant with 'family' in the current study.

In this research the *family of origin* pertains specifically to the family in which one was raised (e.g., parents and siblings). The *current family* can refer to relationships with members of the family of origin as well as to relationships with members of the nuclear family (e.g., with a partner and/or children). Also when people are not married, the partner is viewed as a family member. In this dissertation only the ethnic attitudes of adults are examined. Hence, when family influences in youth or adolescence are discussed this pertains to influences stemming from the past.

1.2.3.1 Family influences in adulthood

Research on the role of the family for individual's ethnic attitudes is predominantly concerned with parental influences during childhood and adolescence of the offspring. However, the role of the family for these attitudes might go beyond this relationship and beyond this period. For instance, there is the untested possibility that ethnic attitudes are affected by family relationships (other than parental), even in adulthood. Studies on other types of attitudes (e.g., political, religious or family attitudes) have shown that family members continue to influence each other and, thus, matter for individuals' attitudes in adult life (Jennings & Stoker, 2001; Kenny & Cook, 1999; Roest et al., 2009; Scheepers & Van der Slik, 1998; Wood, 2000). Several mechanisms can be postulated through which family relationships in adulthood affect *ethnic* attitudes.

First, there are reasons to expect that warm (e.g., affectionate and emotionally supportive) family relations are associated with a more positive attitude towards other ethnic groups. It is in emotionally warm relationships that people have trust in significant others and this form of trust tends to transfer into a more generalized sense of trust. Glanville and Paxton (2007) demonstrated that trust in specific people (e.g., family members, neighbors, and club members) spills over to generalized trust. Generalized trust goes beyond the circle of familiar people and extends the boundaries of one's social group. Furthermore, research showed that affectionate and emotionally supportive family relations contribute to the development of empathy and perspective taking, as well as to mental

health and psychological well-being (e.g., Roberts & Bengtson, 1993, 1996; Zhou et al., 2002). Empathy and perspective taking stimulate pro-social attitudes and behaviors towards ethnic outgroups (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Mental health and psychological well-being have been found to be associated with an open and positive orientation towards the larger society and towards other groups (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Tyler et al., 1997). Thus, in addition to family processes in people's youth, warm family ties in adulthood might affect interethnic attitudes positively: affection and emotional bonding may lead to more positive ethnic attitudes, including less resistance to interethnic marriage (of one's child).

Second, intergroup theories, like integrated threat theory, state that people who have a different worldview can be seen as undermining the cultural identity and cohesion of one's own group (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Various studies have shown that perceived threats to the ingroup's values by immigrants and minorities were related to more negative attitudes towards these groups (e.g., Esses et al., 2003; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). This mechanism might also exist in the family context. Families might have an incentive to keep ethnic outgroup members out of the family, as these 'strangers' are seen as undermining the cohesion, stability and functioning of the family. In addition, interethnic marriages reduce the ability of families to pass on their specific ethno-cultural practices and beliefs to the next generations.

The more people are involved in and committed to their own group, the less accepting they tend to be towards outsiders, especially under conditions of threat (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Hence, particularly when family cohesion⁴ – the bonds or 'glue' that hold members of a family together – is strong, family members have an incentive to keep 'strangers' out of the family. It has been argued that norms against interethnic marriage stem from the fear that intermarriage weakens intergenerational solidarity and indirectly threatens the cohesion of the group (Kalmijn, 1998, 2010). With the assumption that the stronger the cohesion of the group, the greater the perceived threat, family cohesion might foster preferences for individuals with the same ethnic background within the family, and lead to more resistance towards interethnic marriages. Thus, opposition to interethnic marriage can be expected to be stronger in cohesive families.

Third, whether and how the relationship with one's partner affects ethnic attitudes has not been studied. Partners constitute a critical social environment for most adults. Partners influence each other, have to manage living together, and

4 The construct of family cohesion sometimes is understood in terms of feelings of affection and emotional bonding (e.g., Dyer, 1972). Others, however, argue that family cohesion and warmth are two interrelated, but distinct aspects of family life that can exert different influences. Following the latter tradition, this dissertation differentiates between the concepts of family warmth and family cohesion. Family warmth is defined as a theoretical concept that indicates the sentiments and evaluation of family members about their relationships with other members, and the exchange of emotional support, whereas the (related) concept of family cohesion refers to the strength of family ties, for instance indicated by family contact and the adherence to family norms.

negotiate what they find important and worthwhile (Marsden, 1987). Attitudinal research has found that partners can affect each other's attitude via their own attitude (Kalmijn, 2005; Roest, Dubas, Gerris, & Engels, 2006). There might also be an indirect effect since partners are not only exposed to each other's views and beliefs but also to each other's social, economic and cultural circumstances that in turn affect individual attitudes (see for instance, Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Smith & Moen, 1998). It is likely that one's partner is particularly important for the acceptance of an ethnic minority member as close kin by marriage of one's child. Such a marriage affects family life, and the nuclear family and parental relationship in particular (Spickard & Fong, 1995).

1.2.3.2 *Assessing the role of the family of origin*

Research not only benefits from asking new questions, but also from testing existing questions in new ways. Many scholars have done important work on the role of the family of origin for ethnic attitudes and many theoretical mechanisms have been identified (for an overview, see Duckitt, 1992). However, there are still some questions on the role of the family of origin that warrant empirical consideration.

First, no clear answer has been given to the question how large the impact is of the family of origin on ethnic attitudes. Answering this question requires specific data. Because siblings generally share their parents and their childhood circumstances, the similarity in attitudes between siblings later in life can be ascribed to the family of origin (Hauser, 1988). Hence, a sibling analysis is suitable to increase our understanding of the (total) influence of the family on ethnic attitudes. There have been sibling studies on kinship norms (De Vries et al., 2009) and on Jewish intermarriage patterns in the Netherlands (Kalmijn et al., 2006), but not on ethnic attitudes.

Second, few empirical studies have simultaneously examined different family mechanisms. Previous studies showed that there are several ways in which the family of origin can influence attitudes. Studies predominantly focused on (a) the transmission of parental attitudes to their children, (b) the effect of the (social and cultural) circumstances during childhood and adolescence (direct parental positional influence), and (c) the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions (Hello et al., 2004; Jennings, 1984; Moen et al., 1997; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Many studies tend to focus on the transmission of attitudes without taking other mechanisms into account. This might lead to an overestimation of the effect of attitudinal socialization practices. Hence, to better assess the extent to which a particular family mechanism contributes to our understanding of ethnic attitudes, it is important to study different family mechanisms simultaneously, as was done by Hello et al. (2004). This study considered different ways in which parents affect their children's ethnic distance. They showed that the effects of what they labeled 'direct parental socialization' and 'direct parental positional influence' were both quite strong, and similar in magnitude. In addition, a relatively small effect was found for the 'indirect positional parental' mechanism: parents affected their children's ethnic distance indirectly via the transmission of educational attainment. However, the study

was based on a small sample and different measures of ethnic attitudes were used for parents and their children.

Third, it is unclear to what extent influences of the family of origin during youth are important for ethnic attitudes in adult life. The acquisition of (negative) ethnic attitudes begins in childhood, and during this period, children acquire social knowledge and attitudes which may endure into adulthood. Many studies focus on the question how the family affects ethnic attitudes of children and adolescents, but it is unclear whether these influences fade away in adult life. As stated before, studies have shown that parental characteristics (via socialization in attitudes and their socio-economic and cultural positions) related to young people's ethnic attitudes. However, the extent to which these parental characteristics are important in adult life has not been examined systematically.

To add to these concerns, family research can often be characterized by several methodological limitations. An extensive study of family influences demands specific data. There are studies that rely on single informant data, with one family member reporting on the attitudes or attributes of other family members. In these studies, there can be a tendency to overestimate similarity in attitudes: the perceived similarity in attitudes is much stronger than the actual similarity. Hence, to adequately test hypotheses on family influences one has to obtain information directly from several family members. Further, studies that do use multi-actor data and include measures (e.g., ethnic attitudes) directly from family members often do not take problems of selectivity into account. An important problem of the use of multi-actor data is that the level of non-response of family members is usually high and selective. For instance, close and warm families tend to be overrepresented in multi-actor studies. A possible consequence of selective (non-) response is that estimates of effects can be biased. One way to take the selectivity of the non-response into account is with so called Heckman models (Heckman, 1979). Unfortunately, these models have, to our knowledge, not been used in family research on ethnic attitudes.

1.2.3.3 The minority perspective and acculturation attitudes

Most studies on interethnic attitudes adopt a one-sided perspective and focus predominantly on majority group members and sometimes on minority group members. However, ethnic boundaries involve (at least) two parties, and it is therefore important to examine both views for understanding interethnic relations. Moreover, there can be important differences between ethnic minority groups. There are cultural and socio-economic differences between these groups and not all ethnic minority groups undergo acculturation in a similar way. This means that different ethnic minority groups should be studied (Portes & Zhou, 1993).

Further, while there is research on parental influences (e.g., socialization or status transmission) on acculturation attitudes of adolescent migrants (see for instance, Pfafferoth & Brown, 2006; Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009), relatively few studies have addressed the role of the family on adult immigrants. This is unfortunate given that previous research has demonstrated that the family is a particularly important context for immigrants (Zhou, 1997). Family

relationships are typically highly salient for immigrants because they provide an important coping resource in the host society and provide continuity with the past. Relationships with family members, in the home and host country, might affirm the ethnic identity and increase feelings of belonging to one's ethnic group, and thereby foster a positive attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. Further, warm family relationships might also facilitate socio-cultural adaptation because they reduce the negative effects of stressful events on social functioning (Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009). The language spoken within the family indicates the acculturation orientations of family members, and interaction in the ethnic language provides a means by which ethnicity is experienced and expressed. Therefore, ethnic language usage is likely to strengthen ethnic identity and the orientation on the ethnic culture, whereas the use of the host language might stimulate socio-cultural adaptation. Despite the theoretical relevance of family ties for acculturation attitudes of (adult) ethnic minorities, relatively little is known about this topic.

1.3 Research questions and outline of the dissertation

The aforementioned limitations of previous studies led us to the formulation of three research questions which this dissertation aims to answer. First, research on family influences on ethnic attitudes has predominantly examined the role of parental socialization and the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions among majority group members. However, this neglects (1) possible family influences in adulthood, and (2) the influence of family members other than parents, like one's partner. Moreover, it is important to include the perspectives of ethnic majority and minority groups while studying ethnic group boundaries. Therefore, the first research question is:

RQ1: How do family relationships in adulthood relate to attitudes towards interethnic marriage among majority and ethnic minority groups?

Second, despite the long tradition of studies on the influence of the family of origin, there are important questions that merit further attention. For instance it is not clear whether family of origin influences in adolescence are relevant for ethnic attitudes of adults, and what the relative importance of different (possible) pathways of family influence is. The second research question addressed in this dissertation is:

RQ2: How do characteristics of the family of origin during youth relate to ethnic attitudes of individuals in adulthood?

Further, the family is believed to be a particularly important context for the acculturation of immigrants through, for example, socialization and by shaping the social conditions for adaptation (Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009; Zhou, 1997). However, relatively few studies have addressed the role of the family

in adulthood for these attitudes. For immigrants, the family provides continuity with the past and relationships with family members might (re)affirm the ethnic identity and increase feelings of belonging to one's ethnic group. The third research question reads:

RQ3: How do family relationships relate to attitudes towards acculturation among adult immigrants?

This dissertation consists of five empirical chapters focusing on the importance of different aspects of the family for ethnic attitudes. These chapters form the empirical base for answering the three main research questions. The main emphasis of chapters 2, 4, and 5 is on the first research question. Chapter 3 deals with the second research question, while chapter 6 addresses the third research question. The first three studies focus on interethnic marriage attitudes of ethnic Dutch, the fourth study includes the perspective of ethnic minorities, and the fifth study examines acculturation attitudes of immigrants in the Netherlands.

1.3.1 Family relations and attitudes towards interethnic marriage

In chapter 2, the focus is on the relationship between current family characteristics and ethnic attitudes expressed through the extent to which someone would disapprove of their child's decision to marry a person with a different ethnic background. In this chapter the first research question is considered, and it is examined whether warm and cohesive family relationships in adulthood relate to the attitude towards interethnic marriage. The main emphasis is on family cohesion and family warmth, but other family characteristics, like (traditional) family values and family structure are also studied. This study concerns the Dutch majority's attitude towards marriage with members of the three numerically largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands; of Surinamese, Moroccan and Turkish origin. Chapter 2 aims to go beyond existing research by considering (a) the role of the current family context, (b) the relevance of different aspects of family life, and (c) the different ways in which these aspects are important for the understanding of the attitude towards interethnic marriage.

1.3.2 Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis

The third chapter focuses on the role of the family of origin – in the formative years and in adult life – in shaping the attitudes towards interethnic marriage. This study aims to contribute to the existing literature on ethnic attitudes in several ways. First, the (total) impact of the family of origin is investigated using multi-level sibling models. Because siblings generally share their parents and their childhood circumstances, the observed similarity in attitudes between siblings later in life can be ascribed to the family of origin (Hauser, 1988). Second, unlike most previous family studies, different pathways through which the family might affect these attitudes (e.g., socialization or the transmission of social positions) are

simultaneously studied. This increases our insights about the relative importance of the different pathways. It also answers the question whether family of origin effects (i.e. influence during youth) remain important for the attitudes of adults. Third, attention is paid to the question whether family characteristics in adulthood – family cohesion and family warmth – not only relate directly to intermarriage attitudes, but also moderate the transmission of attitudes within families. To control for possible selectivity in the multi-actor sampling design, Heckman models are used.

1.3.3 The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics for ethnic attitudes

In chapter 4, the first research question is readdressed in examining the extent to which partner and partner relationship characteristics are related to interethnic marriage attitudes. Although research has examined the importance of relationships in adulthood for individual attitudes, whether and how one of the most intimate relationships in adulthood – with one's partner – is related to ethnic attitudes has not been studied. This study goes beyond previous research in three ways. First, based on social influence approaches and intergroup theories, the focus is on *partner* characteristics by examining the extent to which interethnic attitudes of partners are interrelated, and whether the socio-economic status and ethnic background of the partner has an influence on one's attitude towards interethnic marriage. In addition to each other's views and beliefs, partners are exposed to each other's social, economic and cultural circumstances, which might affect individual attitudes (see for instance, Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Smith & Moen, 1998). Second, the role of structural (i.e. relationship length, having children) and substantive (i.e. cohesion and warmth) partner *relationship* characteristics for the opposition to interethnic marriage, are considered. Third, studies that have focused on conditions which stimulate attitudinal similarity between partners are typically based on small scale and non representative samples, and do not tend to test different conditions simultaneously (but see Kalmijn, 2005). Based on a sample of 2,500 respondents and their partners, chapter 4 assesses whether several structural and substantive relationship characteristics moderate the association between the attitudes of the two partners. Finally, unlike most studies that focus on partners, this study will control for possible selectivity in partner participation by means of a Heckman analysis.

1.3.4 Intermarriage attitudes among ethnic minority and majority groups

The fifth chapter examines to what extent (a) ethnic background, (b) current family characteristics and (c) immigrant characteristics are related to the intermarriage attitudes of ethnic Dutch towards ethnic minority groups, and the intermarriage attitude of the four largest minority groups (the Turkish-Dutch, Moroccan-Dutch, Surinamese-Dutch, and Antillean-Dutch) towards the ethnic Dutch. This chapter expands on previous work in several ways. First, most studies on ethnic attitudes do not include the perspective of both majority and (multiple) minority group

members simultaneously. Second, the possible impact of the *current* family on the intermarriage attitude among the five ethnic groups will be studied. Third, using insights from research and theories on integration and assimilation (Alba & Nee, 1997; Chiswick, Lee, & Miller, 2004; Gordon, 1964; Portes & Zhou, 1993), hypotheses are derived on the importance of immigrant characteristics – generation, length of stay, language proficiency, and migration motives – for intermarriage attitudes.

1.3.5 Family life and acculturation attitudes

Chapters 2 to 5 examine the role of the family for individuals' ethnic attitudes, expressed in the attitude towards interethnic marriage. Family relations in adulthood are likely to also be important for acculturation attitudes of immigrants: their attitudes towards socio-cultural maintenance and adaptation. In chapter 6 the third research question is addressed: How do family relationships relate to attitudes towards acculturation among adult immigrants in the Netherlands? Chapter six aims to contribute to the existing literature in several ways. First, in addition to parental factors, like socio-economic status, it is examined whether different aspects of the *current* family context – contact, warmth, instrumental support and host society language usage – are related to acculturation attitudes among the four largest immigrant groups in the Netherlands. The question of the importance of transnational family ties for acculturation attitudes is also addressed. Second, contrary to most studies on acculturation attitudes, the importance of parental influences for *adult* immigrants rather than for children or adolescents are considered. In this study, the socio-cultural maintenance attitude and the socio-cultural adaptation attitude are studied separately.

1.4 The Dutch context

In this dissertation the ethnic attitudes of ethnic majority and minority groups in the Netherlands are studied. Paragraph 1.4.1 provides a short overview of the Dutch migration history and background information on the four immigrant groups under consideration: the Moroccan-Dutch, the Turkish-Dutch, the Surinamese-Dutch, and the Antillean-Dutch. In paragraph 1.4.2 the receiving Dutch context is discussed.

1.4.1 Migration history and immigrant groups

In the 20th century, the socio-demographic composition of the Netherlands, like other Western European societies, changed considerably. One of the most profound changes was the substantial increase in the number of ethnic minorities due to immigration. The first major immigration wave in the Netherlands started in the 1950s, with the breakdown of the colonial era, with an influx of immigrants from the former colonies (for example, Indonesia, Surinam). In the 1960s and 1970s, lower educated labor migrants were needed and recruited from southern Europe,

and the Mediterranean, mainly Morocco and Turkey. These formed a second wave of migration. In the 1980s and 1990s the Netherlands faced a new category of immigrants, i.e. refugees or asylum seekers from a wide variety of countries. Furthermore, migration in the form of family reunification and family formation among the second generation of immigrants adds to the fact that the Netherlands has become an 'immigration country'.

Currently, approximately 11% of the 16.6 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originates from non-Western countries, with the majority coming from Morocco, Turkey, Surinam, and the Dutch Antilles (SCP, 2009). The latter two colonial groups are culturally and religiously more similar to the Dutch and have better socio-economic positions than the immigrants of Turkish and Moroccan descent (SCP, 2009). People of Turkish and Moroccan origin tend to be more traditional in their family norms and values than the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch who, in turn, are more similar to the more individualistic ethnic Dutch (SCP, 2009).

With regard to interethnic marriages, in the Netherlands there is a decline of ethnic endogamy, although ethnic group barriers remain important (Kalmijn, Liefbroer, Van Poppel, & Van Solinge, 2006; Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006). Of all non-Western couples, 30% is of mixed composition. Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch predominantly marry within their own ethnic group and rarely with an ethnic Dutch partner. The number of marriages with ethnic Dutch for these two groups is very stable: one out of ten marries an ethnic Dutch partner. In contrast, marriage with a Dutch partner is far more common among the Surinamese-Dutch (approximately 40%) and the Antillean-Dutch (approximately 60%) (SCP, 2009).

1.4.2 Receiving context: changing ethnic attitudes and more restrictive policies

The Dutch have traditionally been known for their tolerance towards ethnic minorities and respect for minority rights and interests (Lubbers, Gijsberts, & Scheepers, 2002; Pettigrew et al., 1997). However, since the beginning of the 21st century, the political and social climate changed considerably from a more multicultural perspective to one that emphasizes Dutch national identity and the need for integration of minority groups. This coincided with increased negative feelings towards ethnic outgroups in general, and Muslim groups in particular (Coenders et al., 2008; Entzinger, 2003). Currently, the integration of immigrants is one of the most debated issues, and discussions regarding school segregation, head scarves, criminality, and many other issues, continue to dominate the public arena. In public debates and in the media, Islam and Muslims are typically presented and perceived as threatening national identity, culture, and security. The Moroccan-Dutch in particular have become symbolic for problems related to ethnic minorities and immigration (SCP, 2004).

Besides changes in the political and social climate, the immigration and integration policies in the Netherlands have undergone notable changes. Alongside the implementation of integration policies in the 1980s and 1990s, more restrictive immigration policies were implemented and enforced regarding labor migration,

and later, on asylum and family migration. Family migration started to be seen as a problem for the integration of individuals, of families and, thus, of minorities into society. As presented in the media and stated in many public debates, a broad majority of Parliament believed that, due to a lack of knowledge and skills, those newcomers who immigrated in the framework of family formation or reunification would fail to integrate, or at least would hamper the integration process. The current dominant discourse that family migration is an obstacle for integration is most clearly embodied in a new law that was passed in 2005. This law requires non-Dutch family members of residents who want to immigrate to pass an exam that tests their basic knowledge of the Dutch language and how well informed they are about Dutch society.

1.5 Data sources

1.5.1 Data: the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study

The data used in this dissertation are the first two waves of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Survey (NKPS), a large-scale study of family relations in a random address sample of 8,161 men and women in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). In the second wave data were collected from 6,026 respondents. The NKPS offers unique data to study the role of the family for interethnic attitudes, because the survey was designed to measure the structure, extent, and quality of kinship relationships in individuals' past and present, and includes information on interethnic marriage attitudes of several family members. The participants were presented with items on interethnic marriage within their own family. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they would disapprove of their (actual or imagined) children's decision to marry someone with a (i) Moroccan, (ii) Turkish or (iii) Surinamese background.

The first wave started in 2002 among a sample of adults aged 18 to 79, residing in private households. This sample of primary respondents is referred to as *anchors*. In both waves, data from the anchor respondents was obtained by means of face-to-face computer-assisted personal interviews (CAPI). Additionally, respondents filled out a self-completion questionnaire with items pertaining to attitudes and other subjective measures. The overall response rate in the first wave was 45%, which corresponds to the average response rate of other large scale family studies in the Netherlands. In the first wave, valid self-completion questionnaire data were obtained for 92% of the primary respondents.

A major feature of the NKPS data set is the multi-actor design. The NKPS contains data on various family members as well as data gathered directly from (a subset of) these family members ('alter respondents'). Anchors were asked for permission to contact their alters (both in and outside the household) for an interview. Up to five family members (partner, the father or the mother, a brother or sister aged 15 or older, and a maximum of two children aged 15 or older) of the anchor respondent were approached to fill out a self-completion questionnaire.

Wave 1 response rates for these alter respondents ranged from 38% (siblings) to 72% (partners).

The second wave was conducted between 2006 and 2007, again by means of computer-assisted face-to-face interviews and additional self-report questionnaires. The response rate of wave 2 – calculated as the percentage of wave 1 respondents who completed the wave 2 interview – was 74%. In addition, the cooperation rate for the second wave (excluding respondents who were too ill to participate, respondent who had moved abroad or deceased) was 84%. The response of the supplemental self-completion questionnaire of the anchor respondents was 95%.

1.5.2 The immigrant sample

The first wave of the main sample of the NKPS was supplemented with an immigrant sample, drawn from 13 Dutch cities in which half of the immigrants from the four largest immigrant groups reside. The topics covered in the main and the immigrant questionnaire are largely equivalent. These two related large scale surveys were specifically designed for studying family relationships and to facilitate comparisons between ethnic minority and ethnic Dutch families. This resulted in additional data on immigrants of Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean origin (1,410 respondents) (Dykstra et al., 2005). The heads of household were interviewed in their homes, in most cases by an interviewer of the same ethnic background. The interview followed a structured questionnaire that was available in Turkish, Arabic and Dutch. The response rate among immigrants was in the same range as that of the Dutch (47%), varying from 40% among Surinamese-Dutch to 52% among Turkish-Dutch (Dykstra et al., 2005). In the second wave, conducted in 2007, the data collection of the main and immigrant sample was combined, to assure that the questionnaires were completely compatible. In the second wave of the panel study, 47% of the initial 1,410 immigrants of the first wave participated. In wave 2 additional items were included on the social-cultural orientation on the country of origin and on the orientation on the Netherlands.

1.5.3 The use of the data in the empirical chapters

The first wave of NKPS data were gathered from a large random sample of the Dutch population and contains information on a wide range of family characteristics (e.g., family norms, contact, exchange of support, feelings of warmth, and family structure). This allows us to examine, in chapter 2, the impact of several family characteristics on interethnic attitudes. In chapter 3, the multi-actor structure of the dataset is utilized. The research design requires information on a triad of a sibling pair connected to a parent. The data provides two possible types of triads. The first type consists of the primary respondent, a sibling and a parent, whereas the second type comprises the primary respondent and two of her or his children. The focus in chapter 4 is on partner characteristics. Therefore, the alter information, directly obtained from the partners in wave 2, is used. To answer the research questions of chapter 5, information provided by both the main and immigrant sample of the

NKPS first wave is used. Finally, in chapter 6 the focus is on acculturation attitudes of immigrants. Information from the immigrant respondents in the second wave of the NKPS are combined with background information provided by the immigrant sample in the first wave of the NKPS.

In chapter 7 an overview of the entire study is provided. This chapter summarizes the main findings and conclusions, and discusses the contributions to existing research. The chapter ends with a discussion of the findings, and their implications for further research in both the field of family sociology and interethnic relationships. It should be noted that chapters 2 to 6 were written in the form of separate empirical articles. Therefore, there is an inevitable degree of overlap among these chapters.

CHAPTER 2

Family relations and the attitude towards ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage



This chapter is co-authored by Maykel Verkuyten and Marcel Coenders (Utrecht University, the Netherlands) and is currently under review at an international journal. An earlier version of this chapter has been presented at the 4th European Society on Family Relations Conference, September 2008, Jyväskylä (Finland).

2 Family relations and the attitude towards ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage

2.1 Introduction

Ever since the work of Bogardus (1925), the concept of social distance is commonly used for studying the social boundaries between groups. Ethnic distance refers to the preferred social contact with ethnic groups, and reflects people's degree of acceptance towards ethnic outgroup members. Bogardus devised an instrument to study ethnic distance by developing a scale that assesses group members' evaluations of different types of social interactions. Typically, people are asked to indicate whether they like to have contacts with members of ethnic minority groups, for example, as citizens in their country, neighbors in their street, and close kin by marriage. Kinship by marriage is considered as the most intimate relationship and, therefore, as the domain of life with the highest social distance between majorities and ethnic minorities. The level of interethnic marriages in society is a common indicator for the degree of social integration of ethnic groups (Blau, Beeker, & Fitzpatrick, 1984). When there is acceptance of outgroup members as kin, other types of positive interethnic relations are more likely.

In explaining ethnic attitudes of majority group members, research has focused on the role of social contexts such as country, school, and neighbourhood (Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Oliver & Wong, 2003; Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009; Tolsma, Lubbers, & Coenders, 2008). Because school characteristics relate to the acceptance of ethnic minority classmates and neighbourhood characteristics are associated with the acceptance of minority neighbours, it is likely that the family context is important for the acceptance of an ethnic minority family member. Research on family influences examines the socialization of ethnic attitudes and the intergenerational transmission of social positions from parents to their children (Fishbein, 1996, 2002; Vollebergh, Iedema, & Raaijmakers, 2001). However, there is also the impact of the current family context on the attitude towards interethnic marriage of adult family members. On the one hand, families might have an incentive to keep ethnic outgroup members out of the family, as these 'strangers' might undermine the cohesion and functioning of the family. On the other hand, affective, warm and trusting family relations might increase

tolerance (Glanville & Paxton, 2007), and the acceptance of interethnic marriages in particular.

The present study uses data from a national representative survey to examine the attitude of the ethnic Dutch towards having ethnic minority members as kin through marriage. The focus is on the attitude towards marriage with members of the numerical three largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands: the Surinamese-Dutch, the Moroccan-Dutch, and the Turkish-Dutch. We examine the role of family characteristics in explaining these attitudes, and on family cohesion and family warmth in particular. Thus, this study aims to go beyond existing research by considering (a) the role of the current family context, (b) the relevance of different aspects of family life, and (c) the different ways in which these aspects are important for the explanation of adults' attitude towards interethnic marriage.

2.2 Theory and hypotheses

There are various reasons why the family can be important for individual's ethnic attitudes. Research has mainly focused on three different processes, namely the socialization of norms and attitudes, the influence of structural and cultural conditions of the family in the child's formative period, and the transmission of social positions. First, the family has an influence through socialization processes in which (ethnic) attitudes, values and beliefs are shaped and family identification is developed (Grusec & Kuczynski, 1997; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Thus, children internalize the ethnic attitudes that parents express in verbal and nonverbal ways (see Fishbein, 1996). Second, in Sears' (1993) symbolic politics theory and in Inglehart's (1990) work on the diffusion of postmaterialism, it is argued that people's attitudes and values reflect the material, social and political conditions that prevailed during their pre-adult years. And third, the intergenerational transmission of educational and labor market positions affect children's ethnic attitudes indirectly (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Myers, 1996).

Further, research on the role of the family for individual's ethnic attitudes is predominantly concerned with the influence of the parents on the child. However, the role of the family for these attitudes might go beyond this relationship. In addition to socialization and the transmission of social positions there is the untested possibility that ethnic attitudes of adults are affected by the functioning of the current family. That is to say, relationships within the family may account for the level of acceptance of interethnic marriage. We focus on the role of family cohesion as the extent to which family members have contacts and tight family ties, and feel obliged to take care of each other. In addition, we examine the role of family affection and emotional closeness for the attitudes towards interethnic marriage.

2.2.1 Family cohesion

In general, people prefer to associate with others who are culturally and socially similar: Similarity breeds connection (Byrne, 1971). Sociological research has

shown that this principle of homophily structures network ties, including marriage (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). The principle implies that people can be expected to have a less favorable attitude towards interethnic marriage than towards marriage with someone from their own ethnic group. Individuals who marry outside of their ethnic group sometimes are ostracized from their family of origin, and parental objection has been found to be the most prominent obstacle in pursuing and maintaining an interethnic relationship (Wang, Kao, & Joyner, 2006). In addition, there are reasons to expect that family cohesiveness fosters the preferences for individuals with the same cultural background within the family, and thereby leads to more resistance towards interethnic marriages. Family cohesion is typically conceptualized in terms of the level of contact between family members, the degree of support and help, norms of family obligation, and the perceived strength of the family ties (see Bengtson, 2001; Komter & Knijn, 2006). Family cohesion is considered to have all kinds of beneficial effects for family members. However, it can also act as a principle of exclusion towards outsiders (Komter, 2006). One reason for this is that interethnic marriages reduce the ability of families to pass on their specific cultural practices and beliefs to the next generations. Families do have, of course, additional goals, such as economical benefits, but in affluent societies these economical goals typically play a less important role in marriage preferences than cultural ones (Kalmijn, 1998).

Another reason why family cohesion can act as a principle of exclusion is that sociological and social psychological research has shown that ingroup closure is often accompanied by outgroup rejection (e.g., LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Pettigrew, 1998). The more people are involved in and committed to their own group, the less accepting they tend to be towards outsiders, especially under conditions of threat. A variety of theories suggest that fear and perceptions of threat play an important role in generating prejudice towards outgroups in general, and towards ethnic minority groups in particular. The group position model (Blumer, 1958), realistic group conflict theory (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Sheriff, 1966), ethnic group competition theory (Olzak, 1992) and the integrated threat theory (Stephan & Stephan, 2000) share the idea that the perception of realistic and symbolic threats can lead to negative ethnic attitudes, regardless of whether or not the threat is real (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Symbolic threats are based on perceived group differences in values, norms, and beliefs. People who have a different worldview can be seen as undermining the cultural identity and cohesion of one's own group. Multiple studies have shown that perceived threats to the ingroup's values by immigrants and minorities are related to more negative attitudes towards these groups (e.g., Esses, Hodson, & Dovidio, 2003; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007).

Thus, cohesion can act as a principle of exclusion when there is the perception of threat and individuals are not considered to be part of one's cultural ingroup. This has not only been found for large-scale social categories and groups (e.g., racial, ethnic and national) but also, and more strongly so, for interpersonal groups that are based on common bonds and attachments (Prentice, Miller, & Lightdale, 1994). The family is a prototypical common-bond group, and as Spickard and Fong (1995) have pointed out, an interethnic marriage not only affects the couple,

but also the whole family. Thus, family cohesion might foster a preference for persons with the same ethnocultural background, because mixed marriages can undermine the homogeneity and functioning of the family. When family cohesion is emphasized, family members have an incentive to keep ‘strangers’ out of the family. These ‘strangers’ might undermine the stability and culture of the family. Thus, opposition to interethnic marriage can be expected to be stronger in cohesive families in which family members have frequent contacts, support each other and where norms of family obligation are endorsed.

2.2.2 Family warmth

The construct of family cohesion is sometimes not only understood in terms of contact, support, helpfulness and obligations, but also in terms of feelings of affection and emotional bonding (e.g., Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Dyer, 1972). Olson and colleagues (1983), for example, consider emotional bonding as the key aspect of family cohesion. Others, however, argue that family cohesion differs from emotional closeness and that both aspects of family life have different effects. Research has shown that the different dimensions of family life can relate differently to particular outcomes, like deviant behavior (Sokol-Katz, Dunham, & Zimmerman, 1997) and mental health (Roberts & Bengtson, 1996). We will use the term ‘family warmth’ to indicate the level of family affection and emotional bonding.

There are reasons to expect that affectionate and emotionally supportive family relations are associated with more positive attitudes towards interethnic marriage. These kind of relationships are characterized by mutual confidence, respect and care and therefore make it more likely that one accepts and supports the personal choices and decisions of family members (e.g., Ryan & Solky, 1996). Furthermore, it is in emotional warm relationships that people develop trust in significant others and this form of trust tends to transfer into a more generalized sense of trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). Generalized trust goes beyond the circle of familiar people and extends the boundaries of one’s social group. Furthermore, research has shown that affectionate and emotionally supportive family relations contribute to the development of empathy and perspective taking, as well as to mental health and psychological well-being (e.g., Roberts & Bengtson, 1993, 1996; Zhou et al., 2002). Empathy and perspective taking stimulate pro-social attitudes and behaviors towards ethnic outgroups (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Furthermore, mental health and psychological well-being have been found to be associated with an open and positive orientation towards the larger society and towards other groups (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997). Thus, family affection and emotional bonding may lead to higher acceptance of interethnic marriage.

2.2.3 Different ethnic minority groups

It is likely that the attitude towards interethnic marriage depends on the particular ethnic minority group. Research on the ethnic hierarchy examines preferred social contacts with ethnic minority members, including contact by marriage. In general, it has been found that natives tend to share a sequence of preferences; some ethnic minority groups are kept at a greater social distance than others (see for a review, Hagendoorn, 1995; Owen, Eisner, & McFaul, 1981). In the Netherlands, several studies have shown a hierarchy of preferences for ethnic minority groups among the ethnic Dutch (Hagendoorn & Hraba, 1987; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). After the ingroup, the Dutch favor southern Europeans such as Spaniards, followed by members of ex-colonial groups such as Surinamese and Antilleans and, finally, members of groups that immigrated as labor migrants such as Turks and Moroccans.

The difference in preferred social distance towards different ethnic outgroups has various reasons. Research (see Hagendoorn, 1995) has demonstrated that social distance depends on, for example, the role of negative stereotypes and the degree to which the ethnic minority group has adapted to society, as well as the extent to which these groups are perceived as being culturally different and as undermining the Dutch values and norms. Perceived cultural differences turn out to be important for the acceptance of ethnic minority member as co-workers, neighbors and close kin by marriage, and for ethnic attitudes in general. This has not only be found in the Netherlands (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007), but also in other European countries (Evans & Need, 2002; McLaren, 2003).

The current study examines the attitude towards marriage with a person of Surinamese, Turkish, and Moroccan origin. These are the numerically three largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. Due to the former colonial ties with the Netherlands, the Surinamese-Dutch are culturally (e.g., in language and religion) more similar to the ethnic Dutch than the Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch who have a history of labor migration and an Islamic background. Furthermore, attitudes towards the latter two minority groups have changed over the years with the Moroccans receiving the most negative attention in public and political debates (Coenders, Lubbers, Scheepers, & Verkuyten, 2008). Hence, we expect the ethnic Dutch to have the most negative attitude towards intermarriage with a person of Moroccan origin, followed by an intermarriage with someone of Turkish origin, and the least negative attitude was expected towards the Surinamese-Dutch.

Additionally, we examine whether the effects of family relations on the attitude towards interethnic marriage are different for the three ethnic outgroups. Hagendoorn (1995) claims that the ethnic hierarchy emerges as a result of different factors for the different groups involved in the ranking. Stereotypes would be important for some groups whereas perceived cultural differences and feelings of symbolic threat would drive people's attitude towards other groups. However, research also shows that individuals who have negative feelings towards one ethnic outgroup tend to have negative feelings towards other outgroups as well (see Duckitt, 1992). Furthermore, interpretations in terms of, for example, outgroup

threat and ingroup solidarity appear to explain the attitude towards different ethnic outgroups (e.g., Strabac & Listhaug, 2008). Thus, we expect for the three ethnic minority groups similar relationships between family cohesion and family warmth with the attitude towards interethnic marriage.

2.2.4 Other correlates of ethnic minority attitudes and family life

To assess whether family relations are independently related to attitudes towards interethnic marriage, several additional factors are considered. Research has investigated various correlates of interethnic attitudes of majority group members and these factors might also be related to family cohesion and family warmth. In this paper, we take education, social class, age, gender, religiosity, and urbanization into account. Previous studies have shown that the lower educated, the lower social strata, religious individuals, and people living in rural areas or small towns, express higher levels of resistance towards interethnic marriages compared to the higher educated, the higher social strata, non-religious individuals, and people living in urban areas (Duckitt, 1992; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Tolsma et al., 2008).

Another factor related to ethnic attitudes is age. Older people tend to have more negative ethnic attitudes than younger ones, particularly related to interethnic marriage (e.g., Firebaugh & Davis, 1988; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005). Gender differences in attitudes about interethnic marriage also have been found (e.g., Johnson & Marini, 1998). In general, men tend to have more negative interethnic attitudes than woman. However, Muir and McGlamery (1984) showed that men are more likely to accept persons of other races in more intimate relationships (e.g., to marry, date, or share a room), whereas women are more likely to accept less intimate interracial relationships (e.g., as a neighbor or a co-worker).

Education, age, gender, social class, urbanization, and religiosity have also been found to be related to family life (Komter & Vollebergh, 2002; Rossi & Rossi, 1990), and therefore should be taken into account when examining the association between family relations and attitudes towards interethnic marriage. In addition, we take aspects of the family structure into account; whether one has a partner and/or child(ren) and the size of one's family. These factors may affect the attitudes towards having ethnic minority members as kin. Furthermore, research has shown that people who more strongly endorse conservative and authoritarian family values tend to have more negative ethnic attitudes (Duckitt, 1992). The endorsement of these values is also related to aspects of family life, such as feelings of family obligation and family warmth (Triandis, 1995; Wilcox, 1998). This means that we need to take conservatism into account when assessing the role of family cohesion and family warmth for the attitude towards interethnic marriage.

2.3 Method

2.3.1 Sample

We analyzed data from the first wave of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS) (Dykstra et al., 2005). The NKPS is a large scale research on family relationships among a representative sample of the Dutch population. The data were gathered from 2002 to 2004 when individuals between 18 and 80 years old were interviewed face-to-face in their home using a structured questionnaire. The overall response rate was 45%, which is about average for family studies in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005). After the interview, the participants received a supplementary self-completion questionnaire, which was returned by 93% ($N = 7,549$). For the present purpose, we considered only those participants who returned the self-completion questionnaire. Furthermore, because our focus is on the attitude of majority group members towards ethnic minorities we studied those participants who themselves as well as both of their parents were born in the Netherlands. That means that participants from the three ethnic minority groups (< 3.0%) were excluded from our sample. In addition, participants with missing values on the dependent variable were also not considered (1.6%). In total, a sample of 6,632 ethnic Dutch participants remained.

We compared this sample to the general population (18-79 years) with respect to age, sex, and region of the country. The results showed that younger people, men, and people from the east of the Netherlands are under-represented in our sample. Therefore, a weight factor was constructed based on the differences in statistics between the population and the subsample. In the analyses, we used weights to adjust our sample for gender, age and regional composition of the Dutch population.

2.3.2 Measures

Dependent variable

The participants were presented with three items on interethnic marriage within their own family. The items differed only for the target group mentioned. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they would disapprove of their (actual or imagined) child's decision to marry someone with a (i) Moroccan, (ii) Turkish or (iii) Surinamese background. The response categories of the three items were 1 = *would bother me a lot*, 2 = *would bother me a little*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *would not bother me*, and 5 = *would not bother me at all*. After recoding, higher scores indicated more opposition towards interethnic marriages.

Independent variables

In their model of family solidarity or family cohesion, Bengtson and Roberts (1991) distinguish between various dimensions, like associational solidarity (frequency of contact), functional solidarity (exchange of instrumental support), normative solidarity (endorsement of family norms of obligation), structural solidarity

(opportunity structure for interactions), and affective solidarity (feelings of affection and emotional closeness). Following this model we included measures of these different dimensions in our statistical model. Associational, functional, normative and structural solidarity were taken as indicators of family cohesion. Additionally, we included a general cohesion measure that indicates the strength of the family ties (Komter & Knijn, 2006). Feelings of affection and emotional closeness were used as indicators of family warmth.

Contact frequency was measured by the frequency of face-to-face contact in the past twelve months with one's partner, siblings, parents, and children. Questions about contact were only asked when the participant did not live in the same household as the family member in question. The response categories varied from 1 = *never* to 7 = *daily*. A measure of family contact was constructed by computing the mean score of contact frequency with at least two family members.

Instrumental support was measured by the exchange of support in the last three months, between the participant and his or her family members (partner, siblings, parents, and children). Questions were asked about receiving and giving help with housework tasks and with practical matters. Response categories were 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *once or twice* and 2 = *several times*. The mean score of these two questions was used and a higher score indicates higher instrumental support.

Family norms were operationalized by the endorsement of norms of family obligation. Following Voorpostel and Blieszner (2008), four items were used. The items were "Family members should be ready to support each other, even if they do not like each other", "If one is in trouble, family should be there to provide support", "Family members must help each other, in good times and bad", and "One should always be able to count on family". Response categories ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. These four items were combined in one scale by taking the mean value ($\alpha = .86$). Higher scores indicated a stronger endorsement of *family norms*.

Family ties reflected the strength of the family bonds and was measured with the following three items: "The ties in my family are very strong.", "Our family is loosely affiliated.", and "In our family we keep each other informed about important events.". Response categories varied from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The negatively worded item was reversed. The reliability of the scale was adequate ($\alpha = .78$)

Family affection was measured with four items. The items were: "I place confidence in my family", "I come from a special and precious family", "When I do something for my family, I do it because I care about them", and "At times, I find it hard to respect my family". The response categories ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The negatively formulated item was recoded and an average score was computed ($\alpha = .70$). A higher score means higher family affection.

Emotional closeness was measured by two questions on the exchange of emotional interest and support in the personal life of one's family members. The response categories were the same as for instrumental support. A mean score for the exchange of emotional closeness was computed.

Control variables

Education was measured in years and to get an appropriate interval scale, we applied a standard recoding procedure for the Dutch educational system (De Graaf, De Graaf, & Kraaykamp, 2000). *Household income* served as an indicator for social class. *Age* was measured in years. *Female* was coded as 1 = *yes* and 0 = *no*. *Religious affiliation* was measured with the question whether the participant considered him- or herself as belonging to a particular faith, religious denomination or church. We recoded this question into a dichotomous variable with 1 = *church member* and 0 = *no church member*. *Church attendance* was measured with the categories 0 = *never*, 1 = *a few times a year*, 2 = *a few times a month*, and 3 = *a few times a week*. The degree of *urbanization* was based on the participants' address and the density of the municipality (address per square kilometre), and varied from 1 = *not urbanized* to 5 = *very strongly urbanized*.

Three measures of family structure were taken into account: having a partner (1 = *yes*; 0 = *no*), having (a) child(ren) (1 = *yes*; 0 = *no*) and the family size (number of family members). Finally, *family conservatism* was measured by seven items indicating the importance of traditional family roles and relationships. The items were: "Men and women are allowed to live together outside of marriage", "Children are allowed to choose their own marriage partners", "Two men or two women are allowed to live together", "A woman must quit her job when she becomes a mother", "The parents opinion must play an important role in the choice of a partner for their child", "Married couples with young children are not allowed to divorce", and "Single mothers are very capable of raising their children". The answers were recorded on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*. Items were recoded so that higher scores indicated stronger endorsement of conservative family values. The items were combined in one scale by taking the mean value ($\alpha = .77$).

2.3.3 Method of analysis

For the independent variables, we replaced the missing values by Stata's multiple imputation procedure ICE. For all the variables the proportion missing values was less than 3.5%. Table 2.1 shows the means, standard deviations and the range of all variables and Table 2.2 presents the intercorrelations between the different family characteristics.

Some of the measures were significantly correlated and the highest (positive) associations were between family ties and family affection ($r = .63, p < .001$), and between family contact and instrumental support ($r = .38, p < .001$). In addition, having (a) child(ren) was positively related to the size of the family ($r = .47, p < .001$). All other intercorrelations were moderate to small. High correlations could lead to problems of multi-collinearity. A common method to detect multi-collinearity uses variance inflation factors (VIF). According to Myers (1990) a VIF value greater than 10 indicates a serious problem of multi-collinearity. The highest VIF statistic in our final model was 1.87. Thus, there was no problematic multi-collinearity between the variables.

Table 2.1 Descriptive statistics of the independent and control variables ($N = 6,632$)

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | Range |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|
| <i>Family Structure</i> | | | |
| Partner (1 = yes) | .73 | | 0 – 1 |
| Children (1 = yes) | .68 | | 0 – 1 |
| Family Size | 6.19 | 2.77 | 2 – 16 |
| <i>Family Cohesion</i> | | | |
| Family Norms | 3.68 | .74 | 1 – 7 |
| Family Contact | 4.11 | 1.02 | 1 – 7 |
| Instrumental Support | 1.38 | .34 | 1 – 3 |
| Family Ties | 3.69 | .84 | 1 – 5 |
| <i>Family Warmth</i> | | | |
| Feelings of Affection | 3.90 | .66 | 1 – 5 |
| Emotional Closeness | 2.54 | .43 | 1 – 3 |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | |
| Age | 46.65 | 14.94 | 18 – 79 |
| Female (1 = yes) | .59 | | 0 – 1 |
| Education | 12.12 | 3.13 | 5 – 21 |
| Household Income | 5.26 | 3.67 | 1 – 17 |
| Church Membership (1 = yes) | .54 | | 0 – 1 |
| Church Attendance | .73 | .99 | 0 – 3 |
| Urbanization | 3.20 | 1.29 | 1 – 5 |
| Family Conservatism | 1.99 | .60 | 1 – 5 |

Note. No standard deviations presented for dummy variables.

Table 2.2 Correlations between family characteristics

| | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. |
|--------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Family Conservatism | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Partner | ns | - | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Children | .16 | .30 | - | | | | | | | |
| 4. Family Size | .14 | .30 | .47 | - | | | | | | |
| 5. Family Norms | .17 | -.06 | ns | ns | - | | | | | |
| 6. Family Contact | ns | .04 | -.03~ | -.10 | .13 | - | | | | |
| 7. Instrumental Support | -.09 | -.03~ | -.15 | -.19 | .04 | .38 | - | | | |
| 8. Family Ties | .04 | .03~ | .04 | .04 | .25 | .33 | .08 | - | | |
| 9. Feelings of Affection | -.09 | ns | -.04 | ns | .20 | .28 | .10 | .63 | - | |
| 10. Emotional Closeness | -.11 | .08 | -.05 | -.14 | ns | .21 | .29 | .24 | .28 | - |

Note. $p < .01$ for all correlations, except ~ $p < .05$ and ns = not significant ($p > .05$).

2.4 Results

2.4.1 Interethnic marriage attitudes

We examined whether the attitude towards interethnic marriage differed for the three ethnic minority groups. As expected, the mean score was highest (thus, most opposition) in relation to Moroccans ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.09$; 45% above the neutral midpoint), followed by the Turks ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.07$; 40% above the neutral midpoint), and then the Surinamese ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.04$; 33% above the neutral midpoint). Pairwise t-tests showed that all three differences in mean scores were significant ($p < .001$). The correlations between the three items were very high with .83 (Moroccan-Surinamese), .85 (Turkish-Surinamese), and .94 (Turkish-Moroccan). The three items together form an internally consistent scale with Cronbach's alpha is .95. Hence, we computed an average score for the attitude towards interethnic marriage and used this score as the dependent variable in the analysis.

2.4.2 Predicting the attitude towards interethnic marriage

A stepwise regression analysis was performed to assess the relative contribution of the control variables and the family characteristics on the statistical explanation of the attitude towards interethnic marriage. Gender, age, educational level, income, religious affiliation, church attendance, urbanization, and the endorsement of conservative family values were entered in the first model. The family structure and family cohesion measures were entered in the second model. In the third step, the effect of family warmth was estimated.

As shown in the first model in Table 2.3, significant and common effects were found for all variables except for household income. The total explained variance of the regression model was 17%, with family conservatism being the strongest predictor. As expected, the endorsement of conservative family values was positively related to the opposition to ethnic kinship by marriage. Table 2.3 also shows relatively strong effects for age and for education. Older interviewees had more negative views towards interethnic marriages than younger ones, whereas people with higher education showed less opposition toward interethnic marriages. In addition, both measures of religiosity – church membership and church attendance – showed a significant relationship with the opposition to interethnic marriages. Whereas church membership was associated with more opposition to interethnic marriages, church attendance had a negative effect. Further, people from more rural areas showed higher levels of opposition to interethnic marriage than people from more urban areas. Also gender appeared to be related to the interethnic marriage attitude. Females turned out to be more likely to oppose interethnic marriages than males. Finally, we found no relation between household income and the attitude toward ethnic kinship by marriage.

Table 2.3 Family relations and the resistance to interethnic marriages

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|-------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | β |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | | | | |
| Age | .01 | .10*** | .01 | .09*** | .01 | .09*** |
| Female | .11 | .05*** | .11 | .05*** | .12 | .06*** |
| Education | -.02 | -.09*** | -.02 | -.08*** | -.02 | -.06*** |
| Household Income | -.00 | -.01 | -.00 | -.01 | -.00 | -.01 |
| Religious Affiliation | .16 | .08*** | .14 | .07*** | .14 | .07*** |
| Church Attendance | -.06 | -.06*** | -.05 | -.05*** | -.05 | -.05*** |
| Urbanization | -.05 | -.07*** | -.04 | -.05*** | -.04 | -.05*** |
| Family Conservatism | .49 | .29*** | .48 | .28*** | .47 | .28*** |
| <i>Family Structure</i> | | | | | | |
| Partner | | | .12 | .05*** | .13 | .06*** |
| Children | | | .18 | .08*** | .18 | .08*** |
| Family Size | | | -.01 | -.03* | -.01 | -.04** |
| <i>Family Cohesion</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Norms | | | .08 | .06*** | .09 | .07*** |
| Family Contact | | | .04 | .04** | .04 | .04** |
| Instrumental Support | | | -.07 | -.02 | -.04 | -.02 |
| Family Ties | | | -.01 | -.01 | .04 | .03* |
| <i>Family Warmth</i> | | | | | | |
| Feelings of Affection | | | | | -.09 | -.06*** |
| Emotional Closeness | | | | | -.10 | -.04*** |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 2.59 | | 2.38 | | 2.66 | |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .17 | | .18 | | .19 |

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; β = standardized regression coefficient.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

The addition of the family structure and family cohesion measures in the second model significantly increased the explained variance, $F_{\text{change}} = 16.73$, $p < .001$, and the full regression model explained 18% of the variance in the attitude towards interethnic marriage. In Model 2, the effects of the control variables remained more or less the same. All three measures of family structure were positively related to the opposition towards interethnic marriages. Having (a) child(ren) and having a partner were both associated with more opposition to ethnic minority members as kin by marriage, whereas the size of the family was negatively related to the opposition to intermarriage.

In line with our expectations, the endorsement of norms of family obligations was positively associated with the opposition towards interethnic marriage. Higher endorsement of family obligation was related to stronger opposition to interethnic marriages. The results showed that face-to-face contact also had a positive effect.

The more frequently family members had these contacts, the more negative the attitude towards interethnic marriage turned out to be. However, the exchange of instrumental support and the perceived strength of family ties were not independently related to the interethnic marriage attitude.

The addition of the two family warmth measures in the third step also significantly increased the explained variance, $F_{\text{change}} = 15.20$, $p < .001$, and the full regression model explained 19% of the variance in the attitude towards interethnic marriage. We predicted a negative effect of emotional closeness and feelings of affection on the opposition towards interethnic marriages. The results of Model 3 showed that both indicators of family warmth were indeed associated with a less negative attitude towards interethnic marriages. Thus, affective and emotional warm family relations go together with less opposition towards interethnic marriages.

Interestingly, after the inclusion of the two indicators of family warmth, the effect of family ties became significant. The stronger the family ties, the higher the opposition to interethnic marriage. This suggests that the effect of family ties in the first model was suppressed due to the positive association between family ties and the indicators of family warmth (see Table 2.2). Suppression occurs in a situation in which the magnitude of the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable becomes larger when one or more variables are included.

2.4.3 Different ethnic minority groups

The attitudes towards the three ethnic outgroups were highly correlated and formed an internally consistent scale. In an additional analysis we examined whether the effects of the family characteristics on interethnic marriage attitudes differed for the ethnic minority groups. The statistical significance of the differences between the regression coefficients across the three groups was computed by the following formula: $t = (b_1 - b_2) / \sqrt{s_1^2 + s_2^2}$ with $n-p-1$ degrees of freedom. Results revealed no significant differences in the strength of the regression coefficients for the interethnic marriage attitude towards the three different ethnic outgroups.

2.5 Conclusion and discussion

Many empirical studies have investigated social distance towards ethnic and racial minority groups, including the acceptance of minority group members as kin. Kinship by marriage is one of the most intimate relationships and a useful indicator of the level of interethnic acceptance in society (Blau et al., 1984). Various explanations for the acceptance of ethnic minority members as kin have been suggested and tested (e.g., Hagendoorn, 1995; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005). However, as far as we know there is no research that has examined the role of the current family context. In this research we focused on family cohesion and family warmth. Using a representative sample of ethnic Dutch participants we examined

different aspects of family cohesion and of family warmth, and their relationships with the attitude towards interethnic marriage.

The findings indicated that the level of opposition towards interethnic marriage is quite high in the Netherlands. The mean scores for the three different ethnic minority groups were above the neutral mid-point of the scale. Almost one in two participants indicated that it would bother them when their son or daughter would marry a person of Moroccan origin, 40% was negative about a marriage with a Turkish person, and around one third was negative towards having a Surinamese as kin by marriage. These percentages show that for the ethnic Dutch, ethnicity forms a relatively strong boundary. The percentages also indicated that the social distance towards the three ethnic minority groups varies. In agreement with previous studies in the Netherlands (see Hagendoorn, 1995) it turned out that the opposition was strongest towards the Moroccans, followed by the Turks and then the Surinamese. Thus, there was a clear hierarchy of acceptance of ethnic minority members as kin by marriage. This hierarchy has been found to be related to perceived cultural and religious differences (Hagendoorn, 1995; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007).

The mean levels of opposition towards the different ethnic minority groups do not necessarily imply that the attitudes are relatively independent of each other or that family cohesion and family warmth relate differently to these attitudes. It turned out that there was a very high correlation between the attitudes towards the three ethnic minority groups. This indicates that individuals who are negative against one minority group also tend to be negative against other minority groups, which is a common finding in analyses of prejudice (see Duckitt, 1992). Furthermore, the independent variables, including the different aspects of family life, had similar statistical effects on the attitude towards each of the three minority groups. Thus, the same factors explaining the attitude towards intermarriage with a person of Moroccan origin accounted for the intermarriage attitude towards a person originating from Turkey or from Surinam.

In examining the relationships between the family characteristics and interethnic attitudes we took various well-known factors into account as control variables, like educational level, religiosity, age, gender, socio-economic position, and urbanity. These variables were found to have the familiar and well-known effects on the ethnic attitude. Our aim was to go beyond the existing research by considering (a) the role of family relations, (b) the relevance of different aspects of family relations, and (c) the different ways in which family relations might be important for ethnic attitudes. In doing so we aimed to make a contribution to the examination of contextual micro processes that hamper or facilitate good ethnic relations (Bobo & Fox, 2003). The findings indicated that family relations were indeed important for understanding ethnic Dutch people's attitudes towards interethnic marriage. Further, it turned out that different aspects of family relations had independent relationships with the ethnic attitude. In addition, not all aspects had similar effects on the acceptance of ethnic outgroup members as kin by marriage. We will elaborate on all three findings.

First, research has found that country characteristics are related to people's acceptance of ethnic minorities as citizens (e.g., Pehrson et al., 2009), that

neighborhood characteristics affect residents' willingness to accept ethnic minorities as neighbors (e.g., Oliver & Wong, 2003), and that school characteristics are related to student's acceptance of minority classmates (e.g., Verkuyten & Thijs, 2002). The current findings show that family characteristics were related to the acceptance of minorities as close kin by marriage. The family is a meaningful context for understanding ethnic attitudes. Previous research has suggested that the family has influence on these attitudes through socialization, the living conditions in the formative years, and the intergenerational transmission of educational and labor market positions (e.g., Vollebergh et al., 2001). Our findings indicated that the structure and functioning of the current family context is also important.

Second, we made a distinction between family cohesion and family warmth and it turned out that both aspects of family life were independently related to the attitude towards interethnic marriage. Furthermore, we used multiple indicators for both aspects and found significant effects for all of them, except for instrumental support. Thus, different aspects of the structure and functioning of the family were found to be related to the acceptance of ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage. This is in agreement with existing research on family solidarity (e.g., Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Rossi & Rossi, 1990) and it shows that it is important to distinguish between different aspects and dimensions of family relations.

Third, the importance of making a distinction between dimensions of family relations is also indicated by our finding that not all aspects were related to the ethnic attitudes in similar ways. Some of the relationships were positive and others were negative. Previous studies (see Komter, 2006) have shown that social cohesion can have positive consequences, such as mutual support, cooperation and trust of ingroup members. However, it can also lead to the rejection or exclusion of outsiders. Ingroup cohesiveness and closure is often associated with outgroup rejection, especially when the outgroup is perceived to undermine one's way of life. Furthermore, interethnic marriage reduces the ability of families to pass on their cultural practices and beliefs to the next generations. The results showed that three of the four indicators of family cohesion were indeed related to less acceptance of minority group members as close kin by marriage. This supports the idea that family cohesion can have negative implications for ethnic outsiders. The most likely reason for this is that these outsiders are expected to introduce different cultural values, norms and practices that are seen as undermining the familiar family life. Future studies should examine this interpretation further, for example by measuring feelings of family undermining.

In contrast to the role of family cohesion, it turned out that affective and emotional supportive family relations were associated with less opposition towards interethnic marriages. Warm family relations are characterized by confidence and respect and therefore make it more likely that people accept and support the personal marriage choices and decisions of family members. Additionally, warm and trusting family relationships can lead to the development of generalized trust, empathy and perspective taking (e.g., Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Furthermore, the quality more than the quantity of relationships tends to be important for mental health and well-being (Fiori, Antonucci, & Cortina, 2006), which, in turn, fosters open-mindedness and tolerance (Duckitt, 1992).

In evaluating the present results some qualifications should be considered. For example, the measures of family cohesion and family warmth were predominantly based on the perspective of the interviewee and on the relationships that he or she had with other family members. Thus, family life was not assessed from all family members. It can be argued that the perception and perspective of the interviewee is especially important for understanding his or her attitude towards interethnic marriage. Notwithstanding, future studies should examine family life from different perspectives and should also use multilevel models for assessing family influences in addition to individual level variables.

The effects of the family variables on the attitude towards ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage were significant but small. Thus, the meaning of these variables for ethnic attitudes is limited (Cohen, 1988). However, the findings showed that the family characteristics had an independent statistical effect after various well-known correlates of ethnic attitudes were taken into account. Furthermore, although the efficacy of current family variables may be limited, they are important in conceptually linking contextual and individual-level theories (Liska, 1990).

We examined the attitudes towards interethnic marriage among the native majority group. Analyses of data from different ethnic minority groups would allow to assess the extent to which the effects for family cohesion and family warmth generalize across groups. There are reasons to expect that some of the relationships might be stronger among ethnic minority groups. The importance of the family and family solidarity is more highly emphasized in ethnic minority groups that typically have a more collectivist cultural orientation compared to the highly individualised Dutch. In addition, minority families often play an important role in the ethnic and racial identity development of family members (e.g., Hughes & Johnson, 2001). It is also important to examine differences between ethnic minority groups, and also differences within these groups. There are important socio-economic and cultural differences between and within these groups. These differences might be related to family life and to the acceptance of interethnic marriages.

In conclusion, we used literature on family relationships and on intergroup relations to make predictions about the effect of family cohesion and family warmth on attitudes towards interethnic marriage. We tested the model using data from a nationally representative research on kinship in the Netherlands. We argued that family life is a neglected but critical factor in understanding and explaining why people tend to reject or accept ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage. The main conclusions are that the structure and functioning of the family is related to attitudes towards interethnic marriage, that different aspects of family life are independently related to this attitude, and that these aspects relate to this attitude in different ways. It turned out that family life has negative as well as positive effects on the acceptance of ethnic minorities as close kin by marriage.

CHAPTER 3

Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis in the Netherlands



This chapter is co-authored by Aart C. Liefbroer (Free University Amsterdam, The Netherlands). It is currently revised and resubmitted to *Journal of Marriage and Family*. An earlier version of this chapter has been presented at the 9th European Sociological Association Conference, September 2009, Lissabon (Portugal).

3 Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis in the Netherlands

3.1 Introduction

In societies in which ethnic cleavages exist, understanding the strength and origins of interethnic attitudes is of utmost importance, as these attitudes may shape behavioral patterns towards members of other ethnic groups. For instance, ethnic attitudes have been demonstrated to influence voting behavior, interethnic (friendship) contacts, and interethnic romantic relationships (Bélanger & Aarts, 2006; Jaspers, Lubbers, & De Graaf, 2008; Levin, Taylor, & Caudle, 2007; Levin, Van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003). Many different explanations for ethnic attitudes have been proposed and tested. Research has examined, for example, (a) the influence on ethnic attitudes of personality correlates such as authoritarianism, (b) individual characteristics, like level of education, labor market position, and religiosity, and (c) intergroup phenomena such as intergroup contact and intergroup threat (see for instance, Brown, 1995; Dixon, 2006; Duckitt, 1992; Stephan & Stephan, 1996).

In recent years, increased attention has been paid to the role of social contexts, such as schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods (Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997; Taylor, 1998) in understanding interethnic (or interracial) attitudes. A social context, however, on which surprisingly little *extensive* research has been done is the family. Although researchers have long recognized the importance of family background in explaining ethnic or racial attitudes (see for instance, Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Allport, 1954), the field is characterized by a strong focus on family influences through direct socialization (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Hughes et al., 2006; Sinclair et al., 2005; White & Gleitzman, 2006), and relatively few studies have focused on different pathways of influence simultaneously, or addressed the role of the family during adulthood.

The main aim of this article is to contribute to our understanding of the role played by the family in the formation and maintenance of ethnic attitudes. More specifically, we examine the influence of the family on the attitudes of ethnic Dutch towards having ethnic minority members as kin through marriage. The study of family-related indicators of ethnic boundaries, like the degree of interethnic marriage and the degree of resistance against these marriages, is of societal relevance because these indicators have traditionally been interpreted

as the strongest markers of social distance between ethnic groups in society (Bogardus, 1967). Moreover, when outgroup members are accepted as kin, other types of positive interethnic relations are also more likely. This paper aims to contribute to the existing literature on ethnic attitudes in several ways.

First, little is known about the size of the total influence of the family on ethnic attitudes, because it is hardly possible to include every relevant aspect of the family. Therefore, the total impact of family background is likely to be underestimated in conventional ethnic studies. A partial solution to this problem is provided by a sibling design (Hauser & Mossel, 1985). Because siblings generally share their parents and their childhood circumstances, the observed similarity in attitudes between siblings in later life can be ascribed to the family of origin. Hence, a sibling analysis is well-suited to shed light on the influence of the family on ethnic attitudes. In our study, we use data from a survey among the ethnic Dutch population that contains information on ethnic attitudes of sibling pairs, which allows us to estimate the total impact of family background.

Second, we focus on different ways through which the family of origin influences ethnic attitudes. One such mechanism is the intergenerational transmission of attitudes (Moen, Erickson, & Dempster-McClain, 1997). However, empirical results on the strength of this relationship have been mixed (Fishbein, 2002). In addition, we are not only interested in the transmission mechanism, but also want to examine other possible ways in which the family of origin might influence adult children's attitudes. For instance, the family of origin could influence attitudes of children through the transmission of socio-economic and cultural positions, and through the provision of structural and cultural conditions in the formative period, because people's attitudes and values reflect the accompanying views and ideas of the socio-economic and cultural context to which they are exposed during their pre-adult years. (Jennings, 1984; Vollebergh, Iedema, & Raaijmakers, 2001).

Third, little is known about (possible) family influences on adults' attitudes. Intermarriage attitudes might be related to characteristics of the relations between family members during adulthood, like family cohesiveness and family warmth. For instance, cohesive families might foster interactions with persons who are culturally similar, because people from a different cultural background can be perceived as a threat to the cultural identity and solidarity of one's own group (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). On the other hand, warm family relations might increase tolerance and positive attitudes towards ethnic outgroups via increased psychological well-being and higher generalized trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). Moreover, previous studies showed that family cohesion and warmth facilitate the degree to which attitudes are successfully transmitted within families (Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988; White, 1996). Hence, it is possible that current family characteristics not only have a direct effect on intermarriage attitudes, but also facilitate the transmission of intermarriage attitudes within families. In addition, most studies tend to focus on the way the family affects ethnic attitudes of *adolescents*, but do not address the issue to what extent family background influences are still important for ethnic attitudes in adult life.

To test our hypotheses, we use data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (Dykstra et al., 2007). In this survey, information on ethnic attitudes of multiple family members has been collected, allowing the use of multilevel models in which both individual and family effects can be estimated.

3.2 Theory and hypotheses

3.2.1 Assessing the influence of the family of origin: sibling models

Though it is widely acknowledged that the family exerts an influence on the attitudes of its members, it is not clear to what extent this holds true for ethnic attitudes. *Ethnic* attitudes refer to attitudes towards people with another ethnic background. In the Netherlands, the official definition used by Statistics Netherlands is that someone is classified as an ethnic minority member “if at least one of the parents was born abroad”. Social scientists have long recognized the importance of family background for ethnic attitudes (see for instance, Allport, 1954). Usually, the influence of the family of origin is assessed by estimating the congruence between ethnic attitudes of children and their parents. This approach, however, neglects other possible ways, like the transmission of social and cultural positions, in which the family may influence the attitudes of children. Besides, some possible family effects, such as genetic inheritance (Eaves et al., 1999), are hard to measure at all. Therefore, most studies underestimate the total impact of the family.

A powerful way to deal with this problem is to use information on siblings. Because siblings share their parents and the conditions in which they are raised, similarities between adult siblings in terms of behaviors or attitudes can be attributed to the family of origin (Hauser, 1988; Hauser & Mossel, 1985). Hence, modeling the similarity of siblings is a sophisticated way of taking the full family background into account, without having to measure every possible relevant family characteristic. Recently, sibling data have been used in studies on family influences on family attitudes (De Vries, Kalmijn, & Liefbroer, 2009) and actual intermarriage patterns (Kalmijn, Liefbroer, Van Poppel, & Van Solinge, 2006). These studies showed that almost a third of the total variance was due to the family background.

Extending the sibling approach to the realm of ethnic attitudes, we study the total impact of the family of origin on intermarriage attitudes based on the similarity in attitudes between siblings. Hence, we define the impact of family background very broadly: It consists of all the factors that make brothers and sisters resemble each other more than random individuals. One such factor is the sibling relation itself, since siblings can be important role models for each other. Further, siblings not only share experiences within the family but also outside the family, for instance in the neighborhood and in school. In our view, such experiences are family influences, as it is the family that makes the decision to live in a certain neighborhood or to send the children to a certain school (Sieben, 2001).

3.2.2 Explaining the influence of the family of origin

In addition to the assessment of the total role of the family of origin for one's ethnic attitude, we are interested in examining the underlying mechanisms of this influence. Previous studies showed that there are several ways in which the family of origin may influence attitudes. Studies predominantly focused on (a) the transmission of parental attitudes to their children, (b) the effect of the (social and cultural) circumstances during childhood and adolescence, and (c) the intergenerational transmission of social positions (Jennings, 1984; Moen et al., 1997; Vollebergh et al., 2001).

3.2.3 The transmission of attitudes

According to socialization theories, the family has an important influence through the direct transmission of ethnic attitudes (Glass, Bengtson, & Dunham, 1986; Moen et al., 1997; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Children supposedly adopt the attitudes expressed by their parents in different, both verbal and nonverbal, ways. On the one hand, parents try to transmit their attitudes by teaching and informing their children about the content and functions of the attitudes. On the other hand, the transmission can be less deliberate from the parents' perspective, when children learn their parents' attitudes through observation and the imitation of role models (Bandura, 1986). However, research has shown that the intergenerational transmission of attitudes is not a one-way process flowing from parents to children, since reciprocal effects occur, and children might increasingly influence their parents as they grow older (Glass et al., 1986). Several longitudinal studies confirmed the bi-directional nature of the attitude transmission, though they also showed that the transmission often is asymmetrical, with a larger impact of parents on their children than vice versa (Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004; Vollebergh et al., 2001).

In our study, we examine the relation between current rather than past parental ethnic attitudes and their adult children's attitudes. This is a potential drawback, since parental attitudes might have changed since the formative period. Although longitudinal studies showed that ethnic attitudes are quite stable in adult life, and that the stability is stronger for parents than for their children (Van de Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar, 2008; Vollebergh et al., 2001), caution is needed in interpreting the relation between parental and children's ethnic attitudes. In sum, due to the cross-sectional design and the use of current parental attitudes we are not able to assess the direction of attitude transmission, and therefore use the concept of intergenerational congruence (Bucx, Raaijmakers, & Van Wel, 2010).

Results with respect to the strength and significance of attitudinal congruence between parents and children's are mixed (Fishbein, 2002; Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004). Parent-child congruence varies in strength according to the type of attitude that is transmitted (Rohan & Zanna, 1996). For instance, attitudes and values which serve the interests of the family and attitudes which are more salient are more likely to be transmitted between generations (Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004). Attitudes

that reflect a resistance towards ethnic outgroup members as kin might serve the family, as norms of endogamy help to maintain group culture and solidarity (Clark-Ibáñez & Felmler, 2004), and are rather salient, because an intermarriage has implications for the whole family. Thus, our first hypothesis reads: *A part of the family influence on interethnic marriage attitudes can be explained by the process of intergenerational congruence in attitudes (H1).*

3.2.4 Shared circumstances and the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions

Parents do not only affect their children through their own attitudes, but in other ways as well. First, it is believed that people's attitudes and values reflect the conditions that prevailed during their preadult years (Inglehart, 1990; Sears, 1993). Members of a family share a collective context that fosters or hampers negative ethnic attitudes. Children who are raised in a certain socio-economic and cultural context are exposed to the accompanying views and ideas. In this study, interest focuses on the following family background characteristics: parental education, social status, religiosity, and urbanization. Highly educated parents have relatively highly educated friends and family members; they constitute an environment that may emphasize tolerance and positive ethnic attitudes. In addition, growing up in a high status family with relatively comfortable living conditions during one's youth may lead to low levels of perceived threat from ethnic minorities, and thus to relatively favorable ethnic attitudes (Olzak, 1992). Having religious parents may lead to relatively negatively views towards intermarriage as the religious community to which the children are exposed in their youth might emphasize norms of endogamy (Kalmijn, 1998). Finally, rural areas are relatively homogeneous, providing fewer opportunities to meet ethnic outgroup members, and offer few possibilities for subcultural activities compared to more urban areas. As a consequence, people from rural areas tend to hold less favorable attitudes towards ethnic outgroup members than people who grew up in urban areas (Tuch, 1987). In sum, we hypothesize that: *A part of the family influence on interethnic marriage attitudes can be explained by the direct influence of the shared social and cultural characteristics (parental education, social status, religiosity, and urbanization) while the children were growing up (H2).*

The family also serves as an important locus for the social and structural placement in society, via the intergenerational transmission of structural and cultural positions (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Myers, 1996). Similarities in social and cultural positions may create attitudinal similarity within families (Glass et al., 1986). Parents affect their children's attitudes through (adult) children's positions, for which the parents are partly responsible. Educational attainment, social status, religiosity, and degree of urbanization are all transmitted via the family (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Myers, 1996; Sharkey, 2008; Shavit & Blossfeldt, 1993), and are known to affect ethnic attitudes (Duckitt, 1992; Schuman et al., 1997; Tuch, 1987; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Therefore, part of the family influence can be explained via this (indirect) mechanism. Thus, the effect of family background characteristics can be both direct and indirect. If the influence of family background characteristics is

direct, the effect of these characteristics should remain significant after controlling for individual characteristics. The portion that is reduced after controlling for individual characteristics can be attributed to the indirect effect of family background. Our third hypothesis is: *A part of the family influence on interethnic marriage attitudes can be explained by the indirect influence of the shared social and cultural characteristics (parental education, social status, religiosity, and urbanization) via the transmission of social and cultural positions (H3).*

3.2.5 Additional explanations: current family characteristics

Sibling similarity in intermarriage attitudes may not only result from shared circumstances during childhood and adolescence, but also from a shared family environment during adulthood. There are several reasons for relating current family characteristics to intermarriage attitudes. First, people from a different cultural background can be seen as threatening the cultural identity and cohesion of one's own group (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Cohesion refers to the bonds or "glue" that hold members of a group together, and is believed to be a multidimensional concept which can be indicated by both feelings and beliefs about family ties and concrete behaviors (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991). For instance, family interaction, the exchange of functional support, and norms of family obligation are considered to be important aspects of family cohesion (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Brown, 2000).

People prefer to interact with others who share certain behaviors and worldviews, because cultural similarity enlarges the opportunities to participate in joint activities and enhance mutual understanding (Byrne, 1971; Kalmijn, 1998; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). The preference for cultural similarity might depend on the family context. In general, people from a different cultural background can be perceived as a threat to the cultural identity and solidarity of one's own group (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Therefore, family cohesion might stimulate the preference for family members with a comparable cultural background, as mixed marriages may pose a threat to the internal cohesion and homogeneity of the family. In addition, interethnic relations increase the risks of social sanctions by family members; Interethnic couples have to deal with more disapproval, receive less support, and, at the extreme end might face exclusion and hostility (Hohmann-Marriott & Amato, 2008; Kalmijn, 1998). Hence, an interethnic marriage may come with a price, especially in cohesive families where the ties are strong and the exchange of support is high. Furthermore, ingroup cohesion is often accompanied by outgroup-hostility, particularly under the condition of group threat (Turner, 1999). Because people with a different ethnic background are, in general, more dissimilar with respect to relevant social and cultural characteristics of the family than members from one's own ethnic group (Baerveldt, Van Duijn, Vermeij, & Van Hemert, 2004), we assume that the former are perceived more strongly as an outgroup than the latter. Although these group dynamics are usually applied to large-scale groups, for example ethnic or national groups, perceived cultural threat and ingroup cohesion might also lead to more

negative interethnic attitudes within smaller groups that are based on common bonds (Prentice, Dale, & Lightdale, 1994), of which the family is a primary example.

In sum, cohesive family ties might increase group boundaries and facilitate exclusion of individuals who are not considered to be part of one's own cultural group. Hence, we hypothesize that: *Family cohesion might increase the resistance to interethnic marriage, and therefore a part of the family influence on intermarriage attitudes can be explained by cohesion within the family (H4).*

It is in warm relations, that people develop trust in others. Glanville and Paxton (2007) showed that trust developed within the family can transcend into a more generalized sense of trust. Furthermore, the positive effect of warm family relationships on generalized trust is not restricted to the pre-adulthood years (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). Generalized trust implies a trust that reaches beyond the circle of acquaintances and the boundaries of one's social group (Uslaner, 2002). In addition, research has shown that warm family relationships lead to psychological well-being whereas unsupportive relationships lead to self-uncertainty (Roberts & Bengtson, 1996). Psychological well-being is related to a more open and accepting orientation towards outgroups (Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997) and self-uncertainty leads to bolstering of one's cultural norms and defensive reactions towards outsiders (Hogg, 2000). Although we expect in general family cohesion to relate positively to the resistance to intermarriage, we expect the opposite effect for family warmth: *Family warmth might decrease the resistance to interethnic marriage, and therefore a part of the family influence on intermarriage attitudes can be explained by warm family relationships (H5).*

The construct of family cohesion sometimes is understood in terms of feelings of affection and emotional bonding (see for instance, Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Dyer, 1972). Others, however, argue that family cohesion and emotional closeness are two interrelated, but distinct aspects of family life that can exert different effects (e.g., Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Huijnk et al., 2010). Following this latter tradition, this dissertation differentiates between the concepts of family warmth and family cohesion. Family warmth is defined as a theoretical concept that indicates the sentiments and evaluation of family members about their relationships with other members, and the exchange of emotional support, whereas the (related) concept of 'family cohesion' refers to the strength of family ties indicated by family contact and the adherence to family norms.

3.2.6 Family characteristics and the transmission of intermarriage attitudes

The transmission of attitudes is known to be selective, and an extensive list of moderators has been examined. In addition to individual characteristics, such as gender and age (Bandura, 1986; Jaspers, Lubbers, & De Vries, 2008; Rohan & Zanna, 1996), family characteristics, like family warmth and family cohesion have been identified as transmission facilitators (Jaspers et al., 2008; Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988; White, 1996). Hence, family cohesion and family warmth may not only relate directly to intermarriage attitudes, but also function as a moderator for the transmission of intermarriage attitudes between parents and children.

Grusec and Goodnow (1994) proposed a two-step model of internalization to understand conditions for attitudinal similarity between family members. The first step is the child's perception of the parent's message, a perception that may be accurate or inaccurate. The second step is the acceptance or rejection of the perceived message. Failure to internalize may result either from inaccurate perception or from rejection. First, acceptance or rejection is expected to depend on the warmth of the relationship between parent and child (Grusec & Goodnow, 1994). Parental warmth is related to the extent to which the child is motivated to accept the parental message, and makes the child more eager to be similar to the agents of socialization. Moreover, a lack of (perceived) emotional warmth may cause the child to react against its parents' attitudes throughout adult life (Jaspers et al., 2008). Hence, it is likely that the transmission of attitudes will be more effective in loving circumstances.

Second, family cohesion might relate to both steps in the process of internalization. The idea is that cohesive families have more opportunities for socialization, and family members are more responsive to their family members' beliefs and attitudes. Further, research showed that interdependence promotes the transmission of cultural values from parents to children (Phalet & Schönplflug, 2001).

In our study, we examine whether family cohesion and family warmth in children's adult life also relate to the transmission of attitudes. We have two arguments for expecting a positive effect of family cohesion and family warmth on the similarity in attitudes between parents and children in adult life. First, as children age, most of them leave their parents' home, and are socialized and influenced by other institutions and contexts, such as partners and colleagues (Glass et al., 1986), which consequently will result in less similarity in attitudes between parents and children throughout adult life. It is possible, however, that the warmth and cohesiveness of the family in adult life relates to the degree that these initial socialization influences persist or fade away. Second, current family characteristics may be an indicator for the family situation in the formative period. Whereas friends who have once been close may drift apart, bonds with kin tend to be much more persistent, and the emotional quality of the parent-child relationship shows a great deal of stability over time (Aquilino, 1997). Hence, we hypothesize: *Family cohesion and family warmth positively affect the relation between parents' and children's interethnic marriage attitudes (H6).*

3.3 Method

3.3.1 Sample

The data we used are from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS), a large-scale survey for examining the nature and strength of family relationships in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005; Dykstra et al., 2007). The fieldwork for the first wave took place between 2002 and 2004, and contained 8,161 individuals between 18 and 80 years of age. The overall response rate was 45%, which is about average

for family studies in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005). In 2007 the second wave was conducted, with a response rate of 74%, and a realized sample of 6,026 interviews (Dykstra et al., 2007). Approximately 15% of the wave 1 respondents refused to participate in the second wave, while 11% of the first wave respondents were not reached, too ill, deceased or had left the Netherlands. After the interview, respondents received a supplementary self-completion questionnaire; 95% of them returned it. During the interview, the primary respondents were asked to give permission to send a written questionnaire to several randomly selected family members ('alters'): two children who were at least 15 years old, a sibling, a parent, and a partner (if available). The response rates to the written questionnaire were .31, .34, and .29 for respectively parents, children, and siblings. A substantial proportion of the non-response was due to the fact that the primary respondent did not give permission to contact a family member. When we took this into account the response rates are .45, .42, and .41 for respectively parents, children, and siblings. To examine the potential selectivity bias in these responses, we used Heckman's (1979) sample selection procedure (see the section on Statistical Analyses).

In this study, we mainly used data from the second wave of the NKPS. The first wave of the NKPS is only used to obtain information on the time invariant parental background characteristics when the respondent was 15. Unfortunately, there was no information on intermarriage attitudes of alters in the first wave.

The research design required information on a triad consisting of a sibling pair and a parent. The NKPS allows such triads to be constructed in two different ways. First, a triad could consist of the primary respondent, a sibling, and a parent. We designated these triads as type A triads ($N = 880$). However, a triad could also consist of a primary respondent and two of her or his children. These are called type B triads ($N = 772$). The variables are measured in the same way for both two subsets, except for some small differences to be explained later. In the analysis we analyzed both types of triads simultaneously, but tested for possible differences in the effect of the independent variables on the intermarriage attitude between the two dyad types. For 17 families, information on both types of triads was available. In these families, we randomly excluded one of the two triads to maintain a two-level structure. We considered only those participants who themselves and their parents were born in the Netherlands. A subsample with 1,652 participants (826 sibling pairs connected with one parent) remained.

3.3.2 Measures

In the United States many studies on intermarriage have focused on race as an important demarcation line between groups (Qian, 1997; Rosenfeld, 2008). In the Netherlands, intermarriage is more strongly determined by ethnic or cultural divisions than by racial distinctions (Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006). Hence, in our study we focused on the attitudes towards *interethnic* marriages. Since the 1960s, a diverse group of immigrants have moved to the Netherlands due to the colonial history in the Caribbean area (e.g., Surinam), the recruitment of labor immigrants from Mediterranean countries (e.g., Turkey and Morocco), and, more

recently, the influx of asylum seekers from a wide variety of countries. Currently, 11% of the 16.6 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originates from non-Western countries, with the majority coming from Surinam, Turkey, and Morocco (SCP, 2009). The Surinamese-Dutch are culturally and religiously more similar to the ethnic Dutch and have better socio-economic positions than the Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch immigrants (SCP, 2009).

Interethnic marriage attitudes were measured by three items. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they would disapprove of their (actual or imagined) children's decision to marry someone with a (a) Surinamese, (b) Turkish, or (c) Moroccan background. The response categories of the three items were, 1 = *would bother me a lot*, 2 = *would bother me a little*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *would not bother me*, and 5 = *would not bother me at all*. The items correlated extremely high across out-groups ($\alpha \geq .95$ for all family members), which made it redundant to study the attitudes towards the different outgroups separately. Therefore, the three items were combined into one scale by taking the mean value and higher scores reflect more resistance to interethnic marriage.

Family background characteristics

Parental education was based on the highest educational attainment of either one of the parents, and coded from 0 = *did not complete elementary school* to 10 = *post-graduate*. *Parental social status* was based on the mean score of the parents on the socio-economic index of occupational status (ISEI). Higher scores represented higher socio-economic status. Following De Vries et al. (2009), *parental religiosity* was measured via a dichotomous variable indicating whether both parents were church members (1 = *yes*; 0 = *otherwise*). *Parental urbanization* referred to the population density of the municipality of the family of origin. Higher scores represented higher levels of urbanization. One should note that for triad type A, the family background characteristics reflected the situation when the primary respondent was 15 years old. For subset B, the family background characteristics were based on the current situation of the parents. Although we would have preferred information on parental characteristics during the children's formative period for both samples, we think that this is not a large problem. The current measures are likely to be fairly close to the situation during youth, because these (educational level, religiosity, and social status) are typically crystallized by the time that the children are fifteen. In addition, Mulder and Hooimeijer (1999) showed that there is little urban-rural migration of parents in the Netherlands after the children have reached adulthood. Although the social status (ISEI-score) of the parents might alter after a child reaches the age of fifteen, it probably was strongly correlated to the situation at age 15, and therefore served as a reasonable indicator for the situation in the youth. In our analyses we tested whether the effects of the independent variables differ between the two subsets.

Current family characteristics

Cohesion within the family can be broken down into different but interrelated dimensions, like association, affection, the exchange of support, and the

commitment to group goals and norms (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Brown, 2000). Feelings of affection and the exchange of emotional support are specific indicators of family warmth, whereas the more general notion of family cohesion can be indicated by frequency of family interaction, and a commitment to group goals.

Family contact was measured by asking respondents about their actual face-to-face contact with the parent in the past twelve months. The response categories ranged from 1 = *never* to 7 = *daily*. Questions about contact were not asked when family members lived in the same household; in these cases daily contact was assumed. For each sibling, *family contact* was calculated as the mean score of contact with the parent and with the other sibling.

Family norms referred to the adherence to norms of family obligation. *Family norms* were measured using four items. Sample items were: "Family members should be ready to support each other, even if they do not like each other", and "If one is in trouble, family should be there to provide support". Items were measured on five-point scales that ranged from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*. These items were combined in one scale by taking the mean value ($\alpha = .85$). Higher scores represented a stronger endorsement of norms of family obligation.

Family emotional support was measured by the exchange of emotional support in the last three months between the respondent and the parent. Response categories were (a) *not at all*, (b) *once or twice*, and (c) *several times*.

Family affection was assessed by respondents with eight items reflecting feelings of warmth, and perceived support from the family. Sample items are "I place confidence in my family", "I come from a special and precious family", "At times, I have thought: I wish I had been born in another family", and "Should I need help, I can always turn to my family". The response categories ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. After recoding the negatively formulated item, we used a scale of *family affection* by computing an average score ($\alpha = .86$). A higher score on this variable corresponded with higher family affection.

Individual and control variables

Religiosity was based on church attendance of the respondent with scores ranging from 0 = *never* to 3 = *a few times a week or more*. *Educational attainment* of the respondent was coded from 0 = *did not complete elementary school* to 10 = *post-graduate*. The educational level was adjusted when a respondent was still studying. For these respondents, we computed a mean score based on their obtained level of education and their current level of education. *Social status* was based on the (last) score on the International Socio-economic Index (ISEI) of the respondent in the first wave. Due to nonemployment (e.g., being student, pensioner, unemployed, housewife, disabled), 32% of the respondents had no score on this variable. Therefore, we added an extra category '*not working*' to our analyses (see sensitivity analyses for results). *Urbanization* refers to the degree of urbanization of the municipality, and the response categories varied from 1 = *not urbanized* to 5 = *very strongly urbanized*. In addition to the characteristics described above, we controlled for intermarriage attitudes. *Gender* (1 = *woman*; 0 = *man*), and *age* (years) were measured directly. Respondents with *Children* (reference group) were compared

with those who have no children. The number of missing cases on the variables was limited. The maximum number of missings is 7.6% for religiosity of the parents and the number of missings for the other variables were considerably lower (< 3%). To deal with the missing cases, *imputation* of missing values by chained equations was performed using a *Stata* module (*ICE*) (Royston, 2005). When the intermarriage attitude of a parent was missing the respondent/ triad was excluded from the sample. The descriptive information of the independent variables is presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Means, standard deviations, and ranges for study variables ($N = 1,652$)

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Range</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|--------------|
| <i>Intermarriage Attitudes</i> | 2.93 | 1.06 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Moroccan | 3.06 | 1.15 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Turk | 2.91 | 1.10 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Surinamese | 2.82 | 1.07 | 1 – 5 |
| <i>Family Background Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Education Parents | 6.17 | 2.31 | 1 – 10 |
| Religiosity Parents (1 = both) | .75 | | 0 – 1 |
| Social Status parents | 50.54 | 14.77 | 10 – 88 |
| Urbanization at Age 15 | 2.90 | 1.22 | 1 – 5 |
| Parental Ethnic Intermarriage attitude | 3.35 | .94 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Moroccan | 3.48 | .97 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Turk | 3.36 | 1.00 | 1 – 5 |
| Intermarriage with Surinamese | 3.23 | 1.00 | 1 – 5 |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Education | 7.20 | 1.74 | 1 – 10 |
| Religiosity (Church Attendance) | .49 | .85 | 0 – 3 |
| Social Status | 51.72 | 15.59 | 10 – 88 |
| Urbanization | 3.25 | 1.29 | 1 – 5 |
| Age | 35.76 | 9.29 | 17 – 67 |
| Female (1 = yes) | .60 | | 0 – 1 |
| Children (1 = yes) | .57 | | 0 – 1 |
| <i>Current Family Characteristics</i> | | | |
| Family Support | 2.79 | .38 | 1 – 3 |
| Family Affection | 4.21 | .67 | 1 – 5 |
| Family Contact | 4.71 | 1.16 | 1 – 7 |
| Family Norms | 3.61 | .71 | 1 – 5 |

Note. No standard deviations presented for dummy variables.

3.3.3 Method of analysis

Two common approaches to examine family influences via sibling data exist. One approach uses structural equation modeling (De Vries et al., 2009). The

other approach uses multilevel modeling (see for instance, Kalmijn et al., 2006). Since we were also interested in the way individual factors relate to the individual intermarriage attitudes, and to what extent they help to explain the family influence, we used multilevel sibling models instead of structural sibling similarity models. Hence, our dependent variable was not a latent family factor, but an individual intermarriage attitude. In multilevel sibling models, differences between families and differences between individuals within families are estimated simultaneously based on the resemblance between siblings belonging to the same family (Goldstein, 1995). The total variation in the intermarriage attitude is decomposed into a within-family variance and a between-family variance. The between-family variance pertains to all measured and unmeasured characteristics of the family, and indicates how much of the variation can be attributed to the family of origin. The within-family variance indicates the factors unique to the individual. A multilevel sibling model allows for a correct estimation of the effects of the measured family variables, and enables us to assess to what extent variation among families is explained by these measured characteristics.

A potential problem of the use of multi-actor data is that the level of non-response of family members usually is high. As a result, data are available for a subset of all eligible family triads only. This could result in biased estimates. For instance, studies have shown that close and qualitatively good family relationships are often overrepresented in multi-actor designs. We used Heckman's sample selection models (Heckman, 1979) to correct for this possible bias.

We used information from the primary respondent to construct a set of all possible triads. For all these triads, we determined whether they actually participate or not. Next, we estimated which factors influence the propensity of a triad to actually participated in the study. Independent variables included social and demographic characteristics of the triad members (gender and cohabitation status of the triad members, level of education and age of the primary respondent), characteristics of the relation between triad members (frequency of face-to-face contact, quality of the relationship, exchange of support, gender composition, and the occurrence of conflicts between family members), and experiences of the primary respondent during the interview (the atmosphere of the interview). This information was all obtained directly from the primary respondent. Based on the results of this probit model, we calculated a score that indicates a triad's propensity to respond (Mill's lambda) (Heckman, 1979).

Next, we added Mill's lambda to our multilevel sibling models. The effect of Mill's lambda indicates whether the intermarriage attitude is related to the non-response pattern of the triad, and it automatically corrects the effects of the other independent variables. Lambda is an inverse transformation of the probability of a triad participating. Hence, a positive effect means that those who are less likely to respond have higher resistance to intermarriage (more detailed information with respect to the probit analyses and the Heckman procedure is available upon request from the first author).

In the first step of the analysis we estimated the proportion of the total variance that is due to the family rather than to other factors. Next, we estimated

a model containing family background variables to study the relation between parental social background and (adult) children's attitudes. Then, we included the parental intermarriage attitude to examine the independent contribution of the transmission mechanism for the explanation of the family variance. In the third model we incorporate individual control variables to see to what degree the effects of family background are direct and/or indirect via current individual factors. Further, we focused on the possible direct (Model 4) and moderating (Model 5) effects of family cohesion and family quality. In the fifth model, the moderating variables were centered around the mean. Finally, we conducted a number of additional analyses to examine the robustness of the findings. In particular, it was examined whether family congruence is stronger for same-sex siblings than for siblings with different sex and whether congruence differed between triads consisting of the primary respondent, his or her sibling and his or her parent (type A) and triads consisting of the primary respondent and his or her children (type B).

3.4 Results

3.4.1 Multilevel sibling models

We start by describing the results of the empty model without predictors (not shown). The proportion of total variance due to family was calculated by dividing the between-family variance (.318) by the total variance, which consisted of the within-family variance (.819) and the between-family variance (.318). The proportion family variance in the empty model was .28, which implied that 28% of the total variance in intermarriage attitudes was due to differences between families. Hence, the results show that, in line with our expectations, the family of origin accounts for a substantial part of differences in attitudes towards interethnic marriage.

The results of the multilevel regression models are presented in Table 3.2. Model 1 displays findings for family background variables. Together, these family background variables account for 10% of the family variance, as the between-family variance decreased from .31 to .28. Children of parents with higher education and higher social status reported less resistance to intermarriage. Parental church membership did not have the expected positive effect: Children of religious parents were not more inclined to oppose intermarriage than those of nonreligious parents. The degree of urbanization of the parents had no effect. The positive effect of Mill's lambda indicated that those triads that did not respond had higher resistance to intermarriage. However, non-response did not seem to bias the relevant estimates in the model, as these remain virtually unchanged after inclusion of Mill's lambda.

In the second model, we included the parental intermarriage attitude, which contributed considerably to the explanation of the total family influence, as the family variance decreased by 39%. As expected (H1), we found a strong and significant positive effect of the parental intermarriage attitude. The higher the parent's resistance to intermarriage, the higher the children's resistance to intermarriage. Parental socio-economic status became non-significant, whereas parental education remained significant. This finding revealed that the effect of

Table 3.2 Multilevel sibling models: Intermarriage attitudes

| | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 3.43 | | | 3.24 | | | 3.81 | | |
| <i>Family Background</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Education Parents | -.05** | .02 | .10 | -.03* | .01 | .06 | -.01 | .01 | .03 |
| Religiosity Parents | .11 | .08 | .04 | .05 | .07 | .02 | .03 | .07 | .01 |
| Social Status Parents | -.01* | .00 | .07 | -.01 | .00 | .06 | -.00 | .00 | .03 |
| Urbanization at Age 15 | -.02 | .02 | .02 | -.01 | .02 | .01 | .04 | .02 | .04 |
| <i>Parental Attitude</i> | | | | .33*** | .03 | .30 | .31*** | .03 | .28 |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | | | -.06*** | .02 | .10 |
| Religiosity | | | | | | | .10** | .03 | .08 |
| Social Status | | | | | | | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Urbanization | | | | | | | -.09*** | .02 | .10 |
| Age | | | | | | | -.01* | .00 | .08 |
| Female (1 = yes) | | | | | | | -.08 | .05 | .04 |
| Children (1 = yes) | | | | | | | .21*** | .06 | .10 |
| <i>Lambda</i> | .19* | .09 | .06 | .18* | .08 | .06 | .15 | .09 | .05 |
| <i>Residual Variance</i> | .82 | | | .82 | | | .81 | | |
| <i>Family Variance</i> | .28 | | | .19 | | | .15 | | |
| <i>Explained Family Variance</i> | .10 | | | .39 | | | .52 | | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

parental socio-economic status was only indirect: it is due to the transmission of attitudes.

To test whether the family background effects were (partly) indirect via the intergenerational transmission of positions, we included individual measures of these social and cultural positions. Model 3 provides the results of the analysis after including the individual position variables *education*, *religiosity*, *social status*, *urbanization*, *age*, *gender*, and *having children*. Parental intermarriage attitude remained significant, whereas parental education did not. Thus, we did not find evidence that the direct (socio-economic) context in which children are raised also has a direct influence (H2). The explained family variance increased to 52% which confirms the hypothesis that the family has influence via the transmission of social and cultural positions (H3). Education as an individual variable had a negative effect on social distance. The higher educated had less negative views towards interethnic marriage than the lower educated. Religiosity also was significant. People who attended church more often showed higher levels of social distance. Further, degree of urbanization had a negative effect on social distance. People from more urban areas were less inclined to keep social distance than people from rural areas. Next, less resistance to intermarriage was found for older people and people without children than for younger people and people with children. We did not find effects of (individual) social status and gender. After the inclusion of the

individual variables, Mill's Lambda's was no longer significantly associated with the intermarriage attitude, suggesting the minimization of selection effects.

Table 3.3 Current family characteristics and intermarriage attitudes

| | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 3.56 | | | 3.50 | | |
| <i>Family Background</i> | | | | | | |
| Education Parents | -.02 | .01 | .03 | -.01 | .01 | .03 |
| Religiosity Parents (1 = both) | .02 | .07 | .01 | .04 | .07 | .02 |
| Social Status Parents | -.00 | .00 | .02 | -.00 | .00 | .02 |
| Urbanization at Age 15 | .03 | .02 | .04 | .03 | .02 | .04 |
| <i>Parental Attitude</i> | .30*** | .03 | .27 | .30*** | .03 | .27 |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Education | -.05** | .02 | .08 | -.05** | .02 | .08 |
| Religiosity | .09** | .03 | .08 | .09** | .03 | .07 |
| Social Status | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 | .01 |
| Urbanization | -.07** | .02 | .08 | -.07** | .02 | .09 |
| Age | -.00 | .00 | .05 | -.00 | .00 | .03 |
| Female (1 = yes) | -.08 | .05 | .03 | -.06 | .05 | .06 |
| Children (1 = yes) | .20*** | .06 | .10 | .21*** | .06 | .10 |
| <i>Current Family Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Support | -.27*** | .07 | .10 | -.28* | .07 | .10 |
| Family Affection | -.10* | .04 | .06 | -.09*** | .04 | .06 |
| Family Contact | .08*** | .02 | .09 | .08*** | .02 | .08 |
| Family Norms | .09* | .04 | .06 | .09** | .04 | .06 |
| <i>Interaction terms</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Support * Parental Attitude | | | | .07 | .07 | .03 |
| Family Affection * Parental Attitude | | | | -.05 | .04 | .03 |
| Family Contact * Parental Attitude | | | | .05* | .02 | .05 |
| Family Norms * Parental Attitude | | | | .04 | .04 | .03 |
| Lambda | .10 | .09 | .03 | .10 | .09 | .03 |
| <i>Residual Variance</i> | .80 | | | .80 | | |
| <i>Family Variance</i> | .14 | | | .13 | | |
| <i>Explained Family Variance</i> | .55 | | | .58 | | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

The fourth model (Table 3.3) included family contact, family norms, family-level support, and family affection as current family characteristics. In this model, the proportion of the explained family variance increased to 55%. All four current family characteristics were associated with intermarriage attitudes.

Both family contact and the adherence to family norms increased the resistance to intermarriage. Hence, the results confirmed the fourth hypothesis

regarding the positive effect of family cohesion on social distance. Both measures of family warmth were associated with less resistance to interethnic marriage. The exchange of emotional support within families was related to a more accepting attitude towards ethnic 'outsiders' in the family, as was family affection. Persons who perceived their families as warm and supporting reported less negative attitudes towards interethnic marriage.

The final model tested whether the association between children's and parental intermarriage attitude depended on family cohesion and family warmth. The inclusion of the interaction terms between current family characteristics and the parental intermarriage attitude indicates that the transmission of attitudes differs between families. Family contact conditions the relationship between parent and children's intermarriage attitude, whereby this relationship is stronger in families with higher contact frequency. There was no evidence for a moderating role of family affection, family emotional support, or family norms.

3.4.2 Sensitivity analyses

We tested whether there was a direct effect of type of triad (primary respondent-sibling-parent (type A) versus child₁-child₂-primary respondent (type B)), and whether the effects of the independent variables differed between the two types of triads. Interaction analyses revealed no significant differences between the two subsets in any of the effects. In addition, no direct effect was found for type of triad, and none of the other predictors changed after entering this variable in the model. Hence, it was appropriate to analyze both sets in one aggregated sample without controlling for triad type.

Next, we examined the gender composition of the triads. The total family variance was slightly higher for *same-sex parent-child dyads* (.32) than for *different-sex parent-child dyads* (.28). In addition, *same-sex sibling dyads* showed a somewhat higher family factor (.30) than *different-sex sibling dyads* (.25). However, the gender composition of the parent-child dyad neither showed a direct relation with the intermarriage attitude nor did it condition the association between the attitudes of the parent and the child. Thus, the results were not affected by the gender composition of the triads.

The age-composition of triads was also examined. Since the age difference between most siblings was relatively modest, a part of the family variance might be due to cohort effects. However, when age was added to the multilevel model, the unexplained family variance did not change. Thus, it appears that the age composition of the dyads did not lead to an upward bias of the family factor.

Finally, we examined whether the high proportion of item non-response on occupational status biased the estimates. If a control variable indicating whether the socio-economic status was missing due to non-employment was added to the models, this additional variable was statistically non-significant in all the models. In addition, none of the other estimates of interest changed substantially.

3.5 Conclusion and discussion

Although it is widely acknowledged that the family plays an important role in influencing attitudes, it is surprising how little is known about the impact of family on adult children's ethnic attitudes, and the underlying mechanisms that account for this influence. Therefore, this study examined the role of family of origin for negative ethnic attitudes indicated by ethnic Dutch people's attitudes towards having ethnic minority members as kin through marriage.

This study demonstrated the importance of the family in shaping ethnic attitudes. Almost thirty per cent of the variance in the intermarriage attitude could be attributed to the family of origin. This is quite similar to the results of recent sibling studies on kinship norms (De Vries et al., 2009) and on Jewish intermarriage patterns in the Netherlands (Kalmijn et al., 2006). Although people's attitudes are to a large extent based on personal choices and circumstances, the process of ascription also is important for the formation of ethnic attitudes, despite notions of individualization and modernization (Popenoe, 1988).

Our second aim was to assess the role of family background characteristics for the intermarriage attitude. In our final models, we were quite successful in explaining the family influence, as we were able to account for almost sixty per cent of the between-family variation in the interethnic marriage attitude. The intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes between parents and children was an important mechanism. This is in line with the yet untested claim of Kalmijn et al. (2006) that family background strongly influences homogamy preferences. Contrary to the vast majority of transmission research which has been done with young children or adolescents, this study examined adult children's attitudes. Therefore, our study was able to shed some light on the understudied issue whether family effects remain present in adulthood (Knafo & Galansky, 2008). The results indeed suggest that not only ethnic attitudes of children and adolescents are influenced by their family, but that this is also true for the ethnic attitudes of adults.

The data gave us the opportunity to unravel the possible direct and indirect effects of family background. In line with previous studies (Vollebergh et al., 2001), the indirect influence via the transmission of positions turned out to be important. After the inclusion of other variables, the initially significant effect of parental education became statistically non-significant. Moreover, a part of the family influence is explained by the similarity in social and cultural positions of the siblings. This suggests that the role of the family in intermarriage attitudes can partly be ascribed to the process of the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions. The results of the final model, however, provide no evidence of a direct effect of the parental positions in the child's youth.

Current family characteristics also explained a part of the family influence on intermarriage attitudes. We found support for the hypothesis which stated that family cohesion, expressed via the adherence to family norms and family contact, is positively related to more resistance to intermarriage. This is in accordance with the idea that when the ties are tightly knit and people are strongly oriented towards

the family, family members have an incentive to keep 'strangers' out of the family. On the other hand, family characteristics that indicate warm relations appeared to be related to more acceptance of interethnic marriage. The underlying mechanism might be that warm and trusting family relationships can lead to the development of generalized trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007) and a sense of open-mindedness.

Finally, family cohesion did not only have a direct effect on the intermarriage attitude, but also served as moderator for the effect of parental attitude on children's attitude. More specifically, the more frequently family members interact, the stronger the association between parent's and children's attitudes. These results indicated that the family context not only conditions the relation between parents' and children's attitudes in childhood and adolescence (Jaspers et al., 2008; Roest, Dubas, & Gerris, 2009; Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988), but also in adulthood. We did not find a moderating influence of family warmth, which suggests that the congruence of attitudes seems to depend on the opportunity structure rather than on the affective climate in which this transmission takes place. No evidence was found for the proposition that within families with less warm relationships adult children might distance themselves from their parents and turn away from parental attitudes.

This study has shed light on the magnitude and underlying mechanisms of the family influence on ethnic attitudes. Nevertheless some limitations should be noted. Although we were able to explain more than the half of the family variance, the study raises questions on how to explain the remaining (unexplained) family influence. One possible improvement is to include better measures of family characteristics. There might have been some measurement error, as the participants were asked retrospectively about family characteristics when they were 15 years of age. Furthermore, parental religiosity was measured quite crudely. As a result, the effects of parental characteristics might be underestimated. In addition, despite the fact that attitudes of both parents are probably strongly related, we might have been able to explain more of the family variance if there had been information on both parents.

Future studies could also explore other pathways through which the family influences ethnic attitudes. We suggested that one possible pathway through which parents affect their children is by shaping their social and cultural circumstances in the youth. Children not only adopt attitudes from their parents, but also learn and get influenced by their behavior. In this way, it is possible that interethnic *behavior* of the parents during childhood and adolescence, for instance their contact with interethnic friends, affects the ethnic attitudes of their children. Moreover, parents clearly influence the neighborhood and school in which their children spent most of their youth. This creates shared interethnic experiences between siblings, as there are large differences in ethnic compositions across neighborhoods and schools (McPherson et al., 2001), which in turn might affect their ethnic attitudes. Two other possible sources for attitudinal similarity within families are genetic factors and the cultural climate. There have been studies that indicated that the role of genetic factors in the transmission of social attitudes and orientations is significant (Eaves et al., 1999), although other studies did not found such effects

(Veniegas & Conley, 2000). Some studies have also found that the culturally prevailing value climate at a given time ('Zeitgeist') relates to attitudinal similarity within families, although this influence was not very strongly (Boehnke, 2007).

Another limitation of these data is that the current attitudes of the parent were assessed rather than their attitudes during the formative period for children, which is the period in which the family is believed to influence the attitudes of their members the most (Vollebergh et al., 2001). Longitudinal studies, however, showed that ethnic attitudes are quite stable in adult life, and that the stability is stronger for parents than for their children. In addition, although studies showed that the influence of parents on children is stronger than the other way around (Vollebergh et al., 2001), we have to take into account that a part of the observed similarity between the family members might be due to the fact that they have mutually affected each other. To disentangle this possible reciprocal influence, and to provide stronger evidence for the lasting influence of parental socialization influences, longitudinal data is needed. Further, norms and values that are salient and that serve the ingroup are transmitted relatively strongly (Phalet & Schönplflug, 2001; Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004). The degree to which ethnic outsiders are accepted as close kin by marriage might be a particularly important and salient point of discussion, as an intermarriage of one's child directly affects the lives of all family members, and not in the least, of the parents (Spickard & Fong, 1995). Hence, future studies should examine whether family effects are equally important for other sets of ethnic attitudes of adults.

In addition, it is interesting to study whether family influences on ethnic attitudes are conditioned by family-level and country-level characteristics. Conley et al. (2007) demonstrated that the family factor is smaller in single-parent families than two-parent families because the former are more subject to extra-familial influences and do not profit from the stability and social control that a second parent may offer. In collectivist countries values of family harmony, interdependence and obedience are stressed, whereas in individualist cultures more emphasis is placed on autonomy and equality (Triandis, 1995). Hence, in individualistic societies such as the Netherlands and the United States, we might expect that the influence of the family is weaker than in collectivist societies such as China. Further, stratification scholars have argued that the transmission of social positions and attitudes depend on the institutional context, for instance the strength of the social welfare system (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992). In countries with a strong welfare system, people are less dependent on their families. Therefore, we might expect that in countries with generous social welfare policies, such as the Netherlands and Sweden, the influence of the family is weaker than in countries with less generous social welfare policies like the United States and the United Kingdom.

CHAPTER 4

Attitudes towards interethnic marriage: The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics



This chapter is co-authored by Maykel Verkuyten and Marcel Coenders (Utrecht University, the Netherlands). It is currently revised and resubmitted to *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

4 Attitudes towards interethnic marriage: The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics

4.1 Introduction

Despite an increase in the number of interethnic marriages and a greater tolerance of intimate relationships between members of different ethnic and racial groups, many people still reject a (possible) marriage of their children with someone from an ethnic minority group (George & Yancey, 2004; Kalmijn, 1998; Tolsma, Lubbers, & Coenders, 2008). The opposition to such a marriage can result in family conflicts, parental withdrawal of support, and in extreme cases in family exclusion and ostracism (Clark-Ibanez & Felmlee, 2004; Gaines, 2001). Furthermore, the lack of parental support and the disapproval by parents and other family members are among the main reasons why interethnic relations are more likely to end than intra-ethnic relationships (Wang, Kao, & Joyner, 2006).

The existing family research on ethnic attitudes predominantly examines the ways in which parents affect their children's views and beliefs (see Fishbein, 2002; Hughes & Johnson, 2001). Whether and how one of the most intimate personal relationships in adulthood – with one's partner – is related to ethnic attitudes has not been studied. Research has examined the importance of intimate relationships for individual attitudes (e.g., Kenny & Cook, 1999; Wood, 2000), and it has been found that one's partner's attitude can directly affect one's own attitude (Kalmijn, 2005; Roest, Dubas, Gerris, & Engels, 2006). There is also an indirect effect because partners are not only exposed to each other's views and beliefs but also to each other's socio-economic circumstances that affect individual attitudes (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Smith & Moen, 1998). It is likely that one's partner is also important for the acceptance of an ethnic minority member as close kin by marriage. Such a marriage affects the (nuclear) family life and the parental relationship in particular (Spickard & Fong, 1995).

The present study uses data from a national representative survey to examine the attitude of the ethnic Dutch towards having an ethnic minority member as a (possible) spouse of one's child. Studies on partner relationships typically rely on small and non-representative samples (e.g., Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Roest

et al., 2006). The large-scale and multi-actor nature of our data allows us to focus systematically on the relative importance of several partner and partner relationship characteristics for the attitude towards interethnic marriage, while taking various other characteristics into account.

The focus is on the attitude towards marriage with members of the numerical three largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands: Surinamese-Dutch, Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. We go beyond previous research in three ways. First, based on social influence approaches and intergroup theories, we focus on *partner* characteristics and study the extent to which the attitudes of the partners are similar, and whether the socio-economic status and ethnicity of the partner relate to one's opposition to interethnic marriage. Second, we consider the role of structural (i.e. relationship length, having children) and substantive (i.e. cohesion and warmth) partner *relationship* characteristics for the opposition to interethnic marriage. Third, we assess whether the structural and substantive relationship characteristics moderate the association between the attitudes of the two partners.

4.2 Theory and hypotheses

4.2.1 Partners' opposition to interethnic marriage

Attitude research demonstrates the importance of one's partner's beliefs, behaviors, and socio-economic position for one's own attitudes. The role of the partner for individual attitudes is typically examined in terms of social influence processes (Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Kalmijn, 2005; Roest et al., 2006). Theories of social influence argue that the partner is a socializing agent who communicates his or her beliefs and views and thereby reinforces or changes one's own attitudes. Longitudinal studies have shown that with time people change their views in the direction of their partner's attitudes and that the level of change depends on the importance of the attitude for the relationship (Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Kalmijn, 2005). In general, partners are motivated to avoid conflicts (Kalmijn, 2005). Therefore, the more important the attitude is for the functioning of the relationship, the stronger the degree of attitude similarity tends to be. The marriage of one's child affects the lives of all family members, not in the least that of the parents (Spickard & Fong, 1995). For parents, an ethnic minority member marrying one's child is probably an important and salient point of discussion. Hence, we expect that the partner's attitude towards such a marriage is positively and quite strongly related to one's own attitude (H1).

However, an association between the attitudes of the partners does not indicate social influence processes per se. A positive relation might also be due to selection processes or 'assortative mating': people tend to select intimate others who are similar in social positions and in related attitudes and values (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2003). Furthermore, an association between partners' attitudes might also be due to shared circumstances and shared experiences during the relationship (Byrne, 1971; Kalmijn, 1998, 2005). These different processes are difficult to disentangle, also for panel studies. Most panel studies, for example,

cannot disentangle social influence effects from assortative mating because the attitudes of the partners before they have met are typically not known.

Although we have to be cautious with our theoretical interpretations, studying the association between partners' opposition to a (possible) interethnic marriage of one's child is relevant. The extent to which partners share their views and attitudes is related to the quality and stability of their relationship (Blossfeld & Müller, 2002), and to the effectiveness of parental socialization (Cavalli-Sforza & Feldman, 1981).

4.2.2 Partner characteristics: socio-economic status and ethnicity

People are not only influenced by the *attitudes* of their partner but also by their partner's behaviors, social positions and social networks (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Scheepers & Van der Slik, 1998; Smith & Moen, 1998). Partners influence the social, cultural and economic living conditions of each other and consequently can shape each other's ethnic attitudes. Intergroup theories like realistic group conflict theory (LeVine & Campbell, 1972) and ethnic group competition theory (Coser, 1956) argue that feelings of threat play an important role in prejudices towards ethnic minority groups. Ethnic competition theory states that actual or perceived ethnic competition over economic resources enhances the perceived ethnic threat which, in turn, fosters negative attitudes towards ethnic outgroups. Studies have shown that relatively weak economic circumstances at the individual, neighborhood, municipality and country level are related to more negative ethnic attitudes, including the opposition to interethnic marriage (Esses, Hodson, & Dovidio, 2003; Quillian, 1995; Tolsma et al., 2008). So far, no attention has been paid to the question of whether the socio-economic position of one's partner is related to one's own ethnic attitude. Although the economic interdependence within couples has declined (Sorensen & McLanahan, 1987), many couples tend to form an economic unit and partners rely on each other's income to provide a standard of living. Furthermore, partners tend to have close and committed relationships in which they feel responsible for each other's (economic) well-being.

Thus, the economic position of one's partner might be related to one's own ethnic attitude because ethnic minorities can be seen as a threat to the partner's socio-economic position, even when partners are not economically dependent on each other. Since natives with a lower socio-economic status can rely on fewer resources and are typically more directly in competition with ethnic outgroups than people with a higher socio-economic status, they perceive the ethnic competition more strongly. Perceived ethnic threat evoked by perceptions of ethnic competition enhances in turn negative attitudes towards ethnic outgroups (Quillian, 1995). Hence, we hypothesize that a lower socio-economic position of the partner is related to higher opposition to interethnic marriage of one's child (H2).

Having a partner with a non-native Dutch background can be expected to be related to higher acceptance of an ethnic minority member as a spouse of one's child. It is likely that a positive attitude towards interethnic marriage increases the chance of having a partner with an ethnic minority background in the first place. Additionally, contact theory (Allport, 1954) argues that having a relationship with

an ethnic minority member increases the positive attitudes towards members of ethnic outgroups. This is especially likely when the contact is characterized by intimacy and affection (Pettigrew, 1998).

In the Netherlands, the number of marriages with one of the ethnic outgroups under investigation is low, particularly for intermarriage with partners with a Moroccan or Turkish background (SCP, 2009). In 2008, only 10% of the Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch were married to an ethnic Dutch. Nevertheless, we examined the role of partner ethnicity by including a variable indicating whether one's partner is ethnic Dutch or not.

4.2.3 Cohesive relationships

In addition to economic threats, cultural threats have been found to enhance ethnic prejudice (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Taylor, 1998). Intergroup theories argue that people who have different values, norms, and world views tend to be seen as threatening one's own cultural identity and thereby the cohesion of one's ingroup. As a result, ethnic minorities are evaluated more negatively when they are seen as undermining the society's self-defining values and beliefs (Esses et al., 2003; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). One can expect a similar reaction to perceived cultural threat, in groups based on common bonds such as the family in which lives are intimately related to each other. A member of another ethnic or cultural group can be perceived as threatening the cultural values and internal cohesion of the family. Cohesion refers to the bonds or "glue" that hold members of a group together, and is typically conceptualized in terms of the level of contact between family members, the degree of support and help, norms of family obligation, and the perceived strength of the family ties (see Bengtson & Roberts, 1991; Roberts, Richardson, & Bengtson, 1991). The exclusion of ethnic or cultural outsiders from the family may help to maintain cohesive family relationships (Huijnk, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2010). Thus, members of cohesive families might have a preference for marriage relationships with people who are culturally similar (Byrne, 1971).

Furthermore, an interethnic marriage of one's child might form a source of conflict and irritation between parents. Parents might not only have different views on the partner choice of their child, but can also react differently on questions related, for example, to the cultural upbringing of grandchildren and contacts with the family of their child's partner (e.g., Wang, Kao, & Joyner, 2006). Hence, an interethnic marriage of one's child might form a potential source of conflict between the parents. Following intergroup theories, we assume that a more cohesive partner relationship implies a stronger motivation to protect the relationship from cultural threats. Thus, relationship cohesiveness is expected to be positively related to the opposition towards interethnic marriage of one's child (H3).

4.2.4 Relationship warmth

Apart from the cohesiveness of the partner relationship, relationship warmth might also relate to the opposition to interethnic marriage. Although cohesion

and warmth are interrelated concepts (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991) there are clear differences between the two constructs and each might have different effects (e.g., Doohan, Carrère, Siler, & Beardslee, 2009; Huijnk et al., 2010). We use the term 'relationship warmth' to indicate the level of affection and emotional support that partners experience. The trust that partners develop in each other typically implies a sense of confidence in being able to deal with difficult or unsettling relationship situations. Therefore, partners who have a warm bond might perceive a cultural outsider in the close circle of the nuclear family as less of a threat to their relationship than partners who have a less warm bond.

In addition, research has found that warm and emotionally supportive social ties are related to positive psychological outcomes such as trust, empathy, perspective taking, and to less anxiety and self-uncertainty (Glanville & Paxton, 2007; Hogg, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997). These outcomes, in turn, are factors that stimulate positive interethnic attitudes. Glanville and Paxton (2007), for example, demonstrated that trust in specific people (e.g., family members, neighbors) transcends to generalized trust, and thereby to a more positive attitude towards outgroup members. Empathy and perspective taking have also been found to be related to more positive outgroup attitudes (e.g., Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Further, low feelings of anxiety and self-uncertainty are related to a more positive orientation towards the larger society, and towards outgroups in particular (e.g., Hogg, 2000; Tyler et al., 1997). Romantic partners are especially important sources of emotional support (Priem, Solomon & Steuber, 2009). In line with these notions, Huijnk et al. (2010) found that warm family relationships are associated with more positive ethnic attitudes. In sum, a warm and loving partner relationship is expected to foster tolerance and a more open and accepting attitude towards ethnic minority members as close kin by marriage (H4).

4.2.5 Structural relationship characteristics

Not only substantive relationship characteristics but also more structural ones might affect people's ethnic attitudes. We focus on two structural characteristics, namely having children and the length of the partner relationship. Having children typically implies greater interdependence and higher separation costs, compared to having no children. In addition, having children clearly increases the relevance and importance of the possibility of having an ethnic minority member as a son-in-law or a daughter-in-law. Therefore, having children is expected to be positively related to the opposition to interethnic marriage since it is an indicator of the cohesiveness of the partner relationship (Brines & Joyner, 1999) (H5).

The length of the relationship might also be an indicator of relationship cohesion. This could mean that relationship length is positively associated with the opposition towards interethnic marriage. A long-term relationship, however, might also indicate high emotional support so that relationship length is negatively associated with the interethnic marriage opposition. Both processes might also work simultaneously. This would mean that there are two opposite effects of

relationship length on the ethnic attitude and that these effects cancel each other out leading to zero association.

4.2.6 Conditional associations between partners' ethnic attitudes

The degree to which people are influenced by each other depends on the nature of their relationship (Kenny & Cook, 1999). The more the lives of partners are interdependent, the stronger the (mutual) influence is assumed to be. We are not studying social influence processes as such, but rather focus on attitudinal similarity in terms of the strength of the (cor)relation between partner's attitudes (see Roest, 2009).

In general, similarity in attitudes is dependent on specific features of the relationship (Kenny, 1998; Roest et al., 2006). Previous studies have identified a list of relationship characteristics that moderate attitudinal similarity, both substantive and structural ones (see Arnett, 1995; Schönplflug, 2001; Whitbeck & Gecas, 1988). These studies, however, have predominantly focused on the parent-child bond and not on substantive and structural aspects of the partner relationship (for exceptions see, Kalmijn, 2005; Roest et al., 2006).

Compared to loosely affiliated couples, partners with a strong, cohesive relationship spend more time together, are more oriented to each other, have more joint activities and a stronger overlap in their social networks (Doohan et al., 2009; Roberts & Bengtson, 1991). A cohesive relationship implies shared circumstances and many opportunities for social influence. Therefore, we expect relationship cohesion to foster attitudinal similarity between partners. Thus, the association between the partners' interethnic marriage attitudes is expected to be stronger among couples that have a more cohesive relationship (H6).

The similarity in attitudes might also be higher among couples that have a relatively warm relationship. Research has shown that a warm relationship facilitates attitude transmission between parents and children (Arnett, 1995). For partners, a warm relationship implies mutual responsiveness and a tendency to adapt one's attitudes towards each other (Roest et al., 2006). Thus, we expect relationship warmth to moderate the association between the partner's interethnic marriage attitudes with a stronger association for couples with a more warm relationship (H7).

Structural aspects of the relationship might also condition attitudinal similarity between partners. Partners who have been longer together are likely to have more similar attitudes because they share more experiences and circumstances, and have had more opportunities for social influence (Jennings & Stoker, 2001) (H8). Further, the motivation for convergence might be stronger for couples with children because of the need to 'speak with one voice' when teaching one's children particular norms and values. This motivation is probably stronger when children are still living at home. In addition, compared to couples with no children, couples with children might be more dependent on each other and for them conflicts come with higher costs (Brines & Joyner, 1999) (H9).

In sum, we hypothesize that both substantive (relationship cohesion and warmth) and structural relationship characteristics (relationship length and having children) condition the association between the partners' opposition to interethnic marriage.

4.2.7 Control variables

In studying the relationship between partner characteristics and individual ethnic attitudes we take a number of variables into account. Previous studies have found that older people, the lower educated, the lower social strata and religious individuals express more opposition to interethnic marriage than young people, the higher educated, the higher social strata, and nonreligious individuals (see Duckitt, 1992; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Tolsma et al., 2008). Further, although women in general show more positive attitudes towards ethnic minorities than men, women tend to report more negative attitudes towards interethnic romantic relationships than men (Mills, Daly, Longmore, & Kilbride, 1995). Education, age, gender, religiosity and socio-economic status have also been found to be related to family life (see Komter & Vollebergh, 2002; Rossi & Rossi, 1990), and therefore should be taken into account when examining the association between partner characteristics and the attitude towards interethnic marriage.

In addition to the socio-economic status of the partner, we include educational background of the partner in our analyses. We have no clear theoretical expectations about the influence of educational level of the partner but it might be relevant for people's attitude. For instance, higher educated partners might affect one's own attitude because these partners have higher educated friends and family members who endorse more tolerant views on interethnic relationships. Thus, we will explore the role of education of one's partner for one's ethnic attitudes towards the three numerically largest ethnic minority groups living in the Netherlands.

Since the 1960s, a diverse group of immigrants has moved to the Netherlands due to the colonial history in the Caribbean area (e.g., Surinam and Dutch Antilles), the recruitment of labor migrants from Mediterranean countries (e.g., Turkey and Morocco), and, more recently, the influx of asylum seekers from a wide variety of countries. Currently, approximately 11% of the 16.6 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originates from non-Western countries, with the majority coming from the former Dutch colony of Surinam (339.000), Turkey (378.000), and Morocco (342.000) (SCP, 2009). Although the Dutch are traditionally known for their tolerance towards minorities, the Netherlands has witnessed a shift in public opinion towards ethnic minorities quite recently. The recent public and political retreat of multiculturalism in favor of assimilation goes together with more negative feelings towards ethnic outgroups (Coenders, Lubbers, Scheepers, & Verkuyten, 2008).

4.3 Method

4.3.1 Sample

The data used were from the first (2003) and second wave (2007) of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS). This is a large-scale nationally representative survey on the nature and strength of family ties in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). In the first wave 8,161 primary respondents participated, resulting in a response rate of 45%, which is comparable to other large-scale family surveys in the Netherlands (Dykstra et al., 2005). In the second wave, 74% of the primary respondents of the first wave participated. Questionnaires were also sent to partners of the primary respondents who gave permission to do so.

The data set enabled us to identify both partners of a couple and to consider information about several social, cultural and demographic positions, relationship characteristics and attitudes towards interethnic marriage. Thus, we had independent information about each of the partner's attitudes and positions. Unfortunately, information on the interethnic marriage attitudes of the partner was not collected in the first wave which makes it impossible to study the ethnic attitudes longitudinally. We only used information from the first wave when questions were not asked in the second wave. For instance, questions on the ethnic background of the respondents were only included in the first survey. In the second wave of the NKPS there were 4,269 ethnic Dutch primary respondents with a partner. Approximately 65% of these partners also participated in the study. When the intermarriage attitude of one of the partners was missing, both partners were excluded from the analysis. Our final sample comprised of 2,500 (heterosexual) respondents. We discuss possible problems of selective non-response of partners below.

4.3.2 Measures

Dependent variable

The primary respondents and their partner (*secondary respondent*) were independently asked about their views related to interethnic marriage of their child with three different ethnic minority groups: "Would it bother you if one of your (actual or imagined) children decided to marry someone of [Turkish/ Moroccan/ Surinamese] descent?". Response categories were, 1 = *would bother me a lot*, 2 = *would bother me a little*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *would not bother me*, and 5 = *would not bother me at all*. The scales were recoded so that a higher score indicates more opposition to interethnic marriage.

Partner relationship characteristics

Relationship warmth. We measured the warmth of the partner relationship by the perception of received emotional support from the partner. The respondents were asked to what extent their partner supports them emotionally, "In personal matters that are on your mind", "When you have worries or health problems", and "In your leisure time activities and social contacts". The response categories varied on a

four-point scale from 1 = *no support* to 4 = *a lot of support*, and α for the 3-item scale was .79. We constructed a measure, based on the mean score of the three items, indicating the warmth of the partner relationship with higher levels indicating more emotional support.

Relationship cohesion. The cohesiveness of the partner relationship was based on the following four questions on joint activities and network visits: “Going on day trips, spending time on a hobby or leisure-time association, do you mostly do that with or without your partner?”, “When you visit family, do you usually do that together with your partner or without your partner?”, “When you visit friends, do you usually do that together with your partner or without your partner?”, and “Are your friends mostly your own friends or mostly friends shared with your partner?”. These items had four response categories varying from 1 = *mostly without my partner/ usually without my partner/ mostly own friends* to 4 = *mostly with my partner/ usually with my partner/ mostly shared friends*. The measure for relationship cohesion was created by calculating the mean score on the four items (α was .67). Relationship warmth and cohesion are interrelated concepts and therefore we examined the underlying factor structure of the two scales. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that the proposed two factor model had a good model fit ($\chi^2 = 131.37$, $p < .001$; CFI = 0.97; NFI = 0.97; RMSEA = 0.06). The correlation between the latent concepts of relationship warmth and relationship cohesion was .26.

Relationship length was based on the number of relationship years.

Children. We included two dummy variables indicating whether the respondent has 1 = *at least one child who lives at home* or 2 = *children, but none living at home*. The reference category is *having no children*.

Respondent characteristics

Education was based on the highest educational attainment obtained using ten categories varying from 1 = *did not complete elementary school* to 10 = *post-graduate*. Furthermore, *church attendance* was measured with the categories 0 = *never*, 1 = *a few times a year*, 2 = *a few times a month*, and 3 = *a few times a week*. *Socio-economic status* was based on the socio-economic index of occupational status (ISEI) in the first wave. Higher scores represented a higher socio-economic status. *Age* was measured in years. Finally, *gender* of the respondent was coded as 1 = *female* and 0 = *male*.

Partner characteristics

To assess different possible pathways by which the partner might be relevant for individual attitudes, we examined the relationships between the interethnic marriage attitude, education, ethnic background and socio-economic status of one's partner with one's own attitude. We constructed the variable *Dutch partner* with the categories 1 = *native Dutch partner* and 0 = *non-native Dutch partner*. Following the official definition in the Netherlands, a partner was labeled ‘non Dutch’ (< 3% of the sample) when (s)he or one of the parents was born abroad.

The intermarriage attitude of the partner was based on their views towards an interethnic marriage with the three aforementioned minority groups. However, for

partners with a Surinamese, Turkish or Moroccan background (< 1% of the sample) we did not include the item that refers to the own ethnic ingroup, but only used the two other items as an indicator of their intermarriage attitude.

The variables *partner's education* and *partner's socio-economic status* were measured with similar items as the ones measuring the education and socio-economic status of the primary respondents.

4.3.3 Method of analysis

The number of missing cases on the different variables was low. There were no missing values for age, gender, having children living at home or outside the home, and relationship length. All other variables, except the socio-economic status of the partner, had less than 3% missing values. In total, 36% of the partners had no reported ISEI score. This is mainly due to non-employment (e.g., being student, pensioner, unemployed, housewife, disabled). Therefore, we added an extra dummy variable '*partner not working*' to our analyses. To deal with the missing cases, imputation of missing values by chained equations was performed using a Stata module (*ICE*) (Royston, 2005).

A methodological problem of multi-actor data is the possible selective (non) response of the secondary respondents (so called "alters", in our case the partner). Previous studies (e.g., Groves & Couper, 1998) have shown that the response of alters depends on individual characteristics of the primary respondent, the quality of the relationship, and characteristics of the interview itself. Selective nonresponse can lead to bias in descriptive statistics and in the estimation of regression effects. To correct for possible selective non-response we used Heckman's models (Heckman, 1979).

First, for the sample ($N = 4,269$), whether or not a partner participated was estimated with a probit model. This probit model included social and demographic characteristics of the primary and secondary respondent (gender, age, church visits, education of the primary respondent; education, and religiosity of the partner), characteristics of the interview (interview atmosphere and permission for a next interview) and relationship characteristics (warmth, cohesiveness, relationship length, marital status⁵, and having children). Based on the results of this probit model (available upon request from the first author), a score was computed that indicated a partners' expected propensity to participate (called Mill's Lambda).

Second, the individual propensity score was added to our regression analysis predicting the interethnic marriage attitude. As a measure of the individual propensity to participate, we applied Mill's Lambda which is an inverse transformation of the probability of the partner participating. Hence, a positive effect of Mill's Lambda indicated that those who are less likely to respond have more opposition to interethnic marriage. Moreover, because Mill's Lambda was included in our regression models, it corrected for the effects of the other independent variables.

⁵ We also studied whether marital status was related to the attitude towards interethnic marriage, but no such effect was found.

For assessing the independent role of the partner and relationship characteristics for the respondents' attitude, we analyzed the data in different steps. In the first step, we estimated the effects of respondents' (control) variables: education, socio-economic status, religiosity, age, and gender. Next, we estimated a model containing education, ethnic background, and the socio-economic status of the partner. In Model 3, we included the interethnic marriage attitude of the partner. This enabled us to examine the extent to which the relationships between partner's education, ethnic background and socio-economic status, and the respondents' opposition to interethnic marriage were indirect, via the partner's own attitude. In the fourth model we focused on the role of relationship warmth and relationship cohesion for the opposition to intermarriage. In addition, we included the length of the relationship and having children (living at home or not living a home) as independent predictors. In the fifth and final model we examined whether the relationship between partners' attitudes was dependent on the structural and substantive aspects of the relationship by adding the appropriate interaction terms to the regression equation. All continuous variables were centered prior to the analysis.

4.4 Results

4.4.1 Descriptive results

The descriptive characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 4.1 for both primary respondents and secondary respondents (partners). The mean score among all respondents on the opposition towards interethnic marriage (on a five-point scale) was highest in relation to Moroccans ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 1.08$; 47% above the neutral mid-point), followed by the Turks ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.05$; 41% above the neutral mid-point), and then the Surinamese ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.03$; 34% above the neutral mid-point). Pairwise t-tests showed that all three differences in mean scores were significant ($p < .001$). The three questions were strongly correlated ($r > .83$) and formed an internally consistent scale with α was .95 for the primary respondent and α was .95 for the partners. The high correlations between the items made it redundant to study the attitudes towards the different outgroups separately. Hence, we constructed one general measure of the opposition to interethnic marriage, based on the mean score on the three items. The bivariate correlation between the attitudes of the partners was .50.

Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of the study variables ($N = 2,500$)

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | Range |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|
| <i>Respondent characteristics</i> | | | |
| Opposition to Interethnic Marriage | 3.24 | 1.00 | 1 - 5 |
| Opposition to Marriage with Moroccan | 3.37 | 1.08 | 1 - 5 |
| Opposition to Marriage with Turk | 3.23 | 1.05 | 1 - 5 |
| Opposition to Marriage with Surinamese | 3.12 | 1.03 | 1 - 5 |
| Education | 6.41 | 2.19 | 1 - 10 |
| Socio-economic Status | 50.51 | 16.34 | 10 - 90 |
| Church Attendance | .70 | 1.03 | 0 - 3 |
| Age | 49.61 | 13.35 | 21 - 85 |
| Female (1 = yes) | .54 | | 0 - 1 |
| <i>Partner characteristics</i> | | | |
| Socio-economic Status | 51.28 | 15.86 | 10 - 90 |
| Education | 6.03 | 2.36 | 1 - 10 |
| Dutch Background (1 = yes) | .97 | | 0 - 1 |
| Opposition to Interethnic Marriage | 3.25 | 1.03 | 1 - 5 |
| <i>Relationship characteristics</i> | | | |
| Relationship Warmth | 3.44 | .53 | 1 - 4 |
| Relationship Cohesion | 3.03 | .64 | 1 - 4 |
| Relationship Length | 25.42 | 15.17 | 0 - 64 |
| Children Living at Home (1 = yes) | .43 | | 0 - 1 |
| Children, None Living at Home (1 = yes) | .43 | | 0 - 1 |
| No Children (1 = yes) | .14 | | 0 - 1 |

Note. No standard deviations presented for dummy variables.

4.4.2 Regression analyses: main effects

The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 4.2. Model 1 shows that respondents with higher education, younger respondents, those who are not a church member, those who attend the church less often, and respondents from higher socio-economic strata had lower levels of opposition to interethnic marriage than respondents with lower levels of education, older respondents, those who are church members, those who attend church more often, and respondents from lower socio-economic strata. Females did not show different levels of opposition than males. Further, Mill's Lambda was negatively related to the opposition to interethnic marriage. Thus, those who are less likely to participate have lower opposition to interethnic marriages.

Model 2 contains the results for the partner characteristics. In contrast to our expectation (H_1), the socio-economic status of the partner has no independent effect on the ethnic attitude. Educational level and ethnic background of the partner, however, are significantly related to the opposition to interethnic marriage. Respondents with a higher educated partner and with a non Dutch partner show

lower levels of opposition than respondents with lower educated partners and with Dutch partners. The effects of the respondent's variables and for Mill's Lambda remain similar.

In the third model we added the opposition to interethnic marriage of the partner to the model. As expected (H2), the partner's attitude is strongly and positively related to the respondent's own attitude. People with more negative attitudes towards interethnic marriages are more likely to have partners who also show negative attitudes towards these marriages. After the inclusion of the partners' attitude in the regression equation, education is no longer significantly associated with the respondent's attitude. This shows that the effect of partner's education is mostly indirect. In addition, the effect of education, socio-economic status, church attendance, age, and Mill's Lambda remained significant, though all decreased in strength.

Table 4.2 Respondent and partner characteristics and the interethnic marriage attitude

| | M1 | | M2 | | M3 | |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|
| | B | SE | B | SE | B | SE |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 3.87 | | 3.85 | | 3.51 | |
| <i>Respondent Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Education | -.08*** | .01 | -.06*** | .01 | -.04*** | .01 |
| Socio-economic Status | -.01** | .00 | -.01* | .00 | -.01* | .00 |
| Church Attendance | .09*** | .02 | .09*** | .02 | .05** | .02 |
| Age | .01*** | .00 | .01** | .00 | .01* | .00 |
| Female (1 = yes) | .06 | .04 | .06 | .04 | .01 | .04 |
| <i>Partner Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Socio-economic Status | | | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Education | | | -.04*** | .01 | -.01 | .01 |
| Dutch Background (1 = yes) | | | .22* | .12 | .19* | .11 |
| <i>Partner Attitude</i> | | | | | | |
| Opposition to Interethnic Marriage | | | | | .45*** | .02 |
| <i>Lambda</i> | -.43*** | .12 | -.27* | .13 | -.19 | .12 |
| <i>R</i> ² | .08 | | .09 | | .27 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests).

Table 4.3 provides the results of the analysis after including the relationship characteristics of warmth, cohesion, length of the relationship and having children.

Model 4 indicates that the two substantive relationship characteristics have a significant effect on the opposition to intermarriage. As expected (H4), respondents with an emotionally warmer partner relationship are less likely to show negative ethnic attitudes, whereas respondents with a more cohesive relationship are more likely to show negative attitudes towards interethnic marriages (H3). For the structural relationship characteristics it turns out that having children living at home or outside the home is associated with less acceptance of a member of an

ethnic minority group as close kin by marriage, compared to having no children (H5). Relationship length was not found to be related to the ethnic attitude. In comparison to Model 3, Mill's Lambda is no longer significantly associated with the ethnic attitude in Model 4. This suggests that there is no selection bias in model 4. In addition, compared to the third model both respondent's socio-economic status and age are no longer significantly related to the ethnic attitude.

Table 4.3 Relationship characteristics and the opposition to interethnic marriage⁶

| | M4 | | M5 | |
|---|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 3.39 | | 3.41 | |
| <i>Respondent Characteristics</i> | | | | |
| Education | -.04*** | .01 | -.04*** | .01 |
| Socio-economic Status | -.00 | .00 | -.00 | .00 |
| Church Attendance | .05** | .02 | .05** | .02 |
| Age | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Female (1 = yes) | .01 | .04 | .01 | .04 |
| <i>Partner Characteristics</i> | | | | |
| Socio-economic Status | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Education | -.01 | .01 | -.01 | .01 |
| Dutch Background (1 = yes) | .19* | .11 | .18* | .11 |
| Opposition to Interethnic Marriage | .44*** | .02 | .45*** | .05 |
| <i>Relationship Characteristics</i> | | | | |
| Relationship Warmth | -.10** | .04 | -.11** | .04 |
| Relationship Cohesion | .06* | .03 | .07* | .03 |
| Relationship Length | -.00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| Children (ref = No Children) | | | | |
| Children, at least one living at home | .10* | .06 | .11* | .06 |
| Children, none living at home | .12* | .06 | .12* | .06 |
| <i>Interactions</i> | | | | |
| Relationship Warmth * Opposition Partner | | | .04 | .03 |
| Relationship Cohesion * Opposition Partner | | | .06** | .03 |
| Relationship Length * Opposition Partner | | | .01* | .00 |
| Children, Living at Home * Opposition Partner | | | -.01 | .05 |
| Children, None at Home * Opposition Partner | | | -.02 | .05 |
| <i>Lambda</i> | -.18 | .15 | -.22 | .15 |
| <i>R</i> ² | .28 | | .29 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests).

6 The variable indicating whether a partner had a missing SES score due to non-employment, is not displayed in the tables; in all our models this variable shows no significant relation with the dependent variable.

4.4.3 Conditional associations

To test whether the strength of the association between the attitudes of the two partners is dependent on aspects of their relationship, we included the relevant interactions in Model 5. Table 4.3 shows that the interactions with relationship cohesion and relationship length are significant (H6). The interaction effect between relationship cohesion and the partner's attitude is positive, indicating that the association between the partner's attitudes is stronger when couples have a more cohesive relationship. Contrary to hypothesis 7, no significant interaction effect was found between relationship warmth and the partner's attitude. The warmth of the relationship does not appear to affect the attitudinal similarity between partners. Furthermore, Model 5 demonstrates that the interaction effect of relationship length and the opposition to interethnic marriage of the partner is positive and significant (H8). Hence, the association between the partners' attitudes increases with the duration of the relationship. Having children living inside or outside one's home did not moderate the association between the ethnic attitudes of the partners (H9).

4.5 Conclusion and discussion

Having an ethnic minority member as close kin by marriage often provokes opposition within families (George & Yancey, 2004; Tolsma et al., 2008). The family of origin can constitute an obstacle for the establishment and continuation of intimate interethnic relationships (Gaines, 2001; Wang, Kao, & Joyner, 2006). Although it seems obvious to examine what goes on within nuclear families for understanding interethnic marriage attitudes, research has largely neglected the question of whether and how partner and partner relationship characteristics are connected to these attitudes. Our aim was to shed light on the ways that characteristics of the partner and of the relationship are associated with the acceptance of ethnic minority members as close kin by marriage. In societies in which ethnic cleavages exist, understanding the strength and origins of interethnic boundaries is of utmost importance (Reiter & Gee, 2008; Shelton, Trail, West, & Bergsieker, 2010; Troy, Lewis-Smith, & Laurenceau, 2006; Uskul, Lalonde, & Cheng, 2007).

Compared to previous attitude studies the association we found between the ethnic attitudes of the partners is fairly strong (see for instance, Caspi, Herbener, & Ozer, 1992; Roest et al., 2006). Research shows that the attitudinal congruence tends to be stronger when the topic is more important for the functioning of a dyadic relationship (Davis & Rusbult, 2001). People are more motivated for attitudinal adaptation and agreement when it concerns issues for which disagreements can lead to conflicts. Hence, the relatively strong association between the partner's attitudes might be due to the fact that disagreements about the marriage of one's (potential) children can be important sources of discussion, irritations, and conflict (Doohan et al., 2009).

We used intergroup theories to derive the hypothesis that the socio-economic position of the partner relates negatively to the opposition to interethnic marriage. However, no statistical independent effect was found. The lack of support for the hypothesis might be partly due to the specific content of our ethnic attitude. It is possible that the socio-economic status of the partner is more important for ethnic attitudes that refer directly to the domain of work and economic issues, like the admission of minorities to the labor market or unemployment benefits for ethnic minorities. Although the partner's educational level was related to the respondent's attitude, this relationship turned out to be indirect, via the attitude of the partner.

Several relationship characteristics were found to be associated with the ethnic attitude. We reasoned that a warm or emotionally supportive partner relationship decreases the opposition to interethnic marriage because relationship warmth contributes to open-mindedness, generalized trust, empathy and reduces self-uncertainty and anxiety, which are all factors that are related to positive attitudes towards ethnic minority members (Glanville & Paxton, 2007; Hogg, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Moreover, the trust and confidence that characterizes a warm partner relationship implies that the relationship is strong enough to face possible difficulties. In line with the hypothesis, the results showed that people with a warm partner relationship are indeed less likely to oppose interethnic marriages.

In addition, and also as expected, cohesive partner ties were associated with a more negative ethnic attitude. The findings showed that partners with more shared leisure activities, joint family visits and joint friends (visits) were more likely to be negative about an interethnic marriage compared to partners who were more independent in their activities and network of friends. When the relationship ties are tightly knit, family members have an incentive to keep 'strangers' out of the family. Mixed marriages can undermine the homogeneity and functioning of the (nuclear) family and might negatively affect dyadic family ties. This interpretation is in agreement with the proposition that social cohesion can act as a principle of exclusion when outgroup members are perceived as threatening the culture of the ingroup (Esses et al., 2003; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Our study supports this proposition in the domain of close family relationships. These findings were also in line with previous research that demonstrated that family cohesion is related to more negative ethnic attitudes, whereas family warmth is associated with more positive ethnic attitudes (Huijnk et al., 2010).

Studies that have focused on conditions that stimulate attitudinal similarity between partners are typically concerned with small scaled and nonrepresentative samples, and do not tend to test different conditions simultaneously (but see Kalmijn, 2005). Therefore, a clear understanding of the relationship characteristics that affect the similarity of partners' attitudes is lacking (Gottman & Notarius, 2002; Reis, Collings, & Berscheid, 2000; Roest, 2009). Our study contributes to the existing literature by demonstrating that the strength of the association between the partner's attitudes is dependent on both structural and substantive relationship characteristics. We used a large representative sample and we corrected for possible selective nonresponse of partners via Heckman's models for sample selection bias (Heckman, 1979).

The cohesiveness of the partner relationship turned out to foster attitudinal similarity. Similar to other studies (e.g., Roest et al., 2006), this suggests that shared circumstances facilitate attitudinal similarity between partners. In addition, within less cohesive relationships partners might have a stronger tendency to distance themselves from the views and beliefs of the other. However, unlike other studies, relationship warmth did not condition the attitude similarity of the partners. Hence, we found no evidence for the interpretation that warmth is relevant for attitudinal similarity. It is possible that the reason that we found different results compared to other studies is that we tested the interactions of these related family concepts simultaneously. This study showed that it is the cohesiveness rather than the warmth of the partner relationship that fosters similarity in attitudes. Furthermore, the results indicated that relationship length fosters the similarity in ethnic attitudes of the partners. This might be due to processes of social influence, shared experiences and the exposure to shared circumstances.

Respondents who have children (living at home or not) were more negative towards interethnic marriage than respondents without children. One possible interpretation is that this structural relationship characteristic is indicative of relationship cohesiveness. Another plausible reason is that the question of a possible marriage of one's child is more realistic and consequential for the former compared to the latter group of respondents. Having children or not, however, did not moderate the relationship between the partner's attitudes. Theoretically one could argue that children foster congruence. Having children increases mutual dependence and the motivation to achieve similarity in attitudes in order to prevent conflicts or sending mixed signals to the children. The findings offered no support for this reasoning in the case of ethnic attitudes.

To evaluate the present findings, some limitations should be mentioned. We found that ethnic attitudes of partners are quite strongly related, but future studies need to examine more closely the underlying processes of assortative mating, direct social influence, and shared circumstances and common experiences. Longitudinal panel data on the ethnic attitudes of both partners is necessary to disentangle these effects. In addition, panel data might illuminate the extent to which similarities are a function of age rather than of relationship length (Feng & Baker, 1994), and whether selective couple attrition accounts for the interaction effect of relationship length on similarity, since similar attitudes can contribute to the longevity and stability of relationships (Kalmijn, 2005). Most panel studies, however, are not able to disentangle direct social influences from similarity due to shared experiences. For doing so the attitudes of both partners should be measured before they have met each other which is difficult to do because of not knowing which people will later form a relationship.

Further, in our study we assumed that higher similarity in attitudes corresponds to a stronger (statistical) association between partners' attitudes. But similarity and associations are not necessarily the same concepts. Theoretically an association between variables can be high, whereas the mean scores might differ substantially. However, our descriptive analysis showed that the mean attitude of the respondent and of the partner were similar.

Although we tried to address the different ways through which the partner might affect one's ethnic attitude, we were not able to examine all possible mechanisms. For instance, people are not only exposed to their partner's ethnic attitudes, but also to their partner's ethnic behavior. When a partner has an ethnically mixed social network, it is likely that he or she comes into contact with ethnic outgroup members and these contacts can lead to more positive interethnic attitudes (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1988). The importance of contact is indicated by our finding that having a non-native Dutch partner had a positive relationship with one's ethnic attitude. Future research should examine the consequences of 'ethnic behavior' of the partner in more detail.

Another interesting question for future research is to consider the issue of relationship dominance. Research has shown that people do not always influence each other in a similar degree. For example, men tend to have a stronger influence on the attitude of women compared to the influence of women on men, although the findings are not conclusive (Kalmijn, 2005). It would be interesting to examine cross-lagged dependence models in which the ethnic attitudes of both partners on different time points are measured. This would allow to examine possible dominance effects for gender or for other characteristics like education or socio-economic status. Furthermore, our study focused on the acceptance of an ethnic minority as close kin by marriage. A further understanding of partner and relationship influences on ethnic attitudes might be developed by including other attitudes. The interethnic marriage attitude is relatively salient for partners as it relates directly to the domain of the nuclear family. Therefore there might be a higher level of similarity compared to other measures of ethnic attitudes like the endorsement of minority rights and policies. It would also be interesting to test possible partner effects among different ethnic minority groups because minority couples might depend even more strongly on each other due to their living in a majority dominated setting (Gaines, 2001).

To conclude, this study showed that interethnic marriage attitudes of partners are quite strongly related and that substantive and structural relationship characteristics (warmth, cohesion, and presence of children) were associated with the opposition to interethnic marriage. Furthermore, the strength of the association between the partner's attitudes was dependent on substantive and structural relationship characteristics. Thus, our study makes an original contribution to the understanding of the role of an understudied close relationship, namely the partner relationship, for the acceptance of an ethnic minority member as close kin by marriage.

CHAPTER 5

Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands: The role of family relations and immigrant characteristics



This chapter is co-authored by Maykel Verkuyten and Marcel Coenders (Utrecht University, the Netherlands). A slightly different version of this chapter is published as: 'Huijnk, W., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2010). Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands: the role of family relations and immigrant characteristics. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 41, 389 – 414.'

5 Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands: The role of family relations and immigrant characteristics

5.1 Introduction

Ethnic distance refers to the extent to which people wish to avoid contact with members of ethnic outgroups (Bogardus, 1959). Kinship by marriage is one of the most intimate relationships and, therefore, the domain of life with the highest distance between ethnic groups in society. Marriage is an intimate and often long-term relationship and interethnic marriages indicate close interactions across ethnic group boundaries. Factors related to intermarriage have been studied intensively (e.g., Blau, Beeker, & Fitzpatrick, 1984; Kalmijn, 1998; Qian, 1997). Next to opportunities for contacts and third party restrictions, preferences and attitudes towards intermarriage play an important role (Kalmijn, 1998). In this study, we examine the attitude towards interethnic marriage among majority and minority groups in the Netherlands. We focus on the role of family relations and on immigrant characteristics of different ethnic minority groups.

Most studies on ethnic distance do not include the perspective of both majority and minority group members. However, to fully understand interethnic relations and their social consequences, the views of both sides need to be examined (Kalmijn, 1998). Hence, we focus on the majority group of the Dutch and on the numerically four largest minority groups: Turkish-Dutch, Moroccan-Dutch, Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch. We examine intermarriage attitudes of the ethnic Dutch towards the ethnic minority groups and intermarriage attitudes of the four minority groups towards the Dutch.

We investigate the association between current family relations and the intermarriage attitude. Existing research on family influences is mainly concerned with the socialization of ethnic attitudes and the intergenerational transmission of social positions from parents to their children (see Fishbein, 2002; Vollebergh, Iedema, & Raaijmakers, 2001). However, there is also the possible impact of the *current* family on adults' intermarriage attitude. Family cohesion as well as the

endorsement of conservative family values might go together with the rejection of ethnic outgroups as kin by marriage. It is also possible, however, that warm and supportive family relations lead to more acceptance of interethnic marriage via a higher generalized sense of trust and higher psychological well-being (Glanville & Paxton, 2007).

Few studies have examined variations in ethnic distance between different ethnic minority groups. These groups, however, are heterogeneous with respect to language proficiency, education, religion, cultural values and traditions. In this study, we examine to what extent immigrant characteristics relate to intermarriage attitudes when we take relevant socio-economic and cultural factors into account. Using insights from theories on integration and assimilation we derive hypotheses on the relation between immigrant characteristics and intermarriage attitudes. Researchers of immigrant integration have emphasized the importance of generation, length of stay, language proficiency, and migration motives for the socio-cultural integration in the host society (CBS, 2008; Dietz, 2000; Hwang, Saenz, & Aguirre, 1997; Kalmijn, 1998; Lieberson & Waters, 1988), but it is unclear whether these characteristics are associated with attitudes towards interethnic marriage.

5.2 Theory and hypotheses

5.2.1 Immigrants in the Netherlands

In the last decades, the Netherlands has experienced a large influx of immigrants. Around 11% of the total 16.6 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originates from non-Western countries, with the majority coming from Islamic countries such as Turkey (378.000) and Morocco (342.000), or from the former Dutch colonies of Suriname (339.000) and the Dutch Antilles (135.000) (SCP, 2009). Most immigrants from these groups are first generation immigrants, varying from approximately 50% for the Moroccans to 60% for the Antilleans (SCP, 2009). In the early 1960s, Dutch industry started recruiting migrant labor on quite a large-scale. Most of these migrant workers were Turkish and Moroccan men who were either single or had left their families behind in their home country. Many were recruited in the rural areas where Islam played an important role in life. In the mid-1970s, a process of family re-unification began, as first the Turks and later the Moroccans were joined by their wives and children. At the same time, large numbers of Dutch nationals from the former colony of Suriname settled in the Netherlands. Migration from the Antilles to the Netherlands has traditionally taken place for reasons of education (Entzinger, 1994). More recently the limited employment opportunities in the Antilles prompted many young adults to migrate to the Netherlands.

5.2.2 Interethnic marriage

Research in Western countries has shown that most forms of interethnic marriage between ethnic minority and majority groups have become more common (Kalmijn, 1998). For instance, studies revealed growing out-marriage across birth cohorts for European-American groups, American Indians, Asian Americans, Hispanics and African Americans in the United States (Lieberson & Waters, 1988; Qian & Lichter, 2007), for Asians, Africans and Europeans in Israel (Okun, 2001), and for several ethnic groups in Australia (Jones & Luijkx, 1996). Also in the Netherlands there is a decline of ethnic endogamy, although important ethnic group barriers remain (Kalmijn, Liebroer, Van Poppel, & Van Solinge, 2006; Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006). Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch predominantly marry within their own ethnic group and not often with an ethnic Dutch partner. In contrast, marriages with a Dutch partner are far more common among the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch (SCP, 2009).

It is believed that ethnic endogamy indicates group closure, while interethnic marriage patterns reveal a strong social acceptance between groups (Kalmijn, 1998). However, when members of two ethnic groups do not intermarry this does not necessarily mean that both groups reject each other, or that they are 'closed' to outsiders. If one ethnic group (the majority or a minority) is 'closed' whereas the other is 'open', endogamy may still prevail (Kalmijn, 1998). Also at the individual level, heterogamous or endogamous marriages can be interpreted differently. Marrying someone from one's own ethnic group does not necessarily reflect a disapproval of interethnic marriages. And marrying someone from another ethnic group is not always a sign of acceptance of other ethnicities because one of the partners can be fully adjusted to the cultural and religious beliefs of the other ethnic group. Furthermore, marriage patterns depend not only on preferences, but also on the opportunities on the marriage market (Kalmijn, 1998). Preferences and attitudes play a role in the occurrence of interethnic marriages but relatively little is known about the factors that influence these attitudes among ethnic majority and minority groups (but see, Bobo & Hutchings, 1996; Johnson & Jacobson, 2005; Tolsma, Lubbers, & Coenders, 2008).

5.2.3 Ethnic attitudes in the Netherlands

The Dutch have traditionally been known for their tolerance towards minorities and respect for minority interests. For instance, comparative studies on (blatant) prejudice and right-wing voting indicated that the Netherlands was a relatively tolerant nation (Lubbers, Gijsberts, & Scheepers, 2002; Pettigrew et al., 1997) compared to other Western European countries. However, since the beginning of this century, the political and social climate changed considerably from a more multicultural perspective to one that emphasizes Dutch national identity and the need for assimilation of minority groups (Entzinger, 2003). The recent public and political retreat of multiculturalism in favor of assimilation is accompanied with

more negative feelings towards ethnic outgroups especially towards Islamic groups (Coenders, Lubbers, Scheepers, & Verkuyten, 2008).

In general, interethnic relations are influenced by ethnic group positions and cultural differences. First, majority and minority groups are typically defined in terms of power and status differences. Majority group members may fear loss of status through close interethnic contacts with minority groups (Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Tumanov, & Hraba, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). For minority groups, close contacts with majority group members can increase their status. Second, ethnic distance has also been found to depend on cultural differences related to language, religion and values (Hagendoorn et al., 1998). Ethnic distance is greater when cultural differences are larger. Several studies have found a hierarchy of preferences for ethnic groups among the ethnic Dutch (see Hagendoorn, 1995). People showed the strongest preference for their own group, and next they favored immigrants from Western countries, followed by members of ex-colonial groups such as Surinamese and Antilleans and, finally, immigrants from Islamic countries such as Moroccans and Turks are at the bottom of the hierarchy of preferences. The ex-colonial groups are culturally and religiously more similar to the Dutch and have better socio-economic positions than the Turkish and Moroccan immigrants (SCP, 2009). The central role of race in the context of the United States (Kalmijn, 1993; Lieberman & Waters, 1988; Qian & Lichter, 2001) does not influence interethnic relations in the Netherlands to the same degree because of supposed lower levels of racism (Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006).

In public debates and in the media, Islam and Muslims are typically presented and perceived as threatening the national identity, culture, and security. Furthermore, the Moroccan-Dutch particularly have become symbolic for problems related to ethnic minorities and immigration (SCP, 2004). This group clearly faces the highest level of threat to the value of their group identity. The condemnation of Moroccan-Dutch by the public opinion can lead to a strong self-orientation within the Moroccan community, along with a more negative attitude towards the Dutch majority group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Thus, the participants of Surinamese and Antillean origin can be expected to have more favorable attitudes towards kinship by marriage with a Dutch person compared to the participants of Turkish and Moroccan origin. Furthermore, because of their stigmatized position the Moroccan-Dutch are expected to have the most negative attitudes towards this kind of marriage.

5.2.4 Family relations and intermarriage attitude

Research on family influences on ethnic distance has mainly examined the socialization of attitudes, the intergenerational transmission of social positions from parents to their children, and the influence of the material, social and political context that prevailed during the pre-adult years (Kalmijn et al., 2006; Vollebergh et al., 2001). However, the impact of the family might go beyond socialization in the pre-adult years, and beyond the relationship between parents and their children. We focus upon the relationship between current family aspects, such as

family norms, family ties and family conservatism, on the one hand, and attitudes towards ethnic kinship by marriage, on the other hand.

There are different theoretical arguments for the relationship between these kind of family aspects and intermarriage attitudes. First, similarity theory states that people like characteristics in others that are similar to their own (Byrne, 1971). Sociologists use the term homophily to indicate that people tend to associate with others who have similar educational, occupational, religious or linguistic characteristics (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). In addition, members of social (e.g., family) networks are regulated by norms and the sanctioning of non-normative behavior (Surra & Milardo, 1991). An example are norms of endogamy that are sometimes emphasized by groups because endogamy helps to maintain group cohesion, values and traditions (Clark-Ibanez & Felmler, 2004). Thus, family cohesion might foster the preference for interactions with others who are culturally similar. Cohesion refers to the bonds or “glue” that hold members of a group together. People from a different cultural background are often seen as threatening the identity and solidarity of one’s own group (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). This does not only apply to large-scale categories but also, or even more so, to small scale or common-bond groups, such as the family. Cohesive families have an incentive to keep ‘ethnic strangers’ out of the family because these ‘strangers’ form a risk to the stability and solidarity within the family. Family cohesion is expressed in strong family ties which, for example, are indicated by the frequency of contact between family members and the endorsement of family norms (Burt, 2000; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997). Therefore, we expect that family cohesion (frequent contacts and the endorsement of family norms) is positively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage (H1).

Second, research has shown that people who emphasize conservative values are more likely to display prejudice and negative attitudes towards ethnic outgroups (Duckitt, 1992; Lambert & Chasteen, 1997). Therefore, it is likely that people who endorse conservative family values tend to prefer greater ethnic distance in family relations. In addition, research has shown that conservative family values are associated with aspects of cohesive family systems, such as the strong normative orientation of the family (Kagitçibasi, 1996; Triandis, 1995). Because of this relationship, it is important to study conservative family values in addition to family cohesion. Furthermore, ethnic groups have been found to differ in their emphasis on family norms and conservative family values. Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch people have a more collectivist cultural background and tend to be more traditional in their family attitudes and behaviors than the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch who, in turn, do not differ much from the ethnic Dutch (SCP, 2009). Ethnic group differences in the endorsement of family norms and conservative family values can account, in part, for the expected group differences in the attitude towards interethnic marriage. Thus, we expect that conservative family values are positively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage (H2). In addition, it is expected that family norms and conservative family values will, in part, account for the ethnic group differences in interethnic attitudes.

Third, people develop a feeling of trust in others within secure and warm relationships with family members and friends. This feeling can develop into a more generalized sense of trust. For instance, Glanville and Paxton (2007) demonstrated that trust developed within the family can translate into a more generalized sense of trust. Generalized trust goes beyond the circle of familiar people and extends the boundaries of the own social group (Uslaner, 2002). In addition, research has shown that emotionally supportive family relationships lead to psychological well-being, whereas unsupportive relationships lead to self-uncertainty (Roberts & Bengtson, 1996). Psychological well-being is related to a more open and accepting orientation towards outgroups (Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997) and self-uncertainty leads to bolstering of one's cultural norms and defensive reactions towards outsiders (Hogg, 2000). Thus, we hypothesize that warm (e.g., affective and emotionally supportive) family ties are related to less resistance to interethnic marriage (H3).

5.2.5 Immigrant characteristics and intermarriage attitudes

Numerous authors have argued that interethnic marriage is a core measure of social integration (Gordon, 1964; Hwang et al., 1997; Lieberson & Waters, 1988), and it is often viewed as the final step in the assimilation process (Gordon, 1964; Qian & Lichter, 2001). We argue that also positive attitudes towards intermarriage can be considered as an indicator of socio-cultural integration, as they provide a signal that immigrants have adopted, or at least accepted, cultural patterns of the majority population (Qian & Lichter, 2007). Therefore, we apply general propositions of integration theories to explain attitudes towards interethnic marriage of immigrants.

Classical assimilation theory originated largely from the work of Park (Park & Burgess, 1921), Warner and Srole (1945), and Gordon (1964). Two of the core hypotheses postulated by assimilation theory were that the integration of immigrants would increase 1) with a longer stay in the host country, and 2) with successive generations⁷. The underlying idea is that immigrants who stay longer in the host country and later generations of immigrants, are more strongly socialized in the culture of the host society. They develop more primary ties with native members of the host society, and are psychologically less oriented and focused on the country of origin.

In recent decades, classical assimilation theory has been subjected to a lot of criticism, especially on the ideas that assimilation is an inevitable, straight line and unidirectional outcome for all immigrants, without taking into account differences between minority groups and between receiving country characteristics (see for instance, Alba & Nee, 1997; Berry, 1997; Portes & Zhou, 1993). For instance, studies

⁷ It should be remarked that also the age of migration is often identified as an important factor in assimilation theories (Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2005). We do not treat this aspect of assimilation theory here.

have shown that next to straight line assimilation, other forms of acculturation are also possible (Berry, 1997; Portes & Zhou, 1993). Not all groups and individuals undergo acculturation in the same way and it depends simultaneously on the extent to which minority groups wish to maintain their culture of origin, and the degree to which they desire contacts with the majority group.

Further, segmented assimilation theory (Portes & Zhou, 1993) offered a framework for understanding why different patterns of adaptation emerge among contemporary immigrants and their children, based on both individual characteristics and conditions of the receiving context, and especially on the interactions between them. Nowadays, it is recognized that the integration of immigrants also depends on aspects of the receiving country, such as the reactions and openness of the majority population and government policy (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996). A minority group's willingness and ability to integrate is influenced by how the majority population treats that particular group.

Although classical assimilation theory turned out not to tell the whole story about the integration of immigrants, most findings did not contradict the assimilation hypotheses. It is rarely found that over the life-course or with successive generations, the socio-cultural integration of immigrants declines (Van Tubergen, 2004). For a large part, the diverse empirical outcomes can be seen as intergroup differences in the speed to which immigrants integrate into the host country (Alba & Nee, 1997, 2003; Qian & Lichter, 2007).

While it has been frequently demonstrated that actual intermarriage patterns increase with length of stay and across successive generations (Kalmijn, 1998; Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006; Lieberson & Waters, 1988), surprisingly little is known about the degree to which these characteristics also relate to attitudes towards intermarriage. Based on the general notions of assimilation theory, we hypothesize that second generation immigrants (H4a), and immigrants with a longer length of stay (H4b) show less resistance to intermarriage compared to immigrants that are born abroad and with shorter lengths of stay.

In addition, we want to study the relation between intermarriage attitudes and two other immigrant characteristics that have been linked to the cultural integration of immigrants. First, proficiency in the language of the host country is an important condition for full participation in society. It indicates an orientation towards the host country, it is crucial for economic participation, and it is an important resource that facilitates interethnic interaction and intimate relationships (Chiswick, Lee, & Miller, 2004; Hwang et al., 1997; Martinović, Maas, & Van Tubergen, 2008; Van Tubergen & Maas, 2007). It gives immigrants the opportunity to communicate with natives, and it might even render such interaction more appealing to them compared to those who do not speak the language as well. Further, cultural similarity facilitates social interactions, and language is an essential part of culture (Van Tubergen & Maas, 2007). Thus, we expect that among immigrants, Dutch language proficiency is negatively related to the resistance to marriage with a Dutch (H4c).

Second, the attitude towards interethnic marriage might be related to the original motivation for migration. The decision to migrate is based on a variety of

motives associated with safety, labor, education, and family life. In public debates, it is often assumed that restrictive and selective immigration policies are a necessary precondition for integration. For instance, it is believed that family reunification and family formation with someone from the country of origin hampers the social integration of minority groups (Hagendoorn, Veenman, & Vollebergh, 2003, p.4). Immigrants who move for family reasons, are more strongly motivated to preserve their own language, cultural traditions and religious practices compared to immigrants who migrate for economical or educational reasons (Dietz, 2000). Furthermore, family immigrants might be relatively less oriented towards the host country and maintain stronger ties with the country of origin. Therefore, we expect that people who migrated out of family reasons are more inclined to reject ethnic Dutch people as kin by marriage compared to people who migrated for economic or educational reasons (H4d).

5.2.6 Correlates of intermarriage attitudes

In this study we included age, gender, education, income, having a partner, number of children, religious affiliation, and church attendance as control variables. Previous studies have shown that education and income are negatively related to ethnic distance (Gijsberts & Coenders, 2002; Schuman, Steeh, Bobo, & Krysan, 1997). Older people show more ethnic distance than younger ones, particularly in the domain of family (e.g., Johnson & Jacobson, 2005). Generally, results indicated less ethnic distance among females than males (Johnson & Marini, 1998). However, Muir and McGlamery (1984) showed that men are more likely to accept persons of other ethnic groups in more intimate relationships (e.g., to marry, date, or share a room), whereas women are more likely to accept less intimate interethnic relationships (e.g., as a neighbor or as a co-worker). There is a close relationship between religion and ethnic distance. The more religious an individual is, the larger the ethnic distance (see Batson & Burris, 1994; Scheepers, Gijsberts, & Hello, 2002).

5.3 Method

5.3.1 Sample

To test the hypotheses, we analysed data from the main and immigrant samples of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (Dykstra et al., 2005). The NKPS main sample is a large-scale study of family relations among 8,161 participants (aged 18 to 79) within households in the Netherlands. In the NKPS, participants reported on several family relationships: with their partner, siblings, parents and children. The immigrant sample was drawn from 13 Dutch cities in which the majority of immigrants live. It includes 1,410 participants from Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese or Antillean origin. The topics covered in the main and immigrant questionnaires were similar, and provided comparable data.

The NKPS had an overall response rate of 45%, which is comparable to that of other large-scale family surveys in the Netherlands (De Leeuw & De Heer, 2001). The response rate among the immigrants was in the same range as that of the Dutch (from 41% for the Surinamese-Dutch, to 52% for the Turkish-Dutch). The participants were interviewed in their homes, in most cases by an interviewer of the same ethnic background. In this study, we combined both samples into one dataset including the ethnic Dutch and the four immigrant groups. In the analyses, we considered only those participants who returned the self-completion questionnaire and reported on the relationship with at least two family members. This latter criterion was used to ensure that the family measures were not based on a single relationship. Furthermore, participants with missing values on the dependent or independent variables were excluded. After selection, the sample consisted of 5,897 ethnic Dutch, 332 Turkish-Dutch, 295 Moroccan-Dutch, 307 Surinamese-Dutch, and 327 Antillean-Dutch participants.

5.3.2 Measures

Dependent variables

Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they would disapprove of their (actual or imagined) child's decision to marry a spouse from a different ethnic group. For the four immigrant groups the question was: "Would it bother you if one of your children would marry a Dutch person?". For the ethnic Dutch participants, interethnic marriage attitudes were measured by asking three questions on their attitude towards three ethnic outgroups: "Would it bother you if one of your children would marry a Turkish [Moroccan, Surinamese] person?". There was no information in the NKPS survey on the attitude towards intermarriage with an Antillean person. Response categories were 1 = *would bother me a lot*, 2 = *would bother me a little*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *would not bother me*, and 5 = *would not bother me at all*. The scale was reversed so that a higher score indicated more resistance to interethnic marriage. The ethnic Dutch participants had the highest resistance to a marriage with a Moroccan person ($M = 3.34$), followed by a Turkish person ($M = 3.23$), and they reported the least resistance towards a Surinamese person ($M = 3.10$). Paired samples t-tests showed that all the differences between the three mean scores were significant ($p < .05$). However, the three questions were very highly correlated and Cronbach's alpha for these three items was .95. Therefore, an averaged score was used for the resistance to marriage with an ethnic minority group member. Higher scores indicated more resistance to interethnic marriage.

Independent variables

We included different family relational aspects. Family norms and family contact were two indicators of family cohesion. The exchange of emotional support and feelings of affection were indicators for warm family ties. Family conservatism was indicated by the endorsement of traditional family values.

Family norms were measured with 5 items: "Children should look after their sick parents", "In old age, parents must be able to live in with their children", "Children

who live close to their parents should visit them at least once a week”, “Parents should provide lodging to their adult children if they need it”, and “Grandparents should be prepared to look after their grandchildren regularly”. Five-point scales were used ranging from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*. The five items were combined in one scale by taking the average score ($\alpha = .80$). A higher score indicated a stronger endorsement of the norm of family obligation.

Family contact was measured by the frequency of face-to-face contact and of telephone and/or (e-)mail contact in the past twelve months with siblings, parents and children of the participants. The response categories varied from 1 = *never* to 7 = *daily*. To obtain a single contact variable, the mean score on both contact variables and for all family members was computed.

Family emotional support was measured by the exchange of emotional support (e.g., exchange of personal interest and personal advice) in the last three months between the participants and their siblings, parents and children. Response categories were 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *once or twice* and 2 = *several times*. A score for family emotional support was created by computing the average scores on the exchange of the different types of support with at least two family members.

Family affection indicated feelings of affection for the family and was measured with four items in the anchor’s self-completion questionnaire. The items were: “When I do something for my family, I do it because I care about them”, “I rely on my family more than on my friends”, “I prefer discussing problems with my family rather than my friends”, and “I meet with friends rather than with my family”.

The response categories ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. The negatively formulated item was recoded. We used a scale of *family affection* by computing an average score ($\alpha = .62$). A higher score corresponded with more feelings of (family) affection.

Family conservatism was measured by four items about the importance of marriage and traditional family roles. The items were: “Men and women are allowed to live together outside marriage”, “A woman must quit her job when she becomes a mother”, “The parents’ opinion must play an important role in the choice of a partner for their child”, and “It’s best if children live at home until they get married”. Response categories ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. A higher score indicated stronger endorsement of (traditional) family values. ($\alpha = .76$).

Ethnic background. The ethnic background of the participants was based on their country of birth and that of their parents⁸. Participants born in the country of origin or with at least one parent born in that country were assigned to one of the four immigrant groups.

8 In our sample, 90% of the migrants have parents that have the same ethnic background as the respondent. For less than 5% of the respondents one of the parents is from Dutch descent.

Immigrant characteristics

For measuring the *migration motives*, participants were asked: "What was the most important reason for your (last) move to the Netherlands?". Immigrants who migrated for family reasons (the response categories 'family reunion', 'marriage', 'family formation', and 'came with parents') were combined into one group. This group was compared to those who migrated for other reasons ('work', 'studies', 'social security', and 'political situation').

Immigrant generation. Participants' country of birth was used to assess who was born outside the Netherlands (first generation) or in the Netherlands (second generation). The percentage of second generation immigrants was relatively low in our sample compared to the population. This was due to the age criterion: Respondents had to be at least 18 years or older. The second generation has of course no migration motive. Therefore, we compared three groups of participants: First generation immigrants who migrated out of family reasons ('family migration motive'), first generation immigrants who migrated out of other reasons ('other migration motive'), and second generation immigrants.

Language proficiency was assessed by asking the interviewer "How fluent is the respondent in Dutch?". The response categories were 1 = *bad*, 2 = *mediocre*, and 3 = *good*.

Length of stay of the immigrants was measured by subtracting the year of migration from interview year. Following Kalmijn and Van Tubergen (2006), we based the year of migration for the second generation immigrants on their birth year. Since a dummy variable was included for the second generation immigrants, the imputation value did not influence the effect of length of stay.

Individual background variables

We controlled for several possible confounding factors. The *age* of the respondent was measured in years. The dichotomous variable *female* indicated whether the participant was 1 = *female* or 0 = *male*. Participants were asked about the total number of *children* they have had throughout their life. The variable *married* indicated whether the participant was 1 = *married* or 0 = *unmarried*. *Educational attainment* was measured by the highest educational level obtained in the Netherlands or abroad. The educational level was divided into eight categories, varying from 0 = *no education completed* to 7 = *university education*. Immigrant participants were asked to indicate their monthly *household income* in pre-defined categories, varying from 1 = 0-550 euro to 11 = 3000 euro and higher. For the ethnic Dutch, participants' monthly income was combined with their partners' income in order to calculate the total net household income per month. Household income was then recoded into the same 11 categories as for the immigrant participants. Missing values on income were replaced by the mean of the ethnic group. Two measures of religiosity were included in the analysis, namely *religious affiliation* and *church attendance*. Participants were asked whether they belonged to a religious denomination. A dichotomous variable with 1 = *church member* and 0 = *no church member* was included in the analysis. Due to problems of multi-collinearity with ethnic background (almost all Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch are Muslim),

the different religious denominations could not be taken into account. *Church attendance* was phrased as ‘attending services of a church or community of faith’ with four answering categories ranging from 0 = *never*, 1 = *a few times a year*, 2 = *a few times a month*, to 3 = *a few times a week*.

5.4 Results

5.4.1 Descriptive findings

Table 5.1 shows the descriptives (means and standard deviations) of the independent variables by ethnic group.

Table 5.1 Descriptives of the independent variables by ethnic group ($N = 7,158$)

| | Range | Ethnic Dutch ($n = 5,897$) | | Surinamese-Dutch ($n = 307$) | | Antillean-Dutch ($n = 327$) | | Turkish-Dutch ($n = 332$) | | Moroccan-Dutch ($n = 295$) | |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| | | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | 0 - 7 | 4.20 | 1.79 | 3.35 | 1.93 | 3.91 | 2.12 | 2.11 | 1.86 | 1.96 | 2.17 |
| Household Income | 1 - 11 | 4.90 | 2.88 | 5.56 | 2.97 | 5.13 | 3.19 | 5.39 | 2.56 | 4.12 | 1.86 |
| Age | 18 - 79 | 46.63 | 14.53 | 43.38 | 12.84 | 37.87 | 11.97 | 38.93 | 11.46 | 38.69 | 12.73 |
| Female | 0 - 1 | .59 | | .63 | | .51 | | .45 | | .41 | |
| Children | 0 - 11 | 1.69 | .49 | 2.09 | 1.93 | 1.49 | 1.65 | 2.30 | 1.50 | 2.68 | 2.38 |
| Married | 0 - 1 | .58 | | .35 | | .22 ⁹ | | .78 | | .77 | |
| Religious Affiliation | 0 - 1 | .53 | | .79 | | .69 | | .97 | | .99 | |
| Church Attendance | 0 - 3 | .72 | 1.00 | .92 | 1.04 | .89 | 1.06 | 1.57 | 1.17 | 1.60 | 1.30 |
| <i>Family Relations</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Conservatism | 1 - 5 | 1.97 ^a | .71 | 2.42 ^b | .87 | 2.27 ^b | .72 | 3.51 ^c | .86 | 3.70 ^d | .75 |
| Family Norms | 1 - 5 | 2.90 ^a | .65 | 3.40 ^b | .88 | 3.19 ^c | .70 | 3.90 ^d | .67 | 4.24 ^e | .63 |
| Family Contact | 1 - 7 | 4.17 ^b | .95 | 4.15 ^b | 1.33 | 3.68 ^a | 1.23 | 4.11 ^b | 1.46 | 4.37 ^c | 1.39 |
| Family Affection | 1 - 5 | 3.42 ^a | .64 | 3.59 ^b | .79 | 3.65 ^b | .62 | 3.96 ^c | .68 | 3.77 ^d | .76 |
| Emotional Support | 1 - 3 | 2.17 ^a | .44 | 2.39 ^c | .52 | 2.11 ^a | .57 | 2.10 ^a | .62 | 2.25 ^b | .50 |
| <i>Immigrant Characteristics</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay | 0 - 52 | - | - | 25.55 | 9.23 | 18.01 | 11.56 | 20.93 | 8.61 | 19.63 | 8.95 |
| Language Proficiency | 1 - 3 | - | - | 2.94 | .26 | 2.95 | .25 | 2.24 | .75 | 2.49 | .68 |
| Family Migration Motive | 0 - 1 | - | - | .45 | | .21 | | .65 | | .60 | |
| Other Migration Motive | 0 - 1 | - | - | .44 | | .67 | | .25 | | .34 | |
| Second Generation | 0 - 1 | - | - | .11 | | .12 | | .10 | | .06 | |

* Row means with different superscripts (a,b,c) represent significant differences at $p < .05$.

Note. No standard deviations presented for dummy variables.

9 The percentage of married Antillean-Dutch (22%) might seem remarkably low. This is due to the fact that Antillean-Dutch are relatively often single, and cohabit often without being married (CBS, 2008).

Ethnic group differences in the family measures were examined with analysis of variance and post-hoc tests (Bonferroni). It turned out that there were three clusters of groups for the endorsement of family norms and for conservative family values. The Turkish-Dutch and the Moroccan-Dutch endorsed these norms and values more strongly than the other three groups, and the Moroccan-Dutch had a significantly higher score than the Turkish-Dutch. The Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch differed significantly from the ethnic Dutch, and the Antillean-Dutch had a higher score on family norms than the Surinamese-Dutch. The ethnic Dutch endorsed family norms and conservative family values the least. Feelings of family affection followed a similar ethnic pattern, whereby Turkish-Dutch had the highest score on feelings of affection and the ethnic Dutch the lowest. In addition, the Moroccan-Dutch had the highest level of family contact, whereas the Antillean-Dutch reported the lowest levels of family contact. The ethnic group differences in emotional support were relatively small with the Surinamese-Dutch and the Moroccan-Dutch having a somewhat higher score compared to the other three groups.

5.4.2 Family relations and the resistance to interethnic marriage

Stepwise regression analyses were performed to test the hypothesized relationships between family characteristics and the resistance to interethnic marriages. In doing so, we weighted for differences in ethnic group size in order to ensure that the results are not due to the numerical dominance of the largest ethnic group (i.e. the ethnic Dutch). The regression analyses were carried out in three steps. The model in the first step contained the ethnic groups with the ethnic Dutch serving as the reference category. In Model 2, the control variables were entered: education, household income, age, gender, religious affiliation, church attendance, marital status and the number of children. This showed us to what extent ethnic group differences are due to differences in these characteristics. In the third model the influence of the family measures (family conservatism, family norms, family contact, family affection, and family emotional support) were entered to the regression equation. We computed sheaf coefficients to determine the standardized regression coefficient (Beta) of the ethnic groups in the analysis. The sheaf coefficient is the combined effect of a set of nominal variables. The variables were combined additively using weights derived from an ordinary least squares regression. This made it possible to compare the total effect of the ethnic group differences on the resistance to interethnic marriage across the different models.

The results in Model 1 showed that the participants of Turkish, Antillean and Surinamese origin had less resistance compared to the ethnic Dutch, whereas the Moroccan-Dutch reported higher resistance. The regression analysis indicated that ethnic background was strongly related to the level of resistance with a total explained variance of 44%. An additional one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that the four immigrant groups differed significantly in their attitude towards marriage with an ethnic Dutch person, ($F(3,1261) = 322.81$, $p < .001$). Post-hoc analyses showed that all group differences were significant with the

Moroccan-Dutch having the most resistance ($M = 3.54$), followed by the Turkish-Dutch ($M = 2.73$), the Surinamese-Dutch ($M = 1.50$), and the Antillean-Dutch ($M = 1.30$) who practically reported no resistance. The mean score for the ethnic Dutch participants was 3.22.

Model 2 added the control variables to the initial model, which led to an increase of the variance to .47. In this model the ethnic group differences in resistance remained quite large (beta decreases from .66 to .61). The differences between the ethnic Dutch, on the one hand, and the participants of Turkish, Surinamese and Antillean origin, on the other hand, became even larger. However, the difference in resistance between the ethnic Dutch and the Moroccan-Dutch was smaller and no longer significant. In Model 2, education, household income, and age were negatively related to the resistance towards interethnic marriage. The higher the level of education, the higher the household income, and the older the participants, the less resistance was indicated. In addition, women showed higher levels of resistance than men. Furthermore, the two variables related to family structure had a positive effect on the resistance towards interethnic marriage. The number of children and being married were positively related to resistance. Religious affiliation and church attendance were also positively associated with the resistance to interethnic marriage.

In Model 3, the family characteristics were included: the explained variance increased to .50. Compared to the first model, all immigrant groups, including the Moroccan-Dutch, had lower levels of resistance than the ethnic Dutch. The effect of 'ethnic group' decreased from .61 to .57. This indicated that the family characteristics explained a small part of the ethnic group differences in resistance. However, in Model 3 the difference in attitudes between the ethnic Dutch and the immigrant groups (particularly the Moroccan-Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch), increased compared to the first two models. After the inclusion of the family characteristics, education and religious affiliation were no longer significantly associated with the intermarriage attitude. As expected, the endorsement of conservative family values was positively associated with the resistance to interethnic marriage. Stronger endorsement of these values was related to higher resistance. Furthermore and as expected, the two measures of family cohesion were positively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage. Stronger endorsement of family norms and more family contacts were independently related to higher levels of resistance. In addition, family affection was negatively associated with resistance. Thus, affective family ties decreased the resistance towards a marriage with an ethnic outgroup member. The exchange of emotional support within families was not related to the intermarriage attitude.

Table 5.2 Family relations and the resistance to interethnic marriage

| | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | |
|--|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| <i>Ethnic Background</i> (Ethnic Dutch = ref) | | | | | | | | | |
| Moroccan-Dutch | .32*** | .04 | | -.01 | .05 | | -.48*** | .05 | |
| Turkish-Dutch | -.49*** | .04 | | -.74*** | .05 | | -1.11*** | .05 | |
| Surinamese-Dutch | -1.73*** | .04 | | -1.78*** | .04 | | -1.91*** | .04 | |
| Antillean-Dutch | -1.92*** | .04 | | -1.92*** | .04 | | -1.98*** | .04 | |
| <i>Sheaf coefficient</i> | | | .66** | | | .61** | | | .57** |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | | | | -.04 | .01 | -.06*** | -.01 | .01 | -.01 |
| Household Income | | | | -.04 | .01 | -.08*** | -.03 | .01 | -.06*** |
| Age | | | | -.01 | .00 | -.05*** | -.01 | .00 | -.04*** |
| Female | | | | .09 | .03 | .03** | .14 | .03 | .05*** |
| Married | | | | .15 | .03 | .05*** | .13 | .03 | .05*** |
| Children | | | | .06 | .01 | .08*** | .04 | .01 | .06*** |
| Religious Affiliation | | | | .09 | .04 | .03* | .03 | .03 | .01 |
| Church Attendance | | | | .08 | .01 | .07*** | .03 | .01 | .02* |
| <i>Family Relations</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Conservatism | | | | | | | .30 | .02 | .23*** |
| Family Norms | | | | | | | .10 | .02 | .06*** |
| Family Contact | | | | | | | .04 | .01 | .04*** |
| Family Affection | | | | | | | -.07 | .02 | -.04*** |
| Emotional Support | | | | | | | -.01 | .02 | -.00 |
| <i>Intercept</i> | | 3.22 | | | 3.46 | | | 2.51 | |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .44 | | | .47 | | | .50 | |
| <i>F for change in R</i> ² | | 1410.64 | | | 52.35 | | | 88.45 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

5.4.3 Immigrant characteristics and the resistance to interethnic marriage

In an additional regression analysis with the four immigrant groups ($N = 1,228$), the immigration characteristics were added in Model 2 (Table 5.3). We excluded age in this model to avoid problems of multi-collinearity with length of stay.

Also in this model, the explained variance was high ($R^2 = .50$). The results showed that adding the immigrant characteristics to the model significantly increased the explained variance ($F_{\text{change}} = 4.21$, $p < .05$), and decreased the total effect of the ethnic minority group differences. In line with our expectations, Dutch language proficiency was negatively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage. Immigrants who speak the Dutch language relatively well were less inclined to resist such a marriage.

In addition, we compared three categories of immigrants: the first generation immigrants that migrated for family reasons, the first generation immigrants that moved for other reasons, and second generation 'immigrants'. We varied the reference category to test the significance of the differences between these categories. As expected, participants who migrated to the Netherlands for family related reasons (e.g., family reunification) showed higher levels of resistance to intermarriage than those who migrated for other reasons (i.e. educational, economical or safety reasons).

Table 5.3 Immigrant characteristics and the resistance to interethnic marriage

| | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | |
|--|----------|-------------|---------|----------|-------------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β |
| <i>Ethnic Background</i> (Antillean-Dutch = ref) | | | | | | |
| Moroccan-Dutch | 1.55*** | .11 | | 1.42*** | .11 | |
| Turkish-Dutch | .94*** | .10 | | .76*** | .11 | |
| Surinamese-Dutch | .09 | .08 | | .07 | .09 | |
| <i>Sheaf coefficient</i> | | | .46** | | | .42** |
| <i>Controls</i> | | | | | | |
| Education | .00 | .02 | .00 | .01 | .02 | .02 |
| Household Income | -.04 | .01 | -.07** | -.04 | .01 | -.07** |
| Female | .16 | .06 | .06** | .09 | .06 | .03 |
| Married | .13 | .07 | .05 | .12 | .07 | .05 |
| Children | .02 | .02 | .03 | .02 | .02 | .03 |
| Religious Affiliation | -.08 | .09 | -.02 | -.06 | .10 | -.02 |
| Church Attendance | .04 | .03 | .03 | .04 | .03 | .04 |
| <i>Family Relations</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Conservatism | .29 | .04 | .21*** | .28 | .04 | .21*** |
| Family Norms | .12 | .04 | .08** | .12 | .04 | .07** |
| Family Contact | .05 | .02 | .05* | .06 | .02 | .06* |
| Family Affection | -.09 | .04 | -.05* | -.09 | .04 | -.05* |
| Emotional Support | .01 | .06 | .00 | .01 | .05 | .00 |
| <i>Immigrant Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Length of Stay | | | | -.00 | .00 | -.02 |
| Language Proficiency | | | | -.16 | .06 | -.07** |
| <i>Immigrant Category</i> (Family Migration Motive = ref) | | | | | | |
| Other Migration Motive | | | | -.20** | .07 | |
| Second Generation | | | | -.11 | .11 | |
| <i>Sheaf coefficient</i> | | | | | | .07 |
| <i>Intercept</i> | | .43 | | | 1.05 | |
| <i>R</i> ² | | .49 | | | .50 | |
| <i>F for change in R</i> ² | | 16.19 | | | 4.21 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Although analysis of variance indicated that the intermarriage attitude of the first (2.32) and second 'generation' (1.80) differed significantly ($F(1,1226) = 15.56, p < .05$), the multiple regression analyses revealed no difference between first generation immigrants and participants born in the Netherlands. The predicted impact of length of stay on the opposition to interethnic marriage was not found. Further, while the length of stay showed bivariate a negatively relation with the opposition to interethnic marriage ($R = -.08, p < .05$), no association was found in the full model. Apparently, our model takes the factors that contribute to differences in resistance between generations and between immigrants who differ with respect to length of stay into account. Compared to Table 5.2, the effects of the family characteristics were quite similar: Family norms, family contact and family conservatism related positively to the opposition to intermarriage, whereas family affection showed a negative association.

5.5 Conclusion and discussion

Using data from a representative sample designed to facilitate comparisons between immigrant and Dutch families, this study investigated interethnic marriage attitudes among the Dutch majority and four immigrant groups: Turkish-Dutch, Moroccan-Dutch, Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch. We focused on the attitudes of the Dutch towards marriage with an ethnic minority group member and the attitudes of the ethnic minorities towards marriage with an ethnic Dutch person. The role of family relations and immigrant characteristics for these attitudes was examined.

Our models were rather capable of explaining attitudes towards intermarriage, which was largely due to the strong impact of ethnicity on the intermarriage attitude. The findings indicated large differences in the resistance to interethnic marriage between the five ethnic groups. Only a small part of these differences was accounted for in the different steps of the analyses. The ethnic group differences in resistance remained strong after controlling statistically for family cohesion and family conservatism as well as for various other variables (e.g., education, income). In agreement with the role of group status, the ethnic Dutch majority group showed relatively high levels of resistance compared to the four ethnic minority groups. This confirms the importance of the group status position for ethnic distance, which has been demonstrated, for example, in studies on ethnic hierarchies (Hagendoorn, 1995).

However, the Moroccan-Dutch reported the highest level of resistance. This might be due to the fact that this group is strongly criticized in the Netherlands and faces the highest levels of identity threat. High levels of threat to the value of the group can lead to increased ingroup identification and outgroup derogation. To enhance the value and distinctiveness of their ingroup and to maintain a positive ethnic identity, Moroccan-Dutch people can distance themselves from the ethnic Dutch (Verkuyten & Zaremba, 2005). However, it should be noted that compared to the Dutch participants, the Moroccan-Dutch showed less resistance to interethnic marriage after the family characteristics were taken into account

statistically. This suggests that part of the high resistance among the Moroccan-Dutch is due to their relatively high level of family contacts and their strong endorsement of family norms and conservative family values. Family obligations and traditional family values are often strongly emphasized in ethnic groups that have a collectivist cultural background, such as the Moroccan-Dutch (SCP, 2007; Triandis, 1995). The resistance to marriage with a Dutch person was much lower among the Surinamese-Dutch and Antilleans-Dutch compared to the Moroccan-Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch. Immigrants from Suriname and the Antilleans share a common (colonial) history with the Dutch and are therefore culturally more similar to the Dutch, whereas the cultural and religious (Muslim) background of immigrants from Turkey and Morocco is quite different.

In the literature, low levels of intermarriage are often viewed as a lack of integration of migrant groups (Lieberson & Waters, 1988; Qian & Lichter, 2001). However, intermarriage not only depends on the readiness of ethnic minority groups to integrate, but also on the openness and acceptance of the majority group. The relatively high level of resistance to interethnic marriage of the Dutch majority is probably also an important factor for intermarriage patterns in the Netherlands. This corroborates the importance of including the perspective from both sides while studying interethnic marriage.

Another important finding of this study is that not only the ethnic group, but also current family characteristics were relevant for understanding the resistance to interethnic marriage. Previous research on family influences has mainly focused on processes of socialization and the transmission of social positions (e.g., Vollebergh et al., 2001), whereas our study indicates that the structure and functioning of the current family context also is important for people's attitude towards interethnic marriage. It turns out that different family characteristics were relevant. It turns out that different family characteristics were relevant for intermarriage attitudes. In addition, the relationships differed for various aspects of the family. There were negative, as well as positive statistical effects on the acceptance of ethnic outgroup members as close kin by marriage. The finding that family norms and family contacts were positively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage, confirms our first hypothesis. When family ties are tightly knit, family members have an incentive to keep 'ethnic strangers' out of the family. Previous studies showed that solidarity and close group ties can act as a principle of exclusion when there is the perception of threat and when individuals are not considered to be part of one's cultural ingroup (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). The results suggest that these general notions can also be applied in the context of the acceptance of ethnic outgroup members as family members.

The results also supported our second hypothesis. Stronger endorsement of conservative family values was related to higher resistance. This finding is similar to the well-known (positive) relationship between conservatism and prejudice (Duckitt, 1992). In addition, previous research has shown that traditional family values are related to family cohesion (Triandis, 1995). By including a measure of family conservatism, we were able to assess the independent effect of family cohesion (family norms and contacts) on the resistance to interethnic marriage.

The third hypothesis on the effect of warm family ties for the acceptance of interethnic marriage was also (partly) confirmed. Although we found no association between the exchange of emotional support and intermarriage attitudes, feelings of (family) affection showed a negative relation with opposing interethnic marriage. Hence, we found evidence for the proposition that warm and trusting family relations can lead to more tolerance and a more open view towards ethnic outgroup members (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). A likely reason for this is that these kind of family relations support the development of psychological well-being and (generalized) trust in others. In turn, well-being and trust can lead to a more accepting attitude.

For a more in-depth understanding of the differences between immigrants, we derived hypotheses on the relation between several immigrant characteristics and the resistance to interethnic marriage. Interethnic marriage is believed to be an indicator of the social integration or assimilation of immigrant groups (Blau et al., 1984; Qian & Lichter, 2001). Therefore we applied insights of integration and assimilation theories to derive hypotheses on the relation between several immigrant characteristics and the attitude towards intermarriage. We examined four immigrant characteristics that in previous studies have been found to be associated to social integration indicators, such as actual interethnic marriages or other social contacts (Kalmijn & Van Tubergen, 2006; Martinović et al., 2008).

Our study indeed found evidence of the importance of different immigrant characteristics for the attitude towards intermarriage. As expected (H4c), it turned out that Dutch language proficiency was negatively related to the resistance to marriage with a Dutch person. Thus, the command of the Dutch language does not only relate to actual interethnic interactions as found by previous studies (Hwang et al., 1997), but also to the preference for intimate contacts. This also supports the idea that cultural distance hampers the (preferences for) social interaction with ethnic outgroup members (Hagendoorn et al., 1998; Kalmijn, 1998), and the more general notions of the similarity-attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971). We reckon that there are more sophisticated ways to measure language proficiency than we did in our study. Instead of the observation of the interviewer, it is preferable to assess language ability via tests or interviewers that are trained in language analysis. However, one should note that, despite possible measurement error, we still found an effect of language ability on the intermarriage attitude.

Further, in line with hypothesis 4d, people who had migrated for family reasons showed higher levels of resistance to intermarriage than immigrants who migrated for other reasons (e.g., education, work, safety). This finding supports the claim that immigrants who move for family reasons are more oriented towards their own ethnic group and towards the preservation of their cultural traditions (Dietz, 2000). This might be the outcome of the fact that this category of immigrants did not choose the host country themselves. One of the aims of the Dutch immigration law (2002) is to diminish the number of so-called 'import-brides', because it is believed that marriage partners from the country of origin present a problem to the social integration of immigrant groups. The results suggested that family related migration leads to a higher resistance to accept Dutch

people as kin by marriage. Contrary to what was expected based on assimilation theory, the findings showed that generational status (H4a) and length of stay (H4b) were not related to the interethnic marriage attitude. The results revealed that the difference in resistance between generations and between immigrants with varying lengths of stay, disappeared when factors such as education, age, religiosity and language proficiency were taken into account. Hence, these factors are important for understanding why there is a difference in resistance to interethnic marriage between generations of immigrants and between immigrants with different lengths of stay. A similar result has been found in other studies (e.g., Kalmijn, 1998). Further attention should be given to examine in more detail the precise mechanisms that account for the effects of the immigrant characteristics on the acceptance of ethnic outsiders as close kin by marriage.

Future studies could also more deeply investigate the relationship between family characteristics and intermarriage attitudes. Although family contact and the exchange of emotional support within the family were based on multiple family relationships, both measures reflected the experiences and perceptions of the individual participants. In addition, the measures of family norms, family affection and family values were assessed at the individual level and not at the level of the family. The attitudes of family members should be assessed in order to understand the full impact of the current family context on people's attitudes. Future studies could also test the role of family cohesion, emotional good relations and traditional family values on actual intermarriage patterns. The effects of the family characteristics on actual marriages might even be stronger than on attitudes because family norms can be expected to have a greater impact on behaviors than attitudes. It is also important to study among the different immigrant groups what they think about marriages with members of other minority groups. In the current study we focused on the immigrants' attitude towards the Dutch but a multi-ethnic society also involves the acceptance of interethnic relations between minority groups.

In conclusion, this study showed that in the Netherlands there are strong ethnic group boundaries in the acceptance of ethnic outgroup members as close kin by marriage. These boundaries remained strong when a number of background characteristics and several indicators of family relations are taken into account. This suggests that differences in status positions and cultural and religious differences were responsible for these boundaries. In addition, the findings indicated that family relations are important for understanding people's attitude towards interethnic marriages. Different aspects of the relations within the family were related to this attitude and also in different ways. In families that were relatively closed and that emphasized conservative family values, people tended to show more resistance to interethnic marriage, whereas an affective and warm family context contributed to more acceptance.

CHAPTER 6

Family life and acculturation attitudes: A study among four immigrant groups in the Netherlands



This chapter is co-authored by Maykel Verkuyten and Marcel Coenders (Utrecht University, the Netherlands). A slightly different version of this chapter is forthcoming in the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

6 Family life and acculturation attitudes: A study among four immigrant groups in the Netherlands

6.1 Introduction

Acculturation concerns the question whether immigrants adapt to the country of residence and the extent to which they remain involved in their ethnic culture. Key elements in the acculturation process are the acculturation attitudes adopted by immigrants. Acculturation attitudes are important because they shape individuals' behavioral intentions, their motivation to adapt to various spheres of life, and their acculturation behavior (see Sam & Berry, 2006). Research on the determinants of acculturation attitudes has increasingly emphasized the role of contextual influences (Berry, 1997; Pfafferott & Brown, 2006). It has been shown that these attitudes depend, for example, on intergroup contacts and perceived acceptance by the host society (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Sabatier, 2008), and on social relationships with co-ethnics (Zhou & Bankston, 1998).

In this chapter, we examine the role of the family for acculturation attitudes among the four largest immigrant groups in the Netherlands. The focus is on the socio-cultural orientation on the own ethnic group and the socio-cultural orientation on Dutch society. While there is research on parental influences (e.g., socialization or status transmission) on acculturation attitudes (e.g., Pfafferott & Brown, 2006; Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo, Mirsky, Rubinstein, & Nauck, 2009), relatively few studies have addressed the role of the family during adulthood. This is surprising because studies have shown that family members continue to influence each other and, thus, matter for individuals' attitudes and behaviors in adult life (Wood, 2000). In addition, research has demonstrated that the family is a particularly important context for immigrants, for instance for cultural maintenance and for the adaptation to the country of residence (Zhou, 1997). We focus on family life in terms of contacts (cohesiveness), emotional support (warmth), and the extent to which the host society language is spoken within one's family. In addition, many immigrants continue to be involved in their ethnic culture through transnational family ties. Where economic assimilation is known to depend on 'cultivating strong social networks across national borders' (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999: 229),

far less is known about the way that family relationships across national borders relate to acculturation processes.

6.2 Theory and hypotheses

6.2.1 Acculturation attitudes

Classical assimilation theory assumes that immigrants relinquish their culture of origin as they acculturate to the country of residence (Gordon, 1964). However, the theoretical and methodological conceptualization of acculturation has changed from a uni-dimensional assimilation model to the recognition that acculturation is a bi-dimensional process: individuals can maintain their ethnic culture even when they acculturate to new societies (see Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). The two dimensions of adaptation and maintenance should be measured separately and do not have to be combined to create four different acculturation modes (Rudmin, 2003, 2009). We adopt this approach in the current study because it allows us to investigate whether the family context is equally important for both adaptation and maintenance. Following other studies (e.g., Ward & Kennedy, 1993), we consider both cultural and social involvement with one's own ethnic group and with the host society. The former is labeled '*socio-cultural maintenance*' and the latter '*socio-cultural adaptation*'.

6.2.2 Parents and acculturation attitudes

Theoretically, there are various reasons why parents can be expected to be important for acculturation attitudes. The nuclear family provides the primary living conditions in people's formative years in which family attitudes, positions, skills and behaviors are transmitted (Nauck, 2001; Vollebergh, Iedema, & Raaijmakers, 2001; Zhou, 1997). We focus on the socio-economic background of the parents and the emotional warmth of the parent-child relationships in adolescence.

Parents' socio-economic background (e.g., educational level) might be related to children's acculturation attitudes because it provides opportunities and resources for children's educational career, language proficiency, friendships, and it is related to neighborhood conditions (Nauck, 2001; Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001). Furthermore, compared to the lower educated, higher educated parents tend to be more strongly oriented on the host society, maintain less attachment to their own ethnic culture, and have more informal contacts with natives (Nauck, 2001; Phinney et al., 2001; but see Sabatier, 2008). Although there are studies which have demonstrated that the socio-economic background of the parents is an important determinant of their children's acculturation (Rumbaut, 1994; Sabatier, 2008), it has not been examined to what extent these effects remain relevant for acculturation attitudes in adult life. We hypothesize that parental socio-economic background is positively related to the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation and negatively to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance (H₁).

The emotional warmth of the parent-child bond in the child's formative years has been argued to influence the acquisition of attitudes through processes of identification and imitation. The transmission of cultural values is stronger when the bond between parent and child is warmer, whereas a lack of (perceived) emotional warmth may cause the child to reject its parents' attitudes and beliefs (Jaspers, Lubbers, & De Vries, 2008; Schönplflug, 2001). Acculturation research has mostly focused on socio-cultural maintenance of adolescents and has demonstrated that warm family relations are related to the attitude towards cultural maintenance (e.g., Sabatier, 2008; Wilson & Constantine, 1999). Less is known about adults, and about the relationship between the emotional warmth of the parent-child bond in the formative years and the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation.

Parental warmth might contribute to socio-cultural adaptation because it facilitates a secure attachment, self-confidence, and better social skills, which in turn stimulate adjustments to novel and unfamiliar settings (Chen, Liu, & Li, 2000). Mikulincer and Shaver (2001), for example, found that securely attached immigrants trust others more and have more social interactions with outgroup members. In addition, studying ethnic and national identity, Sabatier (2008) found that immigrant adolescents' positive assessment of the relationship with their parents contributes not only to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance but also to socio-cultural adaptation. Hence, we hypothesize that the warmth of the parent-child relationship in adolescence is positively related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance and also to the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation in adult life (H2).

6.2.3 Family context in adult life: warmth and cohesion

Family research on acculturation has mainly focused on children and adolescents and neglected the processes shaping attitudes and orientations of adults. An important question is the degree to which current family life relates to acculturation attitudes, independently of the parents characteristics discussed. Research on adolescents has shown that ingroup evaluation and cultural identity are enhanced by warm interpersonal relations with family and friends (Phinney et al., 2001; Wilson & Constantine, 1999). Similar mechanisms might also work for adult immigrants (Demo & Hughes, 1990). Family relationships are particularly salient for immigrants because they provide an important coping resource in the host society and provide continuity with the past. Ethnic group norms and values are most salient and most easily enforced in the private context of the family (Van de Vijver & Phalet, 2004). Relationships with family members might affirm the ethnic identity, increase feelings of belonging to one's ethnic group and thereby foster a positive attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance.

We focus on two aspects of family life: the cohesion of the family and the warmth of the family relationships. Although cohesion and warmth are interrelated concepts (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991) the two constructs differ and can have different effects on various outcomes (e.g., Doohan, Carrère, Siler, & Beardslee, 2009; Huijnk, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2010). Family cohesion refers to the actual

bonds of family members and is typically conceptualized in terms of the frequency of contact, the degree of support and help, norms of family obligation, and the perceived strength of the family ties (see Bengtson & Roberts, 1991). In general, cohesive or tight families have more frequently contact and members of these families are more exposed to each other's beliefs and attitudes. The endorsement of cultural maintenance and ingroup support is more typical for cohesive immigrant families whereas low cultural maintenance is more common in less cohesive immigrant families (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, 2006).

Family warmth indicates the level of affection and emotional support that family members experience. In general, warm family relationships make people more responsive to social influences. Since families are the main cultural link to one's ethnic background, we assume that warm family relationships stimulate the orientation on one's own ethnic group and culture. Thus, we hypothesize that family cohesion and family warmth independently and positively relate to the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance (H3).

For immigrants, warm family relationships in adulthood might also facilitate socio-cultural adaptation because they reduce the negative effects of stressful events on social functioning (Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009). Warm relationships decrease anxiety and self-uncertainty, and foster (generalized) trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). In addition, psychological well-being and trust are related to a more open and accepting orientation towards outgroups (Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997). Hence, we expect a positive association between family warmth and the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation (H4). We do not have strong theoretical arguments to expect a (positive or negative) relation between family cohesion and the socio-cultural adaptation attitude.

6.2.4 Host language usage within the family

Proficiency in the host country's language is considered to be a key factor in immigrants' social, cultural, and economic adjustment (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). In addition to the individual's language proficiency, we hypothesize that the extent to which one's family communicates in the host language is positively related to the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation and negatively to the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance (H5). The language spoken within the family indicates the acculturation orientations of the family members. For example, family members who are more adapted to the host society are also more likely to speak the host language among each other. Furthermore, interaction in the ethnic language provides a means by which ethnicity is experienced and expressed. Ethnic language usage is likely to reinforce ethnic identity and the orientation on the own ethnic culture, whereas the usage of the host language might strengthen socio-cultural adaptation. Hence, interactions with family members in the Dutch language might not only facilitate socio-cultural adaptation but might also result in a weaker endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance (H6).

6.2.5 Transnational family relationships

Many immigrants maintain social networks and relationships that stretch across national borders. These transnational ties constitute social, cultural and economical linkages to the country of origin (Ryan, Sales, Tilki, & Siara, 2009). Through transnational family relationships norms and practices of the ethnic culture are reinforced and families can use transnational activities for maintaining their ethnic identity across generations (Zontini, 2007). Moreover, studies have shown that practical support reinforces notions of responsibility and attachment to family members in the country of origin (Reynolds, 2006). Hence, we expect a positive relation between transnational family ties and the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance (H7).

It is less clear whether transnational ties also relate to the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation. In public debates, transnational relationships are often perceived as hampering the integration into the host society. However, relationships with the family in the country of origin might be a source of support that promotes adjustment to the country of settlement.

6.2.6 Controls

To assess whether the family characteristics are independently related to the acculturation attitudes, several additional factors were considered: individual language proficiency, immigrant generation, length of residence, age, education, religiosity, and perceived acceptance of the host society. These factors have been found to be related to acculturation attitudes and to family relationships (e.g., Alba & Nee, 1997; Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2008; Bourhis et al., 1997; Phinney et al., 2001; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001), and therefore should be taken into account.

6.3 Method

6.3.1 Sample

We used data from the migrant sample of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS; Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). The first wave of the study was conducted in 2002/ 2003 and the response rate varied from 52% for the Turkish-Dutch to 41% for the Surinamese-Dutch. In the second wave of the panel study, conducted in 2007, 47% of the initial 1,410 immigrants of the first wave participated. After the interview, respondents received a supplementary self-completion questionnaire which was returned by approximately 90% of the respondents. We mainly used the data from this second wave of the NKPS because information on the acculturation attitudes was not collected in the first wave. We only used information from the first wave when questions on background characteristics were not asked in the second wave, like questions on the ethnic background of the respondents. We discuss possible problems of selective non-response in the statistical procedure section.

The *ethnic background* of the participants was based on their country of birth and that of their parents. Since the 1960s, a diverse group of immigrants have moved to the Netherlands due to the colonial history in the Caribbean area (e.g., Surinam and the Dutch Antilles), the recruitment of labor migrants from Mediterranean countries (e.g., Turkey and Morocco), and, more recently, the influx of asylum seekers from a wide variety of countries. Currently, approximately 11% of the 16.6 million inhabitants of the Netherlands originates from non-Western countries, with the majority coming from Morocco, Turkey, Surinam, and the Dutch Antilles (SCP, 2009). The latter two colonial groups are culturally and religiously more similar to the Dutch and have better socio-economic positions than the Turkish and Moroccan immigrants (SCP, 2009). People of Turkish and Moroccan origin tend to be more traditional in their family norms and values than the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch who, in turn, are more similar to the individualistic ethnic Dutch (SCP, 2009).

Participants born in Turkey, Morocco, Surinam or the Dutch Antilles, or with at least one parent born in one of these countries, were assigned to one of the four immigrant groups: Turkish-Dutch ($n = 196$), Moroccan-Dutch ($n = 116$), Surinamese-Dutch ($n = 175$), and Antillean-Dutch ($n = 166$).

6.3.2 Measures

Dependent variables

Socio-cultural adaptation attitude was measured with four items. Respondents were asked how important they find it to (a) “Follow the Dutch way of life”, (b) “Have regular contacts with Dutch people”, (c) “Raise their children in a Dutch way”, and (e) “Participate in typical Dutch activities”. Response categories ranged from 1 = *totally agree* to 5 = *totally disagree*. For measuring the attitude towards *socio-cultural maintenance* the same four questions were asked in relation to the importance attached to the ethnic culture and contacts with co-ethnics.

Using factor analysis with oblique rotation, the data clearly confirmed a two factor model for these eight items. Both factors showed eigenvalues greater than 2, communalities higher than .50, and factor loadings higher than .65. In addition, a multi-group comparison of a structural equation model indicated that the factor structure was the same for the four ethnic groups. Moreover, the fit of the model assuming metric equivalence – the values of the factor loadings of the items on the latent concepts are assumed to be the same across the groups (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998) – was acceptable (RMSEA = .069, CFI = .89, CMIN/ DF = 3.8, $\chi^2 = 287$). We constructed the two acculturation attitudes based on a Likert summation.

Reliability analyses revealed that the alpha for socio-cultural maintenance was .77 for the Turkish-Dutch, .56 for the Moroccan-Dutch, .72 for the Surinamese-Dutch, and .81 for the Antillean-Dutch. The alphas for socio-cultural adaptation were .61 (Turkish-Dutch), .73 (Moroccan-Dutch), .73 (Surinamese-Dutch) and .77 (Antillean-Dutch), respectively.

Parents' variables

Parental education was based on the highest educational attainment of either one of the parents (in the country of origin or the country of residence), and coded from 0 = *did not complete elementary school* to 6 = *university/post-graduate*.

The *warmth of the parent-child bond in adolescence* was based on eight items that assess the strength and emotional supportiveness at age 15. Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed with statements like "I could always turn to my father/ mother with my problems" and "My father/ mother and I had a tight relationship". Response categories ranged from 1 = *totally agree* to 5 = *totally disagree*. Although the effect of the parental bond on acculturation might differ somewhat for fathers and mothers (e.g., Sabatier, 2008), the focus of our study was on general family influences. Therefore, we constructed one family level measure based on the mean score indicating the emotional warmth of the parental bond. The alpha for the eight items was .89, with a minimum of .85 for the Turkish-Dutch. When information on the bond with one of the parents was missing (7%), the score was based on the items for the available parent.

Current family relationships

Feelings of affection and perceived emotional support are indicators of *family warmth* (Huijnk et al., 2010; Jaspers et al., 2008). Family warmth was measured with four items: "I receive enough help and advice from my family", "I place confidence in my family", "Should I need help, I can always turn to my family", and "I can always count on my family". Response categories ranged from 1 = *totally agree* to 5 = *totally disagree*. These items were combined in a scale by taking the mean value ($\alpha = .87$ for all groups, with a minimum of .78 for the Moroccan-Dutch). A higher score indicated higher perceived family warmth. The questions did not differentiate between perceived family warmth from family members living in the Netherlands or abroad.

Family cohesion is indicated by the frequency of family contact and the exchange of instrumental support (Bengtson & Roberts, 1991). We distinguished between contact with family members in the Netherlands and with family in the country of origin. *Family contact in the Netherlands* was measured by asking respondents about the actual face-to-face contact with their father, mother, sibling and a maximum of two children in the past twelve months. The response categories varied from 1 = *never* to 7 = *daily*. The contact measure was constructed by computing the mean score of the face-to-face contact frequency with the aforementioned (existing) family members in the Netherlands. Our measure of *transnational family contacts* indicated how often a respondent visited the family in the country of origin varying from 0 = *never* to 4 = *at least two times a year*.

Transnational family support. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they supported family members (e.g., financially or materially) in the country of origin, and if so, which specific family members (parents, children or other relatives). We computed one dichotomous variable indicating 0 = *no transnational family support* to 1 = *transnational support to family*.

Host language usage within the family was assessed by asking respondents the extent to which they speak Dutch with their partner/ children/ parents/ siblings/ other relatives, with response categories 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes* and 3 = *often, always*. We computed the mean score on the Dutch language usage with these five types of family members ($\alpha = .90$ for all groups, with a minimum of .78 for the Turkish-Dutch). When one of these family members was missing, for instance when a parent was deceased or a respondent did not have any children, the mean score was based on the existing family members.

Individual variables and perceived acceptance

The *age* of the respondent was measured in years. The variable *female* indicated whether the participant was 1 = *female* or 0 = *male*. *Educational attainment* of the respondent was coded from 0 = *did not complete elementary school* to 7 = *university/post-graduate*. *Religious attendance* was based on the church or mosque attendance of the respondent with scores ranging from 0 = *never* to 3 = *a few times a week or more*. *Employment status* indicated whether the respondent had a paid job (1 = *yes*; 0 = *no*).

Respondent were asked whether they had sometimes difficulties with (a) speaking Dutch, and with (b) reading Dutch in papers, letters or flyers. The response categories were 1 = *yes, very often/ always*, 2 = *yes, sometimes*, and 3 = *no, never*. In addition, the interviewer was asked "How fluent is the respondent in Dutch?". The response categories were 1 = *bad*, 2 = *moderate* and 3 = *fluent*. These three items formed a very reliable scale (α is .92 for all groups, with a minimum of .61 for the Dutch-Antilleans) and a higher score indicated higher *Dutch language proficiency*. Participants' country of birth was used to assess who was first generation (born outside the Netherlands) or second generation (born in the Netherlands). In addition, immigrants who moved to the Netherlands before the age of six or younger were also regarded as *first generation* immigrants. Due to the age criterion in the NKPS sample (respondents had to be at least 18 years or older in the first wave), the percentage of second generation immigrants (22%) was relatively low in our sample compared to the population. *Length of residence* of the immigrants was measured by subtracting the year of migration from the interview year. Following Kalmijn and Van Tubergen (2006), the year of migration for the second generation immigrants was based on their year of birth.

The *perceived acceptance by the host society* was measured with the following five items: "In the Netherlands foreigners have excellent opportunities", "In the Netherlands your rights as a foreigner are respected", "The Dutch are hospitable to foreigners", "Foreigners are treated fairly in the Netherlands", and "The Dutch are open to foreign cultures". Response options ranged from 1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*. After recoding, the Cronbach's alpha of the 5-item scale was .75 for all groups, with a minimum of .64 for the Turkish-Dutch.

6.3.3 Method of analysis

A potential problem of the data of the second wave of the NKPS immigrant sample was selective panel attrition. To correct for this we estimated Heckman's models (Heckman, 1979)¹⁰. We estimated the propensity to participate with several socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, having a partner), socio-economic variables (education and income), socio-cultural variables (e.g., religious attendance, family norms), and the number of missing values. Heckman models require variables that are related to selective non-response but not to the acculturation attitudes. We identified having a partner and the number of missing values in the first wave as being related to the chance to participate in the second wave, but not to the acculturation attitudes. Second, Mill's Lambda, an inverse transformation of the probability of the respondent participating in the second wave (Heckman, 1979), was included in our models predicting the acculturation attitudes. Thus, a positive effect of Mill's Lambda indicated that those who are less likely to respond have a higher score on the acculturation attitude under investigation. Missing values on the independent variables were replaced via a multiple imputation procedure¹¹.

We analyzed the two acculturation attitudes of maintenance and adaptation separately. We used regression analysis whereby sets of variables were stepwise entered into the models. First, we entered the control variables. In a second model, we added the parental variables, and in the third model the current family relationships were included. Analyses indicated that there was no problematic multi-collinearity between the variables: All VIF-values were smaller than 5. Finally, we examined the robustness of the results across the ethnic groups in additional analyses in which we included the relevant interaction terms.

6.4 Results

6.4.1 Preliminary findings

Table 6.1 shows the means and standard deviations of the independent variables. In addition, zero-order correlations between all variables were included in Table 6.2. The ethnic group differences in warmth of the parent-child relationship in adolescence, in transnational family contact, and in current family warmth were significant but relatively small. The Turkish-Dutch and the Moroccan-Dutch visited their relatives in the country of origin more often, spoke Dutch with their

¹⁰ More detailed information on the Heckman procedure is available upon request from the first author.

¹¹ Most variables, including the two acculturation attitudes, had no missing values, whereas the variable *Family contacts in the Netherlands* (19%), *Warmth of the parent-child bond* (16%) and *Family warmth* (13%) had the highest numbers of missing values. The relatively large number of missing values for the variable *Family contacts in the Netherlands* is mainly due to the fact that these, mostly first generation, immigrants, had no family members living in the Netherlands. The latter two variables were asked in the self-completion questionnaire.

relatives less often and had lower educated parents, than the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch. The ethnic group differences in transnational support showed that the Antillean-Dutch reported a lower level than the other three groups. The Turkish-Dutch showed the strongest socio-cultural maintenance attitude ($M = 3.97$), followed by the Moroccan-Dutch ($M = 3.73$), the Surinamese-Dutch ($M = 3.20$), and the Antillean-Dutch ($M = 2.84$). A Bonferroni test showed that all the differences between the four groups were significant ($p < .01$).

Table 6.1 Descriptives of the variables by ethnic group ($N = 653$)

| | Range | Turkish-Dutch ($n = 196$) | | Moroccan-Dutch ($n = 116$) | | Surinamese-Dutch ($n = 175$) | | Antillean-Dutch ($n = 166$) | | <i>Eta</i> |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| | | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | |
| <i>Acculturation attitudes</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Socio-cultural Maintenance | 1 - 5 | 3.97 | .70 | 3.73 | .61 | 3.20 | .89 | 2.84 | .81 | .51*** |
| Socio-cultural Adaptation | 1 - 5 | 2.86 | .63 | 2.83 | .74 | 3.46 | .72 | 3.49 | .71 | .42*** |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 0 - 1 | .46 | | .51 | | .66 | | .48 | | .17*** |
| Education | 0 - 7 | 2.62 | 1.86 | 2.19 | 2.24 | 3.95 | 1.91 | 4.40 | 1.77 | .42*** |
| Religious Attendance | 0 - 3 | .90 | 1.06 | 1.19 | 1.17 | .74 | 1.22 | .94 | 1.00 | .13** |
| Age | 21 - 82 | 41.85 | 10.74 | 45.47 | 14.27 | 47.67 | 11.63 | 42.80 | 12.81 | .19*** |
| Employment Status | 0 - 1 | .50 | | .34 | | .59 | | .68 | | .24*** |
| Second Generation | 0 - 1 | .18 | | .18 | | .29 | | .21 | | .11* |
| Dutch Language Proficiency | 1 - 3 | 2.08 | .71 | 2.07 | .79 | 2.88 | .25 | 2.89 | .31 | .57*** |
| Length of Residence | 5 - 76 | 23.42 | 8.36 | 24.40 | 9.62 | 30.32 | 11.25 | 23.37 | 9.68 | .29*** |
| Perceived Acceptance | 1 - 5 | 2.74 | .61 | 3.33 | .66 | 3.32 | .68 | 3.22 | .68 | .36*** |
| <i>Family Characteristics</i> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Warmth of Parent-child Bond | 1 - 5 | 3.77 | .71 | 3.56 | .76 | 3.60 | .90 | 3.47 | .91 | .17*** |
| Parental Education | 0 - 6 | .37 | .97 | .27 | .86 | 1.53 | 1.93 | 2.47 | 1.80 | .51*** |
| Family Contacts in the Netherlands | 1 - 7 | 4.98 | 1.56 | 4.94 | 1.37 | 4.54 | 1.42 | 4.02 | 1.25 | .25*** |
| Transnational Family Contacts | 1 - 5 | 3.49 | .76 | 3.43 | .84 | 2.21 | 1.06 | 2.30 | 1.03 | .55*** |
| Transnational Support | 0 - 1 | .24 | | .29 | | .35 | | .10 | | .22*** |
| Family Warmth | 1 - 5 | 4.17 | .65 | 3.95 | .55 | 3.87 | .86 | 3.89 | .88 | .19*** |
| Host Language Use Within Family | 1 - 3 | 1.41 | .44 | 1.55 | .53 | 2.64 | .69 | 2.16 | .51 | .68*** |

Note. No standard deviations presented for dummy variables.

Table 6.2 Correlations between independent variables and acculturation attitudes

| | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. | 13. | 14. | 15. | 16. | 17. |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Female | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Education | -.03~ | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Religious Attendance | -.09 | -.20 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Age | -.09 | -.29 | .18 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Employment Status | -.22 | .31 | -.05 | -.31 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Second Generation | ns | .26 | -.22 | -.38 | .13 | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Dutch Language Proficiency | ns | .58 | -.16 | -.20 | .29 | .31 | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Length of Residence | -.06 | .03~ | -.13 | .44 | -.06 | .35 | .18 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Perceived Acceptance | .07 | ns | ns | .07 | -.03~ | .07 | .14 | .10 | - | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Warmth of Parent-child Bond | -.12 | -.05 | .05 | .07 | -.03~ | -.14 | -.10 | -.08 | -.05 | - | | | | | | | |
| 11. Parental Education | ns | .50 | -.13 | -.20 | .21 | .28 | .36 | .12 | .11 | -.06 | - | | | | | | |
| 12. Family Warmth | -.05 | ns | ns | -.05 | .03~ | -.09 | -.06 | -.10 | -.11 | .41 | ns | - | | | | | |
| 13. Family Contacts Netherlands | .07 | -.04 | .10 | -.15 | ns | .05 | -.04 | ns | ns | .14 | -.07 | .23 | - | | | | |
| 14. Transnational Family Contacts | -.05 | -.17 | .11 | ns | -.10 | -.16 | -.33 | -.18 | -.14 | .20 | -.28 | .23 | .21 | - | | | |
| 15. Transnational Family Support | ns | ns | .09 | ns | .08 | -.03~ | ns | -.04 | -.07 | .08 | -.08 | .03~ | .08 | .17 | - | | |
| 16. Host Language Usage Family | .08 | .46 | -.18 | -.09 | .22 | .36 | .64 | .33 | .20 | -.12 | .47 | -.15 | -.11 | -.44 | ns | - | |
| 17. Socio-cultural Maintenance | ns | -.38 | .21 | .04 | -.18 | -.20 | -.44 | -.17 | -.22 | .21 | -.40 | .24 | .22 | .39 | .16 | -.48 | - |
| 18. Socio-cultural Adaptation | -.05 | .29 | -.13 | .04 | .13 | .09 | .39 | .11 | .25 | .05 | .29 | ns | -.05 | -.23 | -.04 | .41 | -.22 |

$p < .01$ for all correlations, except ~ $p < .05$ and ns = not significant ($p > .05$).

For socio-cultural adaptation, the Antillean-Dutch showed the highest scores ($M = 3.49$), followed by the Surinamese-Dutch ($M = 3.46$), the Turkish-Dutch ($M = 2.86$), and the Moroccan-Dutch ($M = 2.83$). Except for the difference between the Moroccan-Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch, and the difference between the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch, all other four mean scores on socio-cultural adaptation differed significantly ($p < .01$).

The correlation between socio-cultural maintenance attitude and socio-cultural adaptation attitude was .09 for the Moroccan-Dutch, -.12 for the Turkish-Dutch, -.03 for the Antillean-Dutch, and .02 for the Surinamese-Dutch¹². None of the correlations was significant ($p < .05$).

¹² The correlation between socio-cultural maintenance and socio-cultural adaptation attitude in the total sample was -.22 (see Table 6.2), which is due to the ethnic group differences in the level of social-cultural maintenance and adaptation attitudes. Within each ethnic group, there was no significant correlation between both acculturation attitudes.

6.4.2 Socio-cultural maintenance attitude

In Table 6.3, Model 1 shows that respondents with higher education and those who attend religious services less often, endorsed socio-cultural maintenance less strongly than respondents with lower levels of education and those who attend religious services more often. Gender, age and employment status were not related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. In addition, Dutch language proficiency was negatively related to socio-cultural maintenance, whereas length of residence and generational status were not associated with socio-cultural maintenance. Immigrants who perceived the country of residence as being more accepting had lower endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. Overall, the explained variance of the model was substantial ($R^2 = .36$). Mill's Lambda was not related to socio-cultural maintenance. Thus, those who were less likely to respond in the second wave did not appear to differ in their attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance from those who were more likely to respond.

Parental characteristics were introduced in the second model. Confirming hypotheses 1 and 2, both parental education and parent-child warmth were related to socio-cultural maintenance. The higher educated one's parents, the lower the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. A relatively warm parental bond in adolescence was related to higher levels of socio-cultural maintenance. In the second model, the effects of the individual characteristics remained largely the same.

In line with hypotheses 3 to 6, Model 3 indicates that all included measures of family relationships in adulthood were important for the socio-cultural maintenance attitude. The inclusion of the current family characteristics increased the explained variance to .43. All five family indicators were significantly and independently related to socio-cultural maintenance. Contact with relatives in the Netherlands was positively associated with the socio-cultural maintenance attitude. For transnational family relationships, both support and family contact related positively to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. In addition, a Dutch speaking family context was associated with a less positive attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. Family warmth was positively related to cultural maintenance attitude. However, after the inclusion of family warmth, the effect of the warmth of the parental bond in adolescence was no longer significant.

Table 6.3 Family relationships and socio-cultural maintenance

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|--|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Ethnic Background (Antillean-Dutch = ref) | | | | | | |
| Moroccan-Dutch | .63*** | .10 | .49*** | .11 | .26* | .11 |
| Turkish-Dutch | .83*** | .10 | .67*** | .11 | .38*** | .11 |
| Surinamese-Dutch | .43*** | .08 | .34*** | .08 | .40*** | .09 |
| Education | -.06** | .02 | -.04** | .02 | -.05** | .02 |
| Age | -.00 | .00 | -.01 | .00 | -.01 | .00 |
| Female | -.02 | .06 | .01 | .06 | -.02 | .06 |
| Religious Attendance | .11*** | .03 | .11*** | .03 | .09*** | .03 |
| Employment Status | -.09 | .07 | -.08 | .07 | -.10 | .06 |
| Dutch Language Proficiency | -.13* | .06 | -.17** | .06 | -.11* | .06 |
| Length of Residence | -.01 | .00 | -.00 | .00 | -.00 | .00 |
| Second Generation | -.17 | .11 | -.11 | .11 | -.06 | .11 |
| Perceived Acceptance | -.13** | .04 | -.13** | .04 | -.11** | .04 |
| <i>Parental Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Warmth of Parent-child Bond | | | .14*** | .04 | .06 | .04 |
| Parental Education | | | -.06** | .02 | -.04* | .02 |
| <i>Current Family Relations</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Contacts in the Netherlands | | | | | .05* | .02 |
| Transnational Family Contacts | | | | | .08** | .03 |
| Transnational Support | | | | | .16** | .07 |
| Family Warmth | | | | | .12*** | .04 |
| Host Language Use Within the Family | | | | | -.24*** | .06 |
| <i>Lambda</i> | -.05 | .19 | -.00 | .18 | -.07 | .18 |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 4.23 | | 3.89 | | 3.63 | |
| <i>R</i> ² | .36 | | .38 | | .43 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests).

6.4.3 Socio-cultural adaptation attitude

In Table 6.4 the results are presented of the regression analyses for the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation. Model 1 shows that age was positively and religious attendance was negatively related to socio-cultural adaptation. Further, females were less inclined to endorse socio-cultural adaptation. For the structural variables the analysis revealed that employment status was not related to socio-cultural adaptation, whereas education was positively associated with socio-cultural adaptation. The perceived acceptance of the country of residence was positively associated with the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. Similar to socio-cultural maintenance, Mill's Lambda was not related to socio-cultural adaptation.

In the second model, a warm and loving relationship with the parents in adolescence was positively related to the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation (H2). Furthermore, there was a significant and positive association between parental education and the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. Immigrants with higher educated parents showed higher endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation (H1).

Table 6.4 Family relationships and socio-cultural adaptation

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|--|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> |
| <i>Individual Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Ethnic Background (Antillean-Dutch = ref) | | | | | | |
| Moroccan-Dutch | -.45*** | .10 | -.38*** | .11 | -.36*** | .12 |
| Turkish-Dutch | -.28** | .09 | -.23** | .09 | -.17* | .11 |
| Surinamese-Dutch | -.03 | .08 | -.02 | .08 | -.14* | .09 |
| Education | .04* | .02 | .03 | .02 | .03 | .02 |
| Age | .01** | .00 | .01** | .00 | .01** | .00 |
| Female | -.11* | .06 | -.09 | .06 | -.10* | .06 |
| Religious Attendance | -.06** | .02 | -.06** | .02 | -.06** | .02 |
| Employment Status | .03 | .06 | .04 | .06 | .03 | .06 |
| Dutch Language Proficiency | .20*** | .06 | .22*** | .06 | .15** | .06 |
| Length of Residence | -.00 | .00 | -.00 | .00 | -.01* | .00 |
| Second Generation | .11 | .10 | .10 | .11 | .09 | .11 |
| Perceived Acceptance | .20*** | .04 | .20*** | .04 | .19*** | .04 |
| <i>Parental Characteristics</i> | | | | | | |
| Warmth of Parent-child Bond | | | .09** | .04 | .08* | .04 |
| Parental Education | | | .04** | .02 | .02 | .02 |
| <i>Current Family Relations</i> | | | | | | |
| Family Contacts in the Netherlands | | | | | .02 | .02 |
| Transnational Family Contacts | | | | | -.01 | .03 |
| Transnational Family Support | | | | | -.01 | .06 |
| Family Warmth | | | | | .03 | .04 |
| Host Language Use Within the Family | | | | | .23*** | .06 |
| <i>Lambda</i> | .15 | .17 | .14 | .17 | .18 | .17 |
| <i>Intercept</i> | 1.78 | | 1.36 | | .97 | |
| <i>R</i> ² | .26 | | .27 | | .29 | |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (one-tailed tests).

Model 3 included the current family relationships and the explained variance in this full model was .29. Neither family contact in the Netherlands nor family warmth were significantly associated with the socio-cultural adaptation attitude. In addition, both measures of transnational family relationships – giving support and family contact – were unrelated to the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation.

However, in addition to the respondents' own Dutch language proficiency, the degree to which they speak Dutch with their relatives was independently and positively related to the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation (H6). After including our measures of the current family relationships, the effect of parental education was no longer significant.

6.4.4 Additional analyses

Additional analyses were performed to examine the robustness of our findings (available upon request from the first author). To investigate whether family characteristics matter in a similar way across the four immigrant groups, we included interactions between the (seven) family variables and ethnic background in predicting the two dependent variables. That means that we tested 84 interaction terms in total: for each analysis a comparison of four interaction terms between a family variable and ethnic group. The results did not indicate systematic differences between the ethnic groups in the effects of the family variables on the two acculturation attitudes. There were only three significant interaction effects. The effect of transnational support on the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation was somewhat weaker ($p = .04$) among the Turkish-Dutch than the Moroccan-Dutch. In addition, the positive association between transnational family support and socio-cultural maintenance attitude was weaker for the Moroccan-Dutch than for the Antillean-Dutch ($p = .01$), and for the Surinamese-Dutch ($p = .02$). However, we have to be cautious with the interpretation of these significant interactions because the large number of statistical tests increases the chance of type I statistical errors.

6.5 Conclusion and discussion

We examined the role of family life for adults' acculturation attitudes among the four main immigrant groups in the Netherlands. We focused on parental characteristics and on current family relationship in the Netherlands and in the country of origin.

First, within none of the four immigrant groups, socio-cultural maintenance and socio-cultural adaptation were significantly related. This supports previous studies that conceptualize these two dimensions of acculturation attitudes as independent (see Sam & Berry, 2006). Individual immigrants can maintain their ethnic culture and contact with co-ethnics even when they adapt culturally and socially to the new society.

A second conclusion is that family life mattered for both attitudes, but not to the same degree. Family life was more strongly related to the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance than the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation (Sabatier, 2008). The explained variance was substantially higher for the former compared to the latter attitude. This indicates that family relationships are particularly important for the continuation of ethnic culture and social contacts with co-ethnics (Van de Vijver & Phalet, 2004).

A third conclusion is that different aspects of family life matter for the attitude towards *socio-cultural maintenance*. It turned out that all measured aspects had an independent significant association with this attitude. The family relationships in both adolescence and in adult life, as well as transnational family relations were related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. Thus, cohesive, warm and supportive family relations provide a source for immigrants in the transmission and continuation of their ethnic culture and belonging (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, 2006). The family is an important link to one's culture and positive parental and family relationships make people more responsive to social influences. The finding that transnational family contact and support were related to the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance supports the proposition that many immigrants remain influenced by social networks and relationships that stretch across national borders (Levitt & Schiller, 2004). The use of the Dutch language within one's family and parental education showed negative associations with the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. This indicates that immigrants from families that are more integrated in Dutch society are less in favor of maintaining their own culture.

The fourth conclusion is that the current family cohesion, warmth and support were not related to the endorsement of *socio-cultural adaptation*. That means that these aspects of family life do not constitute an obstacle for the orientation on the host society. This is an important finding because in the Dutch public debate it is often argued that family relationships, and particularly relationships with relatives in the country of origin, hamper immigrants' integration and orientation on the Netherlands. It can be argued, however, that these aspects of family life also are not a steppingstone for integration because they do not contribute to a more favorable attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation.

However, it turned out that the warmth of the parent-child bond in the adolescence period was positively associated with the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. This finding supports the reasoning that parental warmth and affection stimulates the development of feelings of security, self-confidence, and generalized trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). These feelings inhibit a 'closed' ingroup orientation and facilitate adjustments to novel and unfamiliar settings (Chen et al., 2000). Thus, our study showed that parental warmth in one's formative years matters for the importance attached to the endorsement of socio-cultural adaptation. When we took the current family relationships (e.g., family warmth) into account, parental warmth was no longer significantly related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance.

The most important factor for the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation was the use of the Dutch language within one's family. Independently of the respondents' Dutch language proficiency, it turned out that immigrants from families that more often speak Dutch among each other, endorsed the importance of socio-cultural adaptation more strongly. Language proficiency is a crucial factor in the adaptation and integration of immigrants and the family is of key importance for the language acquisition of immigrant children (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). Our study showed that the language usage within the current family also plays a role

in the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. Dutch language usage within the family probably reflects the acculturation orientation of the family context.

A fifth conclusion is that the perceived acceptance of immigrants by the host society mattered for both acculturation attitudes, independently of the other factors and variables (Bourhis et al., 2007). The perception of a more accepting society was associated with a less strong endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance and a more positive attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. Two other noteworthy results were the associations of the own Dutch language proficiency and of the regular attendance of religious services. Being more fluent in the Dutch language was associated with a less positive attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance and a more positive socio-cultural adaptation attitude. Thus, being able to use the Dutch language is closely related to the orientation on the culture of the host society. The result for religion showed that immigrants who more often attend religious services are more strongly oriented on their ethnic culture and less on socio-cultural adaptation. Together with findings of other studies this indicates that religion can stimulate an ingroup orientation and can act as a barrier to socio-cultural integration in the Netherlands which is one of the most secular countries in the world (Te Grotenhuis & Scheepers, 2001; Van Tubergen, 2007).

A last result that we like to mention refers to the ethnic group differences and similarities. As could be expected, members from the two former colonial groups of Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch were more likely to endorse socio-cultural adaptation than the Moroccan-Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. The opposite result was found for the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. This means that the former two groups are very similar in their acculturation attitudes and differ in their attitudes from the latter two groups that also tend to have similar views. However, it should be noted that the ethnic group differences decreased substantially when we took the individual and family characteristics into account. Thus part of the ethnic group differences were due to, for example, Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch participants speaking less often Dutch with their relatives, being less educated and having lower educated parents. In addition, we found hardly any evidence for ethnic group differences in the associations between the family characteristics and the acculturation attitudes. Although we have to be careful with our interpretation because the sample size was not very large, these findings suggest the general importance of immigrants' family life for their acculturation attitudes.

In evaluating the present results some limitations have to be considered. We focused on the prediction of acculturation attitudes but some of the relationships might be bidirectional (Smokowski et al., 2008). In this study no repeated measurements of acculturation attitudes were available. Thus, we could not assess the causal relationship between family relationships and acculturation attitudes. We note, however, that most of the indicators of family relationships refer to the warmth and cohesion within the family prior to the measurement of current acculturation attitudes. For instance, the warmth of the parent-child bond in adolescence, the number of past transnational family contacts, and the frequency

of family contacts in the Netherlands during the twelve months prior to the time of interview.

When immigrants turn away from their ethnic culture this might create an acculturation gap within families that can lead to conflicts, which, in turn, are likely to affect the warmth and cohesiveness of the family relationships (Sam & Virta, 2003). Additionally, the importance of family relationships can be an expression of cultural maintenance, for instance when family cohesion is a core value of the ethnic culture (Umaña-Taylor, Alfaro, Bámaca, & Guimond, 2009). However, we found similar associations for the four immigrant groups that clearly differ in the importance attached to family integrity (SCP, 2009). Still, future longitudinal studies are needed to examine the relationships in more detail.

We studied the family as a single context but research has shown that family influences on acculturation outcomes can differ for particular family members. For instance, Chen and colleagues (2000) and Sabatier (2008) found that the contribution of fathers and mothers to acculturation outcomes can be different. Furthermore, the relationship with one's partner might be particularly important for the acculturation attitude of immigrants (Polek & Schoon, 2008). In addition, family processes might differ for those born and raised in the Netherlands compared to those socialized in the country of (ethnic) origin. Our sample was too small to investigate this possibility. In addition, the relatively small number of second generation immigrants meant that we could not examine the extent to which ethnic and cultural socialization practices persist throughout adult life.

In conclusion, acculturation is not only an individual matter or task but also involves one's family (e.g., Cort, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Controlling statistically for a range of factors, we have shown that family life in the country of residence and in the host country are related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance and, to a lesser extent, to the attitude towards social-cultural adaptation. The findings improve our understanding of the ways in which past and current family relationships contribute to acculturation processes of immigrants.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusions and discussion



7 Conclusions and discussion

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this dissertation was to increase our understanding of the ways in which the family context relates to ethnic attitudes among natives and ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. The overarching research question was: *What is the role of family life for attitudes towards interethnic marriage and acculturation among minority and majority groups?*

The main focus of the research (chapters 2 to 5) was on attitudes towards interethnic marriage. Interethnic marriage is considered a key indicator of social integration, and marriages between members of different ethnic groups are often viewed as an indicator of mutual group acceptance (Gordon, 1964; Hwang, Saenz, & Aquirre, 1997; Lieberson & Waters, 1988). In the Netherlands, the rate of ethnic intermarriage is relatively low, making it important to examine the underlying factors of marriage patterns, of which preferences are an important aspect (Kalmijn, 1998). While there have been numerous studies on actual intermarriage patterns, relatively few studies have examined the attitudes towards intermarriage. In this dissertation, the extent to which someone would (dis)approve of their (actual or imagined) child's decision to marry a person from a different ethnic background was studied. The opposition to interethnic marriages of family members, particularly the parents, can result in family conflicts, parental withdrawal of support, and in extreme cases to family exclusion and ostracism, but very little is known on the determinants of interethnic marriage attitudes.

In addition to attitudes towards interethnic marriage, the acculturation attitudes of migrants were considered. Positive intermarriage attitudes indicate acculturation in the domain of the private (family) sphere, but there is also a large body of acculturation research which is more generally concerned with the socio-cultural orientations of migrants (e.g., Berry, 1997; Hutnik, 1991; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). Acculturation attitudes are key aspects of the acculturation process because they shape individuals' behavioral intentions, their motivation to adapt to various spheres of life, and their acculturation behavior (see Sam & Berry, 2006). An increase in our understanding of intermarriage and acculturation attitudes is of societal relevance as both refer to ethnic group boundaries, and therefore to the social cohesion between ethnic groups in society.

In this dissertation, the focus was on several research questions with respect to the role of the family in attitudes towards ethnic intermarriage and acculturation. Family research on ethnic attitudes typically examines the role of parental socialization and/or the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions to adolescents or children. However, this neglects (a) possible

family influences in adulthood, and (b) the influence of family members other than the parents (e.g., one's partner). Therefore, our first research question was: *How do family relationships in adulthood relate to attitudes towards interethnic marriage among majority and ethnic minority groups?*

Further, despite a long research tradition on the influence of the family of origin on ethnic attitudes, there are still important questions that need to be addressed. For instance, it is unclear how large the total impact is of the family of origin, what the relative importance is of different pathways of family influence, and the extent to which the family of origin remains important in adult life. The second research question was: *How do characteristics of the family of origin during youth relate to ethnic attitudes of individuals in adulthood?*

While there is research on parental influences on acculturation attitudes of immigrant adolescents (e.g., Pfafferoth & Brown, 2006; Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009), relatively few studies have addressed the role of the family in adulthood for these attitudes. The third research question this dissertation addressed was: *How do family relationships relate to attitudes towards acculturation among adult immigrants?*

Based on insights from family theories (e.g., socialization theory) and intergroup approaches (e.g., group threat theories) hypotheses were formulated about family determinants of ethnic attitudes. To answer the research questions, data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study were used (Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). This is a large-scale survey that contains information on family ties and ethnic attitudes. The unique multi-actor nature of the data made it possible to analyze how attitudes of different family members (e.g., partners, siblings, parents) were related to each other. In addition, the multi-group nature of the data enabled us to focus on the ethnic Dutch as well as the four largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands.

In section 7.2 an overview of the main findings of each of the five empirical chapters is given. Section 7.3 discusses the main conclusions regarding the three research questions and the contributions of this dissertation to the literature. The chapter concludes with some limitations of the present research, and gives suggestions and directions for further investigations (section 7.4).

7.2 Summary of findings

7.2.1 Family relations and attitudes towards interethnic marriage

Chapter 2 went beyond existing research by considering the role of the family in adulthood, and the ways in which different aspects of family life are important for ethnic Dutch people's attitudes towards having ethnic minority members as close kin by marriage.

First, the findings indicated that the level of opposition towards interethnic marriage is quite high in the Netherlands, and that the attitude of ethnic Dutch towards the three ethnic minority groups varied. In line with previous studies in the Netherlands (see Hagendoorn, 1995), it turned out that the opposition among

ethnic Dutch was strongest towards Moroccans, followed by Turks and then Surinamese. The attitudes towards the three ethnic minority groups were highly correlated, and different aspects of family life had similar statistical effects on the attitude towards each of the three groups.

Second, the findings showed that different aspects of the structure and functioning of the family were related to the intermarriage attitude. Three of the four indicators of family cohesion – strength of family ties, the adherence to family norms and contact frequency – were related to less acceptance of minority group members as close kin by marriage. This supports the idea that when the ties are tightly knit, family members have an incentive to keep ‘strangers’ out of the family. In contrast, affective and emotional supportive family relations were associated with less opposition towards interethnic marriages. This is in agreement with the idea that warm and emotionally supportive family relationships can lead to the development of generalized trust, empathy and open-mindedness, which in turn enhance positive ethnic attitudes.

7.2.2 Family influences on intermarriage attitudes: A sibling analysis

The findings for current family influences in the first study were used to conduct a second study, presented in chapter 3. This analysis focused on the role of the family of origin on individuals’ attitudes towards interethnic marriage. Information on ethnic attitudes of sibling pairs was used to estimate the total impact of the family of origin. The focus was on different ways in which the family of origin influences ethnic attitudes. The role of the intergenerational transmission of attitudes, the transmission of socio-economic and cultural positions, and the provision of the structural and cultural conditions in the formative period (Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Hello, 2003; Sinclair et al., 2005; Vollebergh et al., 2001; White & Gleitzman, 2006) were simultaneously investigated. Further, we examined whether current family characteristics – family warmth and cohesion – had a direct effect on intermarriage attitudes, and whether these characteristics enhanced the congruence of intermarriage attitudes within families.

Multilevel sibling models showed that nearly 30% of the variation in ethnic attitudes can be ascribed to the family of origin. The explained variance was high: we were able to account for 60% of the between-family variation in the interethnic marriage attitude.

The intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes appeared to be an important mechanism of family influence, and the results suggested that this parental influence remains across the lifespan. In addition, family influences on intermarriage attitudes related to the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions. However, no direct effect was found for the parental positions in the child’s youth (parental social status and education) on the interethnic marriage attitude. The findings on the relevance of current family characteristics for interethnic marriage attitudes were confirmed in the specific context of the family of origin. Family cohesion, expressed via adherence to family norms and family contact, was related to more *resistance* to intermarriage, whereas family

characteristics that indicate warm relations appeared to be related to more *acceptance* of interethnic marriage. In addition, the results showed that family cohesion related not only directly to intermarriage attitudes, but also moderated the congruence of attitudes within families. Family warmth, however, was not related to the extent to which parents' and (adult) children's attitudes are similar.

7.2.3 The role of partner and partner relationship characteristics

In chapter 4 the focus on family life in adulthood and ethnic attitudes was extended to the role of the partner and partner relationship characteristics. Although research has examined the importance of intimate relationships for individuals' attitudes (e.g., Kalmijn, 2005; Kenny & Cook, 1999; Parsons & Bales, 1955; Roest, Dubas, Gerris, & Engels, 2006; Wood, 2000), little is known about whether partner and partner relationship characteristics are associated with the opposition to an ethnic minority member as a (possible) spouse of one's child.

The association found between the intermarriage attitudes of the partners was fairly strong. No evidence was found for the idea that the socio-economic position of one's partner relates to one's own interethnic marriage attitude. However, as expected, we did find that having a non-native partner was related to more positive interethnic marriage attitudes. Further, several *relationship* characteristics were associated with the interethnic marriage attitude. In line with the findings of the previous chapters, the results showed that people with a warm partner relationship were less likely to oppose interethnic marriages. In addition, and in line with our expectations, cohesive partner ties were associated with ethnic exclusionism in the domain of the family. The findings showed that partners who have more shared leisure activities, more joint family visits, and more joint (visits to) friends were more likely to be negative about an interethnic marriage compared to partners who were more independent in their activities and network of friends. In addition, people with children and those who are married were more opposed to interethnic marriage than those without children and non-married people. Further, the results indicated that relationship length fosters similarity in ethnic attitudes of the partners. This might be due to processes of social influence, shared experiences and the exposure to shared circumstances. Finally, whereas the cohesiveness of the relationship appeared to foster attitudinal similarity, no such effect was found for relationship warmth.

7.2.4 Intermarriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups

In chapter 5, our research on family influences was extended with the perspective of the four largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. We examined the intermarriage attitudes of the ethnic Dutch towards the ethnic minority groups and the intermarriage attitudes of the four minority groups towards the Dutch. Again, the association between current family relations – warmth and cohesion – and the intermarriage attitude was investigated. Despite the variation in demographic, socio-economic, and cultural factors of the different ethnic minority groups,

relatively few studies have examined ethnic attitudes of different groups. To study differences in interethnic marriage attitudes across ethnic minority groups, several immigrant characteristics and socio-economic and cultural factors were considered.

The findings indicated large differences in the resistance to interethnic marriage across the five ethnic groups. Only a relatively small part of these differences could be accounted for in the different steps of the analyses. In agreement with notions on group status (Blumer, 1958; Hagendoorn, 1995), the ethnic Dutch majority group showed relatively high levels of resistance. In addition, the resistance to marriage with a Dutch person was much lower among the Surinamese-Dutch and Antilleans-Dutch than among the Moroccan-Dutch and the Turkish-Dutch. Current family characteristics were relevant for understanding the resistance to interethnic marriage among both the ethnic Dutch and ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. The results demonstrated that family norms, family contacts and conservative family values were positively related to the resistance to interethnic marriage, whereas feelings of (family) affection showed a negative association with the opposition towards interethnic marriage.

This study indicated the importance of different immigrant characteristics for the attitude towards intermarriage. Dutch language proficiency was negatively related to the resistance to marriage with a Dutch person. People who had migrated for family reasons showed higher levels of resistance to interethnic marriage than immigrants who had migrated for other reasons (e.g., education, work, safety). Generational status and length of stay were not related to the intermarriage attitude.

7.2.5 Family life and acculturation attitudes

In chapter 6 we focused on family life and the acculturation attitudes of adults among the four largest migrant groups in the Netherlands. Despite the notion that the family is a particularly important context for immigrants (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Zhou, 1997), relatively few studies have addressed the role of the family in the acculturation process of adult immigrants. In this study, the importance of early parental practices and current (national and transnational) family relationships for the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance and the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation were investigated.

Firstly, socio-cultural maintenance and socio-cultural adaptation were not related to each other among any of the four immigrant groups. This supports previous studies that conceptualize these two dimensions of acculturation attitudes as being independent (see Sam & Berry, 2006). As could be expected, the Surinamese-Dutch and Antillean-Dutch were more likely to endorse socio-cultural adaptation than immigrants from Morocco and Turkey, whereas the opposite was found for the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. Second, the results indicated that family life matters for both attitudes, but more strongly for the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. Family (national and transnational) contacts, support and warmth were positively related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance, but not to the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation.

Third, growing up with loving and supporting parents was associated with a more positive attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation, but not to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. Finally, independently from the individual's language proficiency, the extent to which immigrants communicate in Dutch with their family members was related to a more positive attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation and to a lower endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance.

7.3 Main conclusions and contributions to the literature

This dissertation contributes to the existing literature on family influences on ethnic attitudes in several ways. In the introduction three main research questions were formulated on the relation between family life and ethnic attitudes. The main conclusions and contributions to the literature are discussed in light of these questions.

7.3.1 Family relations in adulthood

The first research question was: *How do family relationships in adulthood relate to attitudes towards interethnic marriage among majority and ethnic minority groups?*

The main conclusion is that family life in adulthood is relevant for ethnic attitudes. Research has shown the importance of the family in the formative period through socialization and the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions (e.g., Aboud & Doyle, 1996; Vollebergh et al., 2001). Our study demonstrates that family relationships in adulthood also matter for individuals' attitudes towards interethnic marriage.

The findings showed that family relationships are associated with the opposition to interethnic marriage a) through different mechanisms (e.g., cohesion and warmth (chapters 2 to 5)), b) among both minority and majority group members (chapter 5), c) within different types of family relationships (e.g., family of origin (chapter 3) and one's partner (chapter 4)), and d) towards different ethnic outgroups (chapters 2 and 5). Different indicators of family cohesion (e.g., contact, adherence to family norms, and the strength of family ties) were related to less acceptance of intermarriage, whereas family warmth (e.g., feelings of affection and emotional support) was related to more acceptance of interethnic marriage. The family is often viewed as an institute that opposes interethnic marriages and that forms an obstacle for heterogamy. This dissertation shows that this picture is too simplistic and that influences of family life on interethnic marriage attitudes are mixed.

7.3.1.1 Family warmth

The relation between family warmth and the opposition to interethnic marriage was investigated in chapters 2 to 5. An important conclusion is that affective and emotionally supportive family relationships foster the acceptance of an ethnic minority as close kin by marriage. Furthermore, the positive effect of warm relationships on the acceptance of an ethnic minority as close kin generalizes across different types of family relations and across different ethnic groups.

These findings are in line with research which has found that warm and emotionally supportive ties are related to feelings of trust, empathy, perspective taking, and less anxiety and self-uncertainty (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Glanville & Paxton, 2007; Hogg, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997). These outcomes, in turn, are factors that stimulate positive interethnic attitudes. It is in emotionally supportive and warm relationships that people maintain trust in significant others and this form of trust tends to transfer into a more generalized sense of trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). Generalized trust goes beyond the circle of familiar people and extends the boundaries of one's social group (Uslaner, 2002). Empathy and perspective taking have also been found to be related to more positive outgroup attitudes (e.g., Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Additionally, emotionally supportive family relationships (can) lead to psychological well-being whereas unsupportive relationships lead to self-uncertainty (Roberts & Bengtson, 1996). Psychological well-being is related to a more open and accepting orientation towards outgroups (Tyler et al., 1997) and self-uncertainty leads to bolstering of one's cultural norms and defensive reactions towards outsiders (Hogg, 2000). Further, low levels of anxiety and self-uncertainty are related to a more positive orientation towards the larger society, and towards outgroups in particular (e.g., Hogg, 2000; Tyler et al., 1997).

The findings are in line with these notions: warm social relationships seem to contribute to psychological dispositions which in turn affect ethnic attitudes. Hence, whereas families are often seen as a context in which there is opposition toward ethnic intermarriage (Kalmijn, 1998), this study demonstrates that this is not the case for families that have warm and emotionally supporting family relationships.

7.3.1.2 Family cohesion

Social cohesion can have positive consequences for ingroup members, such as mutual support, cooperation, and trust (see Komter, 2006). However, it can also lead to the exclusion or rejection of outsiders. In agreement with this latter proposition, the results clearly indicate that higher family cohesion is related to stronger opposition to interethnic marriage. This was found in different studies, with different indicators, for different family relationships, and among the majority group as well as different ethnic minority groups.

It was argued that people from a different ethno-cultural background can be perceived as a threat to the cultural identity and solidarity of one's own group (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Furthermore, interethnic marriage reduces the ability of families to pass on their cultural practices and beliefs to the next generations. Thus, especially when families are tightly knit, family members have an incentive to keep 'strangers' out of the family. Indeed, the findings are congruent with the idea that family cohesion stimulates the exclusion of family members with a different ethno-cultural background. Moreover, the results are in agreement with general intergroup theories on the relation between ingroup cohesion and outgroup attitudes. Ingroup cohesiveness and closure is often associated with outgroup

rejection, especially when the outgroup is perceived to undermine one's way of life (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Pettigrew, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Because people with a different ethnic background are, in general, more dissimilar with respect to relevant social and cultural characteristics of the family than members of one's own ethnic group (Baerveldt, Van Duijn, Vermeij, & Van Hemert, 2004), the assumption is that the former are perceived more strongly as an outgroup than the latter. Although these group dynamics are usually applied to large scale groups (e.g., ethnic or national groups), our study suggests that perceived cultural threat and ingroup cohesion also lead to more negative interethnic attitudes within smaller groups which are based on common bonds such as the family (Prentice, Dale, & Lightdale, 1994).

7.3.1.3 *Beyond the parent-child bond: partner (relationship) effects*

Most research on the role of the family for ethnic attitudes focuses on the family of origin, particularly the parent-child relationship. An important conclusion of this dissertation is that family influences go beyond the family of origin, and that also relationships with current family members and with one's partner are related to interethnic marriage attitudes.

First, the results indicated a relatively strong association between the partners' attitudes. Research has shown that the attitudinal congruence between partners tends to be stronger when the topic is more important for the functioning of a dyadic relationship, and when it concerns issues for which disagreements can lead to conflicts (Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Kalmijn, 2005). Hence, the relatively strong association between the partners' attitudes might be due to the fact that disagreements about the future of one's (potential) children are important sources of discussion, irritations, and conflict (Doohan et al., 2009).

Second, contrary to the expectation, the socio-economic status of the partner did not relate to the opposition to interethnic marriage. It was argued that the socio-economic position of one's partner might be related to one's own ethnic attitude because ethnic minorities can be seen as a threat to the partner's socio-economic position. Since a partner with a lower socio-economic status can rely on fewer resources and is typically more directly in competition with ethnic outgroups than a partner with a higher socio-economic status, a person with a partner with a lower socio-economic status might perceive the ethnic competition more strongly. Perceived ethnic threat evoked by perceptions of ethnic competition enhances, in turn, negative attitudes towards ethnic outgroups (Quillian, 1995). The lack of support for the hypothesis might be partly due to the specific ethnic attitude that was examined. It is possible that the socio-economic status of the partner is more important for ethnic attitudes that refer directly to the domain of work, like the admission of ethnic minorities to the labor market or unemployment benefits for ethnic minorities.

Third, whereas the cohesiveness of the partner relationship turned out to foster attitudinal similarity, the warmth of the relationship did not show such effect. Hence, it is cohesiveness rather than warmth of the partner relationship that fosters similarity in attitudes. Cohesiveness involves group norms and social control and

these facilitate attitudinal similarity between partners. In contrast, warm family relationships are important for trust and personal autonomy and thereby provide more opportunities and stronger acceptance of distinctive attitudes and beliefs.

7.3.1.4 *The minority perspective*

Ethnic boundaries involve different groups which might perceive these boundaries differently. Therefore it is important to include the perspective of ethnic majority as well as minority groups when studying ethnic attitudes. In the literature, low levels of intermarriage are often viewed as a lack of integration of immigrant groups (Lieberson & Waters, 1988; Qian & Lichter, 2001). However, intermarriage does not only depend on the readiness of ethnic minority groups to integrate, but also on the openness and acceptance of the majority group. The relatively high level of resistance to interethnic marriage of the Dutch majority is probably an important factor for the intermarriage patterns in the Netherlands. Chapter 5 showed large differences in the resistance to interethnic marriage between the five ethnic groups, and only a relatively small part of these differences was accounted for after controlling statistically for other variables (e.g., education, income). This indicates that other explanations are involved, such as intergroup contact and social status.

An important conclusion is that the role of family life in adulthood for interethnic marriage attitudes, generalizes across different ethnic groups. In chapter 5, the hypotheses on the effects of warm and cohesive family ties for the acceptance of interethnic marriage were also found for the ethnic minority groups. Since ethnic groups differ in types of family relations, a part of the differences in the intermarriage attitude could be attributed to the family context. This means that family life forms an intermediate context for the association between ethnic origin and interethnic attitudes.

7.3.2 Assessing the influence of the family of origin

The second research question was: *How do the characteristics of the family of origin during youth relate to ethnic attitudes of individuals in adulthood?* We aimed to contribute to the literature by studying the total impact of the family of origin by using a multi-level sibling approach, and by looking at the different mechanisms through which the family of origin affects the ethnic attitudes of adults. The findings clearly demonstrated the importance of the family in shaping ethnic attitudes of adults: almost 30% of the variance in the intermarriage attitude could be attributed to the family of origin, which was quite similar to the results of recent sibling analyses on kinship norms (De Vries et al., 2009), and on Jewish intermarriage patterns in the Netherlands (Kalmijn et al., 2006).

An important question raised by social scientists, particularly in the field of educational and occupational stratification (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Haller & Portes, 1973), is the extent to which individual attitudes and behaviors are shaped by processes of ascription (e.g., family of origin influences) or achievement (e.g., individual circumstances). To what extent are our attitudes and behaviors determined by the cradle in which we are born? Our study demonstrates that,

although people's attitudes are to a large extent based on personal choices and circumstances, the process of ascription (through family background) also remains important for the formation of ethnic attitudes, despite notions of increased individualization and modernization (Popenoe, 1988).

Because most studies consider family (background) processes for the development of ethnic attitudes of adolescents only, it was relatively unclear to what extent family background processes remain influential throughout adult life (Knafo & Galansky, 2008). A conclusion of this research is that family background does not only relate to interethnic marriage attitudes of children and adolescents, but also to the attitudes of adults, and hence family background effects do not seem to fade away during adulthood. Chapter 3 showed that the family of origin has a substantial influence on interethnic marriage attitudes of adults. Our study demonstrated that the intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes was the most important pathway. Despite the notions, developed in individualization and modernization theory, that people turn away from their parents in adult life (e.g., Popenoe, 1988), the intergenerational congruence in intermarriage attitudes was relatively strong. This finding is in line with work by Alwin et al. (1991) who showed that the family of origin has a persistent influence on political attitudes throughout the life course.

In addition, in line with previous studies (Vollebergh et al., 2001), the indirect influence via the transmission of positions turned out to be important: parents affect their children's attitudes through intergenerational status inheritance. However, our study provided no evidence of a direct effect of the parental positions in one's youth. Hence, people's ethnic attitudes do not seem to reflect the conditions that prevailed during their pre-adult years (Hello, 2003; Inglehart, 1990). But it should be noted that our research did not provide a very elaborate test of this proposition.

Compared to the role of family background in the formative years, the effects of family relationships in adulthood were relatively small. However, the findings do show that the family characteristics had an independent statistical effect after various well-known correlates of ethnic attitudes were taken into account. Furthermore, although the efficacy of current family variables may be somewhat limited, they are important in conceptually linking contextual and individual-level theories (Liska, 1990).

7.3.3 Family relations and acculturation

The third research question was: *How do family relations relate to attitudes towards acculturation among adult immigrants?* Acculturation of immigrant adults is not only an individual matter or task, but also involves one's family (e.g., Cort, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). An important conclusion is that family life in the country of residence and in the host country is related to the endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. This is in accordance with the idea that family relationships are particularly salient for immigrants because they provide an important coping resource in the host society and provide continuity with the past. It is argued that relationships with family members affirm the ethnic identity and increase feelings

of belonging to one's ethnic group thereby fostering a positive attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance. The finding that, in addition to family relations in the host society, transnational family contact and support are related to the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance supports the proposition that many immigrants remain influenced by social networks and relationships that stretch across national borders (Levitt & Schiller, 2004).

Another conclusion is that current family cohesion, warmth and support do not constitute an obstacle for the orientation on the host society. This is an important finding because in the Dutch public debate it is often argued that family relationships, and particularly relationships with relatives in the country of origin, hamper immigrants' integration and orientation on the Netherlands. The results, however, can also be interpreted as showing that these aspects of family life are not a steppingstone for integration either, because they do not contribute to a more favorable attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation. Therefore, the results do not provide evidence for the proposition of segmented assimilation theory that social relationships within the family can facilitate the integration of immigrants (see for instance, Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997).

It is often argued that language proficiency is a crucial factor in the adaptation and integration of immigrants, and the family is of key importance for the language acquisition of immigrant children (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). This study showed that independently of the individual Dutch language proficiency, immigrants within families in which Dutch is spoken more frequently, had a more positive attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation and a lower endorsement of socio-cultural maintenance. Since Dutch language usage within the family probably (partly) reflects the acculturation orientation of the family context, this finding indicates that immigrants from families that are more integrated in Dutch society are less in favor of maintaining their own culture. Hence, the results indicate that ethnic language use within the family hampers the socio-cultural integration of immigrants, which, again, is not in line with notions of segmented assimilation theory (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Portes & Zhou, 1993).

An important finding of this study was that the warmth of the parent-child bond in the adolescence period was positively associated with the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation in adulthood. This finding supports the reasoning that parental warmth and affection stimulate the development of feelings of security, self-confidence, and generalized trust (Glanville & Paxton, 2007). These feelings inhibit a 'closed' ingroup orientation and facilitate adjustments to novel and unfamiliar settings (Chen et al., 2000). For the attitude towards socio-cultural maintenance, however, the influence of parental warmth appeared to be indirect via the warmth of family relationships in adult life.

In sum, the results indicated that current family relationships have no effect – in the case of (trans)national contact and support – or a negative effect – when communication is not in Dutch – on socio-cultural adaptation. These findings are not in line with notions of segmented assimilation theory which states that ethnic retention and family ties can foster the integration of immigrants into the host society (see for instance, Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). However, the finding that the

warmth of the parent-child bond in adolescence was positively related to socio-cultural adaptation, confirms that family influences in the youth can facilitate adjustment. Therefore our study shows that it is more fruitful to put an emphasis on substantive characteristics of the family rather than to focus on the simple question whether immigrant families hamper or facilitate the integration of their family members into the host society. The latter view that immigrants' relationships with their family either hamper or facilitate integration is quite common in the debate on straight-line assimilation versus segmented assimilation (Alba & Nee, 1997; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001), but this perspective tends to ignore the mixed effects that different family characteristics can have.

7.4 Strengths, limitations, and directions for future research

This research contributes to the literature by asking new questions on the role of family life in adulthood for ethnic attitudes, and by providing better answers to old questions on the role of the family of origin on adults' ethnic attitudes. Further, important methodological strengths of the study were that 1) it relied on a large sample, 2) analyses were conducted with qualitatively high data, and 3) advanced statistical methods were applied to test the hypotheses. Most multi-actor data typically rely on small and non-representative samples (e.g., Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Roest et al., 2006), whereas our research examined 2,500 partner dyads in chapter 4. The richness of the data was fully used in chapter 3 which studied multiple pathways of family of origin influence using information on family triads. While assessing the family of origin effects in the third chapter, multi-level sibling models were applied which controlled for selectivity by Heckman models. Contrary to most studies that use multi actor data, possible problems of selectivity were considered. The use of Heckman models (chapters 3 and 4) enabled us to better assess the relative contribution of the different pathways of influence. Although there was selectivity (e.g., close family relationships were overrepresented in the sample), this did not affect the results when the theoretical models were well specified. Since one does not know beforehand whether the model is specified enough to encounter problems of selectivity it is wise to apply Heckman models when using multi actor data.

Despite the different contributions, the research in the present dissertation has several limitations. The most important limitations, as well as directions for future research are discussed below. The first three subparagraphs explicitly address the main limitations of this study, namely the question of causality (7.4.1), the underlying mechanisms and omitted determinants (7.4.2), and the conceptualizations of the family constructs (7.4.3). Second, the generalizability of the findings for interethnic behavior (7.4.4) and for ethnic attitudes (7.4.5) is considered.

7.4.1 Causality

One limitation of the current study is that cross-sectional data were used. Therefore caution is needed when drawing conclusions about causal effects of family life. However, throughout the dissertation various theoretical arguments have been presented for expecting family relationships to affect ethnic attitudes. For example, there were clear theoretical arguments for expecting family cohesion and family warmth to affect opposition to interethnic marriage. It is more difficult to think of a convincing rationale for expecting that the attitude towards interethnic marriage affects family cohesion and family warmth. It is likely that possible *differences* in ethnic attitudes between family members might cause tensions and conflicts in families, but there is no strong theoretical argument why the opposition or acceptance of intermarriage as such would affect family cohesiveness or warmth. The issue of causality is the most critical with regard to the next three issues: 1) the bidirectional influence of parents and children, 2) selection and influence effects within the partner relationship and 3) the relation between family characteristics and acculturation attitudes.

First, although studies have shown that the influence of parents on children is much stronger than the other way around (e.g., Pinquart & Silbereisen, 2004; Vollebergh et al., 2001), it has to be taken into account that part of the attitude congruence between the family members might be due to the fact that there are mutual influences. It is likely that the dynamic in families changes when children grow older. Knafo and Galanski (2009) for instance, argue that during childhood parental influence is stronger than the child's influence, but that this difference in strength decreases throughout the life span. To disentangle this possibly reciprocal influence, and to provide stronger evidence for the lasting influence of parental socialization influences, longitudinal panel data is needed.

Second, in chapter 4, it was found that ethnic attitudes of partners were quite strongly related, but future studies need to examine the underlying processes more closely. Theories of social influence argue that one's partner is a socializing agent who communicates his or her beliefs and views and thereby reinforces or changes one's own attitudes. A positive relation between partners' attitudes might also be due to selection processes or 'assortative mating': people tend to select intimate others who are similar in social and cultural positions, and in attitudes and values. Furthermore, an association between partners' attitudes might also be due to shared circumstances and shared experiences during a relationship (Byrne, 1971; Kalmijn, 2005). These different processes are difficult to disentangle, also for panel studies. Most panel studies, for example, cannot disentangle social influence effects from assortative mating because the attitudes of the partners before they met are typically not known.

Third, in chapter 6, the focus was on the explanation of acculturation attitudes but some of the relationships might be bidirectional (Smokowski et al., 2008). When immigrants turn away from their ethnic culture this might create an acculturation gap within families that can lead to conflicts, which, in turn, are likely to affect the warmth and cohesiveness of the family relationships (Sam & Virta, 2003).

Additionally, the importance attached to family relationships can be an expression of cultural maintenance, for instance when family cohesion is a core value of the ethnic culture (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2009). The ethnic groups considered in this study differ in the extent to which family cohesion is a central part of their ethnic culture. People of Turkish and Moroccan origin tend to emphasize family norms and family relationships more strongly than the Surinamese-Dutch and the Antillean-Dutch, who, in turn, are more similar to the more individualistic ethnic Dutch (SCP, 2009). However, similar associations between family characteristics and acculturation attitudes were found for the four immigrant groups. This suggests that the role of family relationships on acculturation attitudes is not culturally specific.

7.4.2 Underlying mechanisms and omitted determinants

A second limitation of our research is that assumptions on the underlying mechanisms for the relationships between current family relationships and the interethnic marriage attitude could not be tested empirically. For instance, there was the assumption that family cohesion fosters the opposition to interethnic marriage via increased threat and/or a perceived preference for family members who are ethno-culturally similar. However, no measures of perceived threat and preferences were available. The underlying mechanisms of the hypothesized relation between warmth of the family relation and ethnic attitudes also need to be investigated more closely. The assumption was that family warmth fosters psychological dispositions such as empathy, self certainty and generalized trust, and that these dispositions, in turn, would increase tolerance and positive attitudes towards ethnic outgroups. But no measures of these intermediate concepts were available. Future studies should examine specific mechanisms in more detail.

In examining the relation between family life and the attitude towards interethnic marriage, important possible confounding factors like education, age, social class, and religiosity were taken into account. In addition, it was necessary to include conservative family values in the study. Research has shown that people who endorse conservative and authoritarian family values tend to have more negative ethnic attitudes (Duckitt, 1992), and the endorsement of these values are related to aspects of family life (Triandis, 1995; Wilcox, 1998). Indeed, conservative family values were strongly related to the resistance to interethnic marriage, but could not account for the perceived association between family cohesion and warmth, on the one hand, and interethnic marriage attitudes, on the other. But other factors that might be important for interethnic attitudes were not considered, like intergroup threat and intergroup contact.

The acculturation of immigrants depends on aspects of the receiving context, such as the reactions and openness of the majority population and government policy (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996): A minority group's willingness and ability to integrate is influenced by how the majority population perceives and treats that particular group. For instance, studies have shown that discrimination has a strong negative impact on the extent to which immigrants orient themselves on the host

society (Berry et al., 2006). In reaction to disadvantages and exclusion, immigrants tend to distance themselves from the majority population and mainstream culture, and strengthen the ties with the own ethnic community in general and one's family in particular (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Zhou, 1997). Although immigrants' perception of the openness of the host country was taken into account in chapter 6, future studies should include more direct measures of perceived discrimination.

Intergroup contact might also be a possible mechanism through which the family of origin influences children's attitudes. Children not only adopt attitudes from their parents, but also learn and are influenced by their parents' behavior. Thus, it is possible that behavior of parents during a child's formative years, for instance contacts with non co-ethnic friends, affects the ethnic attitudes of their offspring. Future studies could assess this alternative path of family influence.

7.4.3 Conceptualizations and measures of the family constructs

We conceptualized family warmth and family cohesion as two independent but interrelated constructs which have opposite effects on the attitude towards interethnic marriage. In family research many conceptualizations and operationalizations of family relationships have been suggested and tested. In this dissertation, Bengtson and Roberts' model of solidarity (1991) functioned as a conceptual tool to identify different dimensions of family life. Bengtson and Roberts (1991) distinguish between various dimensions of family solidarity, like associational solidarity (frequency of contact), functional solidarity (exchange of instrumental support), normative solidarity (endorsement of family norms of obligation), structural solidarity (opportunity structure for interactions), and affective solidarity (feelings of affection and emotional closeness). Following this model we included measures of these different dimensions in our statistical model. Bengtson and Roberts themselves use the terms of cohesion and solidarity interchangeably. In interethnic studies cohesion is a more frequently used concept than solidarity, and hence we adopted this specific label. Throughout the dissertation, associational, functional, normative and structural solidarity were taken as indicators of family cohesion. Feelings of affection, emotional support and emotional closeness were used as indicators of family warmth, since these measures were most in accordance with the theoretical notions of why family relationships could also foster tolerance. The aim of this research was not to make another conceptual contribution to the extensive debate on family concepts and dimensions of family life, but to empirically examine the ways in which family relations in adulthood are related to ethnic attitudes. We applied a commonly used conceptual model of family life developed by Bengtson and Roberts (see for instance, Bengtson, 2001; Bucx, 2009; Silverstein & Long, 1998; Voorpostel & Blieszner, 2008). Future studies could assess whether similar results are found when applying other conceptualizations and operationalizations of family relationships.

7.4.4 Interethnic marriage

Although this study addressed and answered several questions on the role of family life for ethnic boundaries, the findings also raise new questions. For instance, what could the current findings imply for actual ethnic intermarriage patterns? The nature of the attitude-behavior association is generally complex, and it is typically argued that the relation is bidirectional. For instance, contact theory predicts that, under certain conditions, interethnic attitudes are influenced by interethnic contact (Allport, 1954). In addition, there are theories that emphasize the reverse relationship whereby interethnic attitudes predict interethnic behavior. For example, the theory of preferences, opportunities and third parties (see Kalmijn, 1998; Van Tubergen & Maas, 2007) postulates that interethnic marriage patterns arise from the interplay between the preferences or attitudes of individuals, the constraints of the marriage market, and the influence of third parties. In addition, (longitudinal) empirical research has demonstrated that interethnic attitudes predict voting behavior (Bélanger & Aarts, 2006), interethnic (friendship) contact (Jaspers, Lubbers, & De Graaf, 2008; Levin, Van Laar, & Sidanius, 2003), and interethnic romantic relationships (Levin, Taylor, & Caudle, 2007).

For interethnic marriages, one could expect that the warmth and cohesiveness of the family relations have an influence on actual intermarriage patterns via the underlying interethnic attitudes. Future studies should test hypotheses on the role of family life for attitudes in relation to actual intermarriage patterns. Do cohesive family relationships translate into more homogamous marriage patterns? To what extent can endogamous marriage patterns of Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch be explained by the cohesiveness of their families? The effects of family characteristics on actual marriages might even be stronger than on attitudes because family norms and the pressure to conform might have a greater impact on behaviors than on attitudes. Processes within the family could provide a link between the macro level phenomena of interethnic marriage patterns and individual decisions about marrying someone from one's own or another ethnic community. Some ethnic groups put more emphasis on family cohesion than others. This affects the family relationships within these ethnic communities, which in turn shape individual marriage decisions that are aggregate to group level intermarriage patterns. Hence, the family might constitute an important mediating context for understanding actual interethnic relations in society.

In this dissertation a specific intermarriage attitude was examined, namely the acceptance of an ethnic minority as a possible spouse for one's child. How can we expect that the attitude towards an interethnic marriage of one's child translates into marriage behavior? In Western countries, parents have limited formal control over their children's marriage decisions, but it is argued that they can still exert influence by setting and transmitting norms and social sanctions (Felmlee, 2003). In line with this, the findings of this dissertation suggest that intermarriage attitudes are quite strongly transmitted within families. With regard to social sanctions, research has shown that interethnic relationships face more disapproval and receive less support than intra-ethnic relationships,

and might even lead to (family) exclusion, ostracism and hostility (Gaines, 2001; Hohmann-Marriott & Amato, 2008; Kalmijn, 1998). Mok (1999) even argues that parental objection is the most prominent obstacle in pursuing and maintaining an interethnic relationship. For immigrants, particularly from Muslim countries, the attitude towards intermarriage of the family can still be very important, and although arranged marriages are becoming, they are not uncommon. In these ways, the family can operate as an institution that restricts or fosters the social interactions and mutual acceptance between different ethnic group members, and, in turn, affects the pervasiveness of ethnic group boundaries in society.

7.4.5 Generalizability of the findings

Our study predominantly focused on the attitude towards interethnic marriage of one's child. This raises questions about the generalizability of the findings for intergroup relations. Theoretically the mechanisms might apply to ethnic (or other types of intergroup) attitudes more generally. For example, if the assumption is correct that family warmth fosters empathy, openness, self-certainty, and generalized trust, one would expect that warm family relationships also relate negatively to other indicators of ethnic rejection (e.g., prejudice or discrimination), and to (negative) attitudes towards other types of outgroups (e.g., racial or religious). The family cohesion mechanism is likely to be more specific for ethnic distance indicators within the close family or private sphere (e.g., the acceptance of interethnic friends or interethnic neighbors), and less applicable to more public or general indicators of ethnic attitudes (e.g., the acceptance of interethnic minorities on the labor market or prejudice). With respect to other types of social (out-)groups such as intermarriage with a religious or racial outgroup member, family cohesion is theoretically also likely to function as a mechanism of exclusion, and therefore to affect the attitude towards these types of intermarriage. This should be examined in future studies.

7.5 Final conclusion

In this dissertation, the role of family life for ethnic attitudes was examined. The first main conclusion is that family life in adulthood is a neglected but relevant factor in understanding and explaining ethnic attitudes. The relevance of family life for ethnic attitudes in adulthood was assessed 1) for different ethnic groups, 2) through different pathways (e.g., warmth and cohesion), 3) within dyadic and group level family relationships, 4) with respect to different ethnic attitudes, 5) towards different ethnic out-groups, and 6) for relationships with the nuclear family and the family of origin. The second conclusion is that the influence of the family of origin persists throughout adult life. This dissertation demonstrated the importance of the family of origin for ethnic attitudes of adults, through the transmission of attitudes between family members, and, more indirectly and less strongly, via the intergenerational transmission of social and cultural positions. Finally, we conclude that family relationships in adolescence and adult life matter

for immigrants' attitudes towards socio-cultural maintenance and the attitude towards socio-cultural adaptation, though more strongly for the former.

Samenvatting in het Nederlands (summary in Dutch)

Inleiding

De toegenomen etnisch-culturele diversiteit in westerse samenlevingen en de daaruit voortvloeiende spanningen tussen bevolkingsgroepen hebben geleid tot een stevige maatschappelijke discussie over de multiculturele samenleving. Immigratie en integratie zijn belangrijke thema's in het publieke en politieke debat. De toegenomen migratiestromen zijn gepaard gegaan met sociale problemen, zoals spanningen en conflicten tussen leden van verschillende etnische groepen, etnische segregatie binnen scholen en wijken, discriminatie, en de in sociaal-economisch opzicht gedepriveerde situatie van veel migranten. Anderzijds zijn er ook positieve tendensen waarneembaar voor de relaties tussen groepen, bijvoorbeeld met betrekking tot het groeiende aantal interetnische vriendschappen en huwelijken. Binnen de samenleving zijn er duidelijke etnische scheidslijnen ontstaan en het is van maatschappelijk belang om meer inzichten te verkrijgen in de factoren die etnische groepsgrenzen verminderen dan wel versterken.

In dit proefschrift worden de etnische grenzen tussen autochtone Nederlanders en de vier grootste migrantengroepen in Nederland bestudeerd. Hierbij ligt de focus met name op de attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Interetnische huwelijken zijn een belangrijke indicator van sociale integratie en een teken van de wederzijdse acceptatie van etnische groepen. Vaak wordt het niet of weinig voorkomen van interetnische huwelijken gezien als een teken van gebrekkige integratie van de minderheidsgroepen. Echter, gemengde huwelijken zijn niet alleen afhankelijk van de bereidheid van migranten om te integreren, maar ook van de openheid van en acceptatie door autochtonen. Het is daarom van belang om het perspectief van zowel migranten als autochtonen te onderzoeken.

Hoewel huwelijkspatronen ons iets vertellen over de mate waarin bepaalde etnische groepen onderling met elkaar omgaan, zeggen ze niet hoe ze tot stand zijn gekomen. Huwelijkspatronen zijn niet alleen afhankelijk van individuele voorkeuren, maar ook van mogelijkheden om elkaar te ontmoeten en van 'derde partijen', zoals de kerk en de familie. Wanneer leden van verschillende etnische groepen nauwelijks met elkaar trouwen hoeft dit niet direct te betekenen dat zij elkaar niet accepteren. Een gemengd huwelijk hoeft ook niet altijd te duiden op wederzijdse groepsacceptatie, bijvoorbeeld wanneer één van de partners zich volledig aanpast aan de cultuur en opvattingen van de partner.

Om etnische groeps grenzen goed in beeld te krijgen is het dus ook van belang om etnische attitudes te bestuderen. De houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk wordt vaak gezien als een uiting van etnische (of sociale) afstand. Etnische afstand verwijst naar de voorkeur voor interetnisch contact, en weerspiegelt iemands acceptatie van andere etnische groepen (Bogardus, 1925). Wanneer leden van een etnische outgroep worden geaccepteerd als huwelijkspartner, zijn andere positieve interetnische contacten ook meer waarschijnlijk (Bogardus, 1925; Tolsma et al., 2008). Inzichten die vergaard worden bij de bestudering van de acceptatie van etnisch gemengde huwelijken bieden ook meer algemene inzichten in relaties tussen groepen.

Gemengde huwelijken en familie

Een interetnisch huwelijk brengt niet alleen twee individuen samen, maar ook de families en sociale netwerken van de beide partners. Hierdoor kunnen interetnische huwelijken bijdragen aan de vermindering van etnische vooroordelen en stereotypen, en de relaties tussen leden van verschillende etnische groepen verbeteren. Echter, interetnische huwelijken kunnen ook een bron van conflict zijn *binnen* families. Traditioneel wordt de familie gezien als een instituut dat dergelijke huwelijken afwijst, vooral omdat ze een gevaar kunnen vormen voor de etnisch-culturele continuïteit. Ondanks een stijging van het aantal interetnische huwelijken in de afgelopen decennia en een toegenomen acceptatie van interetnische huwelijken zijn er relatief veel mensen die weerstand hebben tegenover een (mogelijk) interetnisch huwelijk van hun kind (SCP, 2009). De weerstand van de familie tegen een interetnisch huwelijk kan uitmonden in familieconflicten, het onthouden van hulp, en in extreme gevallen zelfs tot uitsluiting, ostracisme en geweld. In deze dissertatie ligt het zwaartepunt op de houding van individuen ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk van hun kind.

Acculturatie

De attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk wordt vaak beschouwd als een indicator van de sociale integratie of acculturatie van immigranten. Er is ook sociaal-wetenschappelijk onderzoek dat zich meer in het algemeen bezig houdt met acculturatieprocessen van immigranten in de samenleving. In hoeverre worden immigranten onderdeel van de ontvangende samenleving (sociaal-culturele aanpassing) en in hoeverre blijven immigranten gericht op de cultuur van herkomst (sociaal-cultureel behoud)? De (perceptie van de) gebrekkige acculturatie en integratie van etnische minderheden wordt uitvoerig bediscussieerd in de politiek en media. De houdingen van immigranten ten aanzien van sociaal-culturele aanpassing en cultuurbehoud zijn van belang voor het acculturatieproces, naast andere factoren zoals de mate waarin de ontvangende samenleving open en tolerant is. Attitudes ten aanzien van acculturatie worden bijvoorbeeld uitgedrukt door het belang dat wordt gehecht aan sociale contacten van immigranten met Nederlanders of houdingen ten opzichte van het gebruik van de Nederlandse taal. De fami-

lie is belangrijk voor de acculturatie van migranten. Sociaal-culturele oriëntaties worden deels gevormd en aangepast in een dynamische interactie met de context van de familie en de ontvangende samenleving (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

Doel van deze dissertatie en onderzoeksvragen

In deze dissertatie worden etnische attitudes van zowel autochtone Nederlanders als immigranten onderzocht. Wat betreft die laatste groep gaat het om de attitudes van de vier grootste etnische minderheidsgroepen in Nederland: de Turkse, Marokkaanse, Surinaamse en Antilliaanse Nederlanders. Meer specifiek ligt de focus op de houding van autochtone Nederlanders en immigranten ten aanzien van een interetnisch huwelijk van een kind, en op acculturatieattitudes van immigranten. In deze dissertatie staat de rol van de familie voor deze attitudes centraal. De overkoepelende onderzoeksvraag is:

Wat is de rol van de familie voor houdingen ten aanzien van een interetnisch huwelijk en ten aanzien van acculturatie onder etnische minderheids- en meerderheidsgroepen?

Hoewel er relatief veel onderzoek is naar interetnische huwelijken is er veel minder bekend over de attitudes ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Het onderzoek naar etnische attitudes wordt vanuit verschillende theoretische stromingen gedaan. Een eerste benadering, zoals de theorie van de autoritaire persoonlijkheid (Adorno et al., 1950), richt zich voornamelijk op persoonlijkheidskenmerken. In de jaren vijftig en zestig verschoof de aandacht naar de rol van sociale beïnvloedingsprocessen en de relaties tussen groepen. Mensen conformeren hun gedrag en houdingen aan de directe sociale context, zo is de gedachte. Zij worden beïnvloed door de houdingen van mensen in hun omgeving, de normen van de groep waartoe zij behoren, en de relatie tussen hun eigen groep en andere groepen (Allport, 1954). Mensen categoriseren en verwerken informatie over verschillen tussen groepen (zie Duckitt, 1992). Deze classificatie impliceert een onderscheid tussen een ingroup – een groep waarvan iemand zichzelf als lid beschouwt – en één of meerdere outgroups. Gegeven de menselijke behoefte aan een positief zelfbeeld, en het feit dat een deel van het zelfbeeld wordt bepaald door betekenisvolle groepslidmaatschappen, proberen mensen groepen waartoe zij behoren zo positief mogelijk te zien (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Een strategie om dit te bereiken is bijvoorbeeld om de eigen groep positiever te evalueren dan outgroups. Een andere onderzoekstraditie legt de nadruk op etnische dreiging. Hierbij is de verwachting dat competitie tussen etnische groepen kan leiden tot een gevoel van dreiging, dat zich vervolgens kan vertalen in een meer negatieve houding ten aanzien van leden van de groep die als bedreigend wordt ervaren (Levine & Campbell, 1972).

In onderzoek naar etnische houdingen wordt de familie als een belangrijke context gezien voor de vorming van individuele etnische attitudes. Meestal wordt deze invloed bestudeerd aan de hand van socialisatieprocessen en de overdracht van houdingen. Ook is er aandacht voor de intergenerationele overdracht van so-

ciale en culturele posities die mensen innemen (Vollebergh et al., 1999). Ouders beïnvloeden de sociale (bijv. opleiding) en culturele posities (bijv. religie) van hun kinderen, en deze posities zijn op hun beurt weer van invloed op de attitudes van de kinderen.

Ondanks de lange onderzoekstraditie naar familie-invloeden is er tot nu toe weinig onderzoek gedaan naar de wijze waarop familierelaties in het volwassen leven van invloed zijn op individuele etnische attitudes. Eerder onderzoek heeft zich hoofdzakelijk gericht op ouderlijke invloeden op etnische attitudes van kinderen of jongvolwassenen. In deze dissertatie wordt in de verschillende empirische hoofdstukken beargumenteerd dat de familie ook op andere wijze van belang kan zijn op individuele etnische houdingen. Hierbij richten we ons op drie onderzoeksvragen.

De eerste onderzoeksvraag is: *Hoe beïnvloeden familierelaties in het volwassen leven de houding ten aanzien van een interetnisch huwelijk bij meerderheids- en minderheidsgroepen?* Het bestaande onderzoek heeft mogelijke familie-invloeden in het volwassen leven en invloeden van andere familieleden dan de ouders grotendeels genegeerd. Bij de beantwoording van deze onderzoeksvraag gaan we in op de mogelijke invloed die enerzijds warme en anderzijds cohesieve familierelaties in het volwassen leven uitoefenen op de houding ten aanzien van een interetnisch huwelijk. Daarnaast gaan we dieper in op de rol van de partner voor individuele etnische attitudes.

Er is vrij weinig bekend over de omvang van de invloed van de familie van herkomst op de etnische houdingen van volwassenen, en over de relatieve bijdragen van verschillende mechanismen van familie-invloed. De tweede onderzoeksvraag luidt derhalve: *Hoe zijn kenmerken van de familie van herkomst tijdens de jeugd gerelateerd aan etnische houdingen van individuen in het volwassen leven?*

De derde onderzoeksvraag is: *Hoe zijn familiekenmerken gerelateerd aan de houdingen ten aanzien van sociaal-culturele aanpassing en sociaal-cultureel behoud van volwassen immigranten?* De familie wordt geacht van belang te zijn voor de acculturatie van migranten, via socialisatie en door het beïnvloeden van de sociale condities die van invloed zijn op de aanpassing aan de ontvangende samenleving (Sabatier, 2008; Slonim-Nevo et al., 2009; Zhou, 1997). Er is echter weinig onderzoek dat zich expliciet richt op de rol van de familie in het volwassen leven voor houdingen ten aanzien van acculturatie. Familiebanden bieden migranten continuïteit met het verleden, en het is mogelijk dat relaties met familieleden de etnische identiteit en gevoelens van behoren tot de eigen etnische groep versterken.

In vijf empirische hoofdstukken worden verschillende hypothesen geformuleerd en getoetst om antwoorden te geven op deze drie onderzoeksvragen. De hypothesen zijn empirisch onderzocht met behulp van data van de eerste twee rondes van de Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS; Dykstra et al., 2005, 2007). De NKPS is een grootschalig onderzoek naar familierelaties in Nederland. In de eerste enquêteronde, die begon in 2002, werden 8161 mensen van 18 tot 79 geïnterviewd. Dezelfde respondenten werden in 2006 en 2007 benaderd voor de tweede ronde van de dataverzameling: De respons was 74% wat resulteerde in een steekproef van 6026 respondenten. Een belangrijk kenmerk van de NKPS is het multi-actor design: het onderzoek bevat data van verschillende familieleden. In dit proefschrift

is gebruik gemaakt van gegevens afkomstig van de hoofdrespondent (de anchor), één van de ouders, een broer of zus, een kind, en van de partner. Naast deze hoofdsteekproef onder autochtonen bestaat de eerste wave van de NKPS uit een aanvullende steekproef van 1410 immigranten. Respondenten van Turkse, Marokkaanse, Surinaamse en Antilliaanse herkomst zijn geïnterviewd, in de meeste gevallen door interviewers met dezelfde etnische herkomst. De schriftelijke vragenlijsten waarvan gebruik werd gemaakt waren beschikbaar in het Turks, Arabisch en in het Nederlands.

Familierelaties en de attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk

In hoofdstuk 2 is de relatie tussen familiekenmerken in het volwassen leven en de houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk bestudeerd onder autochtone Nederlanders. Hierbij is de rol van de familie in het volwassen leven onderzocht, en de verschillende manieren waarop aspecten van het familieleven belangrijk kunnen zijn voor de houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Daarnaast is de wijze bestudeerd waarop traditionele familiewaarden en de familiestructuur gerelateerd zijn aan deze attitudes.

De resultaten laten zien dat de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk vrij groot is in Nederland, en dat deze weerstand afhankelijk is van de specifieke etnische outgroup. In lijn met eerder onderzoek (zie Hagendoorn, 1995) is de weerstand van autochtone Nederlanders het sterkste tegen een interetnisch huwelijk van een kind met een Marokkaanse Nederlander, gevolgd door een interetnisch huwelijk met een Turkse Nederlander, terwijl er de minste weerstand is ten aanzien van een interetnisch huwelijk met een Surinaamse Nederlander. De houdingen ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk met iemand behorende tot deze drie groepen hangen onderling zeer sterk samen, zodat het gerechtvaardigd is om de verklarende analyses uit te voeren op één algemene meting voor de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk.

Ten tweede blijkt dat verschillende aspecten van de structuur en het functioneren van de familie in het volwassen leven gerelateerd zijn aan interetnische attitudes. De hypothese dat cohesieve familiebanden kunnen leiden tot meer weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk wordt bevestigd. Drie van de vier indicatoren van familie cohesie – sterkte van de familiebanden, de mate waarin familienormen aangehangen worden en frequentie van onderling contact – hangen samen met een hogere weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Deze bevinding ondersteunt het idee dat wanneer de familiebanden hecht zijn, familieleden geneigd zijn om 'vreemdelingen' buiten de familie te houden. De gedachte is dat mensen met een verschillende etnisch-culturele achtergrond als een bedreiging kunnen worden gezien voor de culturele identiteit en solidariteit van de groep, in dit geval de familie. Interetnische huwelijken beperken de mogelijkheid voor families om culturele gewoonten, tradities en opvattingen door te geven aan opeenvolgende generaties. Vooral wanneer families hecht zijn, hebben familieleden een reden om 'buitenstaanders' buiten de familie te houden. Eerder onderzoek heeft laten zien dat groepscohesie en geslotenheid gepaard kunnen gaan met

het afwijzen van leden van outgroups, in het bijzonder wanneer de outgroup wordt gezien als ondermijnd voor de eigen leefwijze. Omdat mensen met een verschillende etnische achtergrond over het algemeen sterker afwijken van de familie op het gebied van belangrijke sociale en culturele kenmerken dan leden van de eigen etnische groep, is het aannemelijk dat leden van een etnische outgroup eerder als een bedreiging worden gezien dan de leden van de ingroup. Hoewel dit soort groepsprocessen meestal worden onderzocht bij grootschalige groepen (bijvoorbeeld religieuze of etnische groepen), laat onze studie zien dat mechanismen van (gepercipieerde) culturele dreiging en groepscohesie ook kunnen leiden tot negatieve houdingen binnen kleinere groepen, zoals de familie.

In overeenstemming met de verwachting hangen warme en emotioneel ondersteunende familiebanden juist negatief samen met de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Warme en emotioneel ondersteunende relaties gaan vaak gepaard met sterkere gevoelens van vertrouwen, met meer empathie, en juist minder met gevoelens van angst en onzekerheid (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Glanville & Paxton, 2007; Hogg, 2000; Stephan & Finlay, 1999; Tyler et al., 1997). Dit zijn allemaal factoren die positieve etnische houdingen stimuleren. Psychologisch welzijn is verbonden met een meer open houding ten opzichte van andere groepen en met meer etnische acceptatie (Tyler et al., 1997). Emotioneel ondersteunende en warme relaties leiden ertoe dat mensen meer vertrouwen hebben en krijgen in andere mensen. Dit vertrouwen kan zich ontwikkelen tot een veralgemeend vertrouwen, dat verder gaat dan het vertrouwen in de directe sociale kring van bekenden, en kan de grenzen van de eigen sociale groep overschrijden. Empathie en jezelf kunnen verplaatsen in een ander hangen ook samen met meer positieve etnische houdingen, terwijl onzekerheid ertoe kan leiden dat mensen juist defensief reageren ten opzichte van andere (etnische) groepen (Hogg, 2000).

Verder laat het onderzoek zien dat traditionele familiewaarden sterk samenhangen met de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Het is van belang om deze waarden op te nemen, aangezien onderzoek heeft laten zien dat traditionele opvattingen over de familie zowel gerelateerd zijn aan familiekenmerken, zoals warmte en cohesie, als aan etnische attitudes (Duckitt, 1992; Triandis, 1995; Wilcox, 1998). Ten slotte blijkt dat bovenstaande effecten van het familieleven – warmte en cohesie – op dezelfde manier samenhangen met de houdingen ten opzichte van de drie etnische outgroups.

De invloed van de familie van herkomst: een sibling-analyse

Waar hoofdstuk 2 zich richt op de invloed van de hele familie, gaat de aandacht in hoofdstuk 3 uit naar de familie van herkomst (ouders, broers en zussen) van autochtone Nederlanders. Terwijl er in de literatuur relatief veel aandacht is voor de rol van intergenerationale overdracht van etnische houdingen onder adolescenten, is er nauwelijks onderzoek naar de (blijvende) invloed van familiekenmerken van het gezin van herkomst op de etnische houdingen van volwassenen. In deze studie is met behulp van een sibling-analyse onderzocht hoe groot de (totale) invloed is van de familie van herkomst. Omdat siblings (broers en zussen) dezelfde ouders

hebben en omstandigheden in de jeugd grotendeels delen, kunnen overeenkomsten in houdingen van siblings in het latere leven worden toegeschreven aan de familie van herkomst, zo is de redenering (Hauser, 1988). Naast het beschrijven van de totale invloed van de familie van herkomst, ligt de focus in dit hoofdstuk ook op het verklaren van deze invloed. De rol van de overdracht van houdingen, de overdracht van sociaal-economische en culturele posities en de directe invloed van leefomstandigheden in de jeugd worden tegelijkertijd bestudeerd. Bovendien worden de inzichten uit hoofdstuk 2 gebruikt om de rol van familiekenmerken in het volwassen leven te bestuderen. In dit hoofdstuk is gebruik gemaakt van informatie van 826 triaden die gevormd worden door sibling-paren met één ouder. Om te controleren voor mogelijke selectiviteit in het multi-actor design zijn Heckman modellen toegepast.

Uit het onderzoek blijkt dat ongeveer 30% van de verschillen in etnische houdingen in het volwassen leven kunnen worden toegeschreven aan (invloeden van) de familie van herkomst. De intergenerationele transmissie van houdingen lijkt een belangrijk mechanisme van familie-Invloed, aangezien er een grote mate van congruentie is tussen de houdingen van (volwassen) kinderen en hun ouders. Verder heeft de familie van herkomst invloed via de intergenerationele overdracht van sociaal-economische en culturele posities. Er is geen directe relatie gevonden tussen de leefomstandigheden in de jeugd en huidige etnische attitudes. De notie dat familiewarmte en -cohesie van invloed zijn op etnische houdingen (hoofdstuk 2), werd ook bevestigd in de specifieke context van de familie van herkomst. Familiecohesie – het aanhangen van familienormen en familiecontact – hangt wederom samen met meer weerstand tegen interetnische huwelijken, terwijl familiekenmerken die warme familierelaties vertegenwoordigen juist samengaan met meer acceptatie van interetnische huwelijken. Verder wijzen de resultaten erop dat meer cohesieve familierelaties niet alleen een directe invloed hebben op individuele etnische houdingen, maar ook een conditionele invloed uitoefenen op de congruentie van etnische attitudes binnen families. In families met cohesieve banden lijken familieleden meer op elkaar in hun etnische attitudes. Familiewarmte heeft echter geen conditionele invloed op de houdingen tussen ouders en kinderen. Na het opnemen van de verschillende inhoudelijke familiekenmerken wordt ongeveer 60% van de familievariantie verklaard. Dit duidt erop dat het (redelijk) goed gelukt is om een theoretische betekenis toe te kennen aan de geobserveerde invloed van de familie van herkomst.

De rol van de partner voor de houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk

Hoewel onderzoeken het belang van sociale relaties voor individuele attitudes hebben aangetoond, is het grotendeels onbekend in hoeverre één van de meest intieme relaties in het volwassen leven – de relatie met de partner – van invloed is op individuele etnische houdingen. In hoofdstuk 4 gaan we verder in op de eerste onderzoeksvraag, en staat de mate waarin de partner en de partnerrelatie van belang zijn voor individuele etnische houdingen centraal. Wederom is de houding

ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk van een kind onderzocht bij autochtone Nederlanders.

Op basis van inzichten uit theorieën over sociale invloed en intergroepsrelaties zijn hypothesen opgesteld over de relatie tussen kenmerken van de partner – zijn of haar attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk, sociaal-economische status en etniciteit – en de individuele attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Partners stellen elkaar niet alleen bloot aan opvattingen en houdingen, maar ook aan elkaars sociaal-economische en culturele omstandigheden, die mogelijk van invloed zijn op individuele houdingen (zie bijvoorbeeld Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Smith & Moen, 1998). Daarnaast is de invloed van structurele (relatielengte, het hebben van kinderen) en substantiële (cohesie en warmte) partnerrelatiekenmerken bekeken voor de attitude ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Bovendien is onderzocht in hoeverre structurele en substantiële relatiekenmerken de samenhang tussen de houdingen van de twee partners beïnvloeden. Het meeste onderzoek dat gericht is op partnerinvloeden is kleinschalig. De resultaten in dit hoofdstuk zijn gebaseerd op een grootschalig databestand met 2500 respondenten en hun partners. Om te controleren voor selectiviteit in partner participatie is ook in dit hoofdstuk een Heckman analyse toegepast.

De resultaten laten zien dat er een redelijk sterke samenhang is tussen de etnische attitudes van de partners. Eerder onderzoek heeft laten zien dat houdingen sterker aan elkaar gerelateerd zijn wanneer het onderwerp van meer belang is voor het functioneren van de relatie, en wanneer het zaken betreft waarbij onenigheden kunnen leiden tot conflict (Davis & Rusbult, 2001; Kalmijn, 2005). De relatief sterke samenhang tussen de attitudes van de partners aangaande een interetnisch huwelijk van een kind kan dus waarschijnlijk verklaard worden doordat onenigheden hierover een mogelijke bron van discussie en conflict kunnen zijn. Zoals verwacht is het hebben van een niet-autochtone partner verbonden met een meer positieve houding ten opzichte van interetnische huwelijken. Tegen de verwachting in, heeft de sociaal-economische status van de partner geen invloed op individuele etnische houdingen. De verwachting was dat mensen met een partner met een lage sociaal-economische status een sterkere etnische dreiging zouden ervaren van etnische minderheden, en daardoor een meer negatieve houding zouden hebben ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk.

We vinden significante verbanden tussen kenmerken van de partnerrelatie met de houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. In overeenstemming met de hypothese laten de resultaten zien dat mensen met een warme partnerrelatie minder geneigd zijn om een interetnisch huwelijk af te keuren. Verder, conform de verwachting en in overeenstemming met eerdere hoofdstukken, zijn cohesieve, sociaal hechte partnerbanden gerelateerd aan meer weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. De bevindingen laten zien dat partners die meer gezamenlijke activiteiten ondernemen en een sociaal netwerk delen, een meer negatieve houding hebben ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk dan partners die meer onafhankelijk zijn in hun activiteiten en sociaal netwerk. Mensen met kinderen en mensen die getrouwd zijn hebben ook meer weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk in vergelijking met mensen zonder kinderen en mensen die niet

getrouwd zijn. De duur van de relatie hangt positief samen met de overeenstemming in etnische houdingen. Dit kan komen door processen van directe sociale invloed of door gedeelde ervaringen. Net als binnen de familie, lijkt de cohesie van de relatie de congruentie van attitudes van de partners te versterken, terwijl geen modererende invloed werd gevonden van de warmte van de partnerrelatie.

Interetnische houdingen onder etnische minderheids- en meerderheidsgroepen

In hoofdstuk 5 is het onderzoek naar familie-invloeden voor etnische attitudes uitgebreid naar de vier grootste migrantengroepen in Nederland. Ondanks de grote variatie in demografische, sociaal-economische en culturele factoren tussen etnische groepen, zijn er relatief weinig studies die de etnische attitudes bekijken van meerdere etnische groepen. We onderzoeken de attitudes van Surinaamse, Antilliaanse, Turkse en Marokkaanse Nederlanders ten opzichte van een huwelijk met een Nederlander, en de attitudes van autochtone Nederlanders ten opzichte van een huwelijk met een migrant. Net als in hoofdstuk 2 is de relatie bestudeerd tussen familiewarmte, -cohesie en conservatieve familiewaarden enerzijds, en de interetnische attitudes anderzijds. Bovendien is voor de minderheden de rol van verschillende migranten kenmerken (verblijfsduur, migratiemotief, generatie) onderzocht.

De bevindingen laten grote verschillen zien tussen de etnische groepen in de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Slechts een beperkt deel van deze verschillen kunnen we verklaren aan de hand van achtergrondkenmerken, zoals opleiding en inkomen. In lijn met de notie van groepsstatus (Blumer, 1958; Hagendoorn, 1995) hebben autochtone Nederlanders relatief veel weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Verder is de weerstand ten opzichte van een huwelijk met een Nederlander veel lager onder Surinaamse en Antilliaanse Nederlanders dan onder Turkse en Marokkaanse Nederlanders. Familiekekenmerken in het volwassen leven blijken relevant voor de onderzochte houdingen. Dit geldt voor zowel de autochtone Nederlanders als de migrantengroepen. Wederom is familiecohesie – in de vorm van familienormen, familie contact en conservatieve familiewaarden – gerelateerd aan meer weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk, terwijl familiewarmte juist verbonden was met minder weerstand. Deze bevindingen ondersteunen nogmaals het idee dat wanneer de familiebanden hecht en cohesief zijn, familieleden de neiging hebben om ‘etnisch-culturele vreemdelingen’ buiten de familie te houden. Warme en emotioneel ondersteunende familierelaties gaan juist samen met minder weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk.

Daarnaast laat deze studie zien dat migrantenkenmerken van belang zijn voor de interetnische attitude. Een betere Nederlandse taalvaardigheid gaat gepaard met minder weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk. Verder blijkt dat mensen die naar Nederland zijn gekomen vanwege familieredenen meer weerstand ten opzichte van een huwelijk met een Nederlander hebben dan mensen die om andere redenen (bijv. economisch of veiligheid) zijn gekomen. Generatie en

verblijfsduur in Nederland zijn niet meer gerelateerd aan de interetnische attitude wanneer er gecontroleerd wordt voor andere kenmerken.

Familielevens en acculturatiehoudingen

In hoofdstuk 6 komen andere etnische attitudes dan de houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk aan bod, namelijk de houdingen van migranten ten aanzien van sociaal-culturele aanpassing en sociaal-cultureel behoud. De acculturatie van migranten is vaak niet alleen een individuele zaak, maar een proces dat plaatsvindt binnen families (e.g., Cort, 2009; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). In dit hoofdstuk bestuderen we het belang van ouderlijke familiekenmerken in de jeugd en het belang van huidige familierelaties – nationaal en transnationaal – voor de acculturatie attitudes van volwassen Turkse, Marokkaanse, Surinaamse en Antilliaanse Nederlanders.

De analyse laat zien dat de attitudes ten opzichte van sociaal-cultureel behoud en sociaal-culturele aanpassing bij alle vier groepen niet gerelateerd zijn. Dit ondersteunt eerder onderzoek dat laat zien dat aanpassing en behoud twee onafhankelijke dimensies zijn (Sam & Berry, 2006). Ook in lijn met eerder onderzoek blijken Surinaamse en Antilliaanse Nederlanders meer geneigd om attitudes van sociaal-culturele aanpassing te onderschrijven dan Turkse en Marokkaanse Nederlanders, terwijl het tegenovergestelde geldt voor de attitude ten opzichte van sociaal-cultureel behoud.

Verder tonen de resultaten aan dat het familieleven van belang is voor beide acculturatie attitudes, maar het sterkste voor de attitude ten opzichte van sociaal-cultureel behoud. De frequentie van familiecontacten – zowel in Nederland als in het land van herkomst –, instrumentele familiesteun en familiewarmte zijn positief gerelateerd met sociaal-cultureel behoud, maar niet met sociaal-culturele aanpassing. De rol van de familie voor sociaal-cultureel behoud is in overeenstemming met het idee dat familiebanden voor migranten een belangrijke ondersteuning en hulpbron zijn in de ontvangende samenleving, en continuïteit bieden met het verleden. Relaties met familieleden bevestigen mogelijk de etnische identiteit en versterken de gevoelens van het behoren tot de etnische gemeenschap van herkomst. Hierdoor wordt een positieve houding ten opzichte van sociaal-cultureel behoud in stand gehouden of zelfs gestimuleerd. De bevinding dat ook transnationale banden gerelateerd zijn aan sociaal-cultureel behoud, bevestigt het idee dat veel migranten worden beïnvloed door sociale netwerken en relaties die nationale grenzen overstijgen.

De huidige familierelaties in de vorm van contact, steun en warmte zijn wel gerelateerd aan sociaal-cultureel behoud, maar niet aan sociaal-culturele aanpassing. Andersom is het zo dat het opgroeien met liefdevolle en emotioneel ondersteunende ouders samenhangt met een meer positieve houding ten opzichte van sociaal-culturele aanpassing, maar niet met sociaal-cultureel behoud. Deze bevinding ondersteunt het idee dat ouderlijke warmte en affectie de ontwikkeling van gevoelens van veiligheid, zelfverzekerdheid en algemeen vertrouwen kan stimuleren. Deze gevoelens kunnen een naar binnen gekeerde, gesloten oriëntatie

beperken, en de aanpassing aan een nieuwe en onbekende omgeving bevorderen. Ten slotte, onafhankelijk van de eigen Nederlandse taalvaardigheid, was de mate waarin migranten Nederlands praten met familieleden positief gerelateerd aan sociaal-culturele aanpassing en negatief met sociaal-cultureel behoud.

Conclusies

De centrale vraag in dit proefschrift betrof de relatie tussen de familie en etnische houdingen. We kunnen concluderen dat het familieleven in het volwassen leven van belang is voor etnische houdingen. De bevindingen laten zien dat verschillende kenmerken van het familieleven samengaan met de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk, en dat verschillende mechanismen hierin een rol spelen. Dit geldt voor verschillende typen van familierelaties, voor zowel etnische minderheids- als meerderheidsgroepen, en ten opzichte van verschillende etnische groepen. Het negatieve verband tussen familiewarmte en de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk is aangetoond in de hoofdstukken 2 tot en met 5. Hoewel de familie vaak wordt beschouwd als een instituut dat zich verzet tegen interetnische huwelijken, laat onze studie zien dat dit niet het geval is voor families die zich kenmerken door onderlinge warmte en emotionele ondersteuning. Cohesie binnen de familie gaat echter samen met meer weerstand ten aanzien van interetnische huwelijken. Een belangrijke conclusie van deze dissertatie is ook dat verschillende leden van zowel de familie van herkomst als het nucleaire gezin (bijv. de partner) van belang zijn voor etnische houdingen in het volwassen leven.

Verder is het van belang om zowel het perspectief van de etnische meerderheid als de etnische minderheden mee te nemen in het onderzoek naar etnische groeps grenzen. In de literatuur wordt het beperkt voorkomen van interetnische huwelijken over het algemeen gezien als een teken van gebrekkige integratie van migranten. Echter, huwelijken zijn niet alleen afhankelijk van de openheid van de etnische minderheidsgroepen, maar ook van de openheid en mate van acceptatie van de meerderheidsgroep. Er bestaan grote verschillen in de acceptatie van interetnische huwelijken tussen de verschillende etnische groepen. De relatief hoge weerstand van autochtone Nederlanders is waarschijnlijk een belangrijke factor in het patroon van interetnische huwelijken in Nederland. Een belangrijke conclusie is verder dat de rol van het familieleven in de volwassenheid geldt voor verschillende etnische groepen. De veronderstelde invloed van cohesie en warmte voor de weerstand ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk is ook gevonden bij migrantengroepen. Doordat etnische minderheidsgroepen in het algemeen verschillen in hun familieleven kan een deel van de verschillen in etnische houdingen worden verklaard. Dit betekent dat de familie een tussenliggende context vormt voor de samenhang tussen etnische achtergrond en etnische attitudes.

Dit proefschrift laat zien dat de etnische houdingen van volwassenen niet alleen kunnen worden toegeschreven aan individuele keuzen en omstandigheden, maar dat ook de invloed van familie van herkomst belangrijk is. Omdat de meeste studies alleen familie-invloeden bestuderen voor de ontwikkeling van etnische houdingen bij adolescenten, was het niet duidelijk in hoeverre de familie van in-

vloed blijft voor etnische houdingen gedurende het volwassen leven. Door tegelijkertijd verschillende mechanismen van invloed te onderzoeken hebben we meer inzicht kunnen geven in het relatieve belang van de verschillende invloeden. De overeenstemming tussen ouders en (volwassen) kinderen in hun houding ten opzichte van een interetnisch huwelijk is relatief sterk. Daarnaast is er sprake van een indirecte beïnvloeding via de overdracht van sociaal-economische posities van ouders naar kinderen.

Ten slotte is de vraag gesteld hoe het familieleven van invloed is op de acculturatiehoudingen van volwassen migranten. Een belangrijke conclusie is dat het familieleven in Nederland en in het land van herkomst van belang is voor de houding ten aanzien van sociaal-cultureel behoud: zowel familiecontact, -warmte als het geven van hulp zijn positief gerelateerd aan deze houding. Deze familiekenmerken zijn echter niet van invloed op de houding tegenover sociaal-culturele aanpassing. Dit is een belangrijke bevinding omdat in het publieke debat vaak wordt verondersteld dat familierelaties, met name die in het land van herkomst, een obstakel vormen voor de integratie van migranten in Nederland. Daartegenover staat dat familierelaties ook niet lijken te functioneren als een opstap voor de sociaal-culturele aanpassing van migranten. Taalvaardigheid is wel een cruciale factor in het acculturatieproces van migranten. Dit proefschrift laat zien dat onafhankelijk van de individuele Nederlandse taalvaardigheid, migranten uit families waar meer Nederlands wordt gesproken een meer positieve houding hebben ten aanzien van sociaal-culturele aanpassing en minder gericht zijn op sociaal-cultureel behoud. Een andere belangrijke bevinding is dat warme familiebanden in de jeugd sociaal-culturele aanpassing bevorderen. De resultaten laten zien dat het niet zinvol is de vraag te stellen of de familie een belemmering dan wel stimulans is voor de integratie of aanpassing van immigranten. Het is nuttiger om na te gaan welke specifieke kenmerken van migrantenfamilies hierbij een rol spelen.

References

- Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. (1996). Parental and peer influences on children's racial attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 371 – 383.
- Acock, A. C. (1984). Parents and their children: The study of intergenerational influence. *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, 151 – 171.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswike, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. W. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31, 826 – 874.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alwin, D. F., Cohen, R. L., & Newcomb, T. M. (1991). *Political attitudes over the life span: The Bennington women after fifty years*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Aquilino, W. S. (1997). From adolescent to young adult: A prospective study of parent-child relations during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 670 – 686.
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2008). Family relationships among immigrants and majority members in the Netherlands: The role of acculturation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 466 – 487.
- Arnett, J. J. (1995). Broader and narrow socialization: The family in the context of a cultural theory. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 617 – 628.
- Baerveldt, C., Van Duijn, M. A. J., Vermeij, L., & Van Hemert, D. A. (2004). Ethnic boundaries and personal choice. Assessing the influence of individual inclinations to choose intra-ethnic relationships on pupils' networks. *Social Networks*, 26, 55 – 74.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barber, B. K., & Buehler, C. (1996). Family cohesion and enmeshment: different constructs, different effects. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 433 – 441.
- Batson, C. D., & Burris, C. T. (1994). Personal religion: Depressant or stimulant of prejudice and discrimination? In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium* (pp. 149 – 169). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bélanger, E., & Aarts, K. (2006). Explaining the rise of the LPF: Issues, discontent, and the 2002 Dutch election. *Acta Politica*, 41, 4 – 20.

- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational Bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1 – 16.
- Bengtson, V. L., & Roberts, R. E. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in aging families: An example of formal theory construction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 856 – 870.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5 – 34.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38, 185 – 206.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, S. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied psychology: An International Review*, 55, 303 – 332.
- Blau, P. M., Beeker, C., & Fitzpatrick, K. M. (1984). Intersecting social affiliations and intermarriage. *Social Forces*, 62, 585 – 606.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Blau, P. M., & Schwartz, J. E. (1984). *Crosscutting social circles*. New York: Academic press.
- Blossfeld, H., & Müller, R. (2002). Union disruption in comparative perspective: The role of assortative partner choice and careers of couples. *International Sociology*, 32, 3 – 35.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3 – 7.
- Bobo, L. D., & Fox, C. (2003). Race, racism, and discrimination: Bridging problems, methods, and theory in social psychological research. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66, 319 – 332.
- Bobo, L. D., & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 951 – 972.
- Boehnke, K., Hadjar, A., & Baier, D. (2007). Parent-child value similarity: The role of zeitgeist. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 778 – 792.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring social distances. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 1, 216 – 226.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1959). Race relations by sexes. *Sociology and Social Research*, 43, 439 – 461.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1967). *A forty-year racial distance study*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369 – 386.
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 333 – 355.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice. It's social psychology*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

- Brown, R. (2000). *Group processes: Dynamics within and between groups* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Bucx, F. (2009). *Linked lives. Young adults' life course and relations with parents*. Utrecht: ICS-dissertation.
- Bucx, F., Raaijmakers, Q., & Van Wel, F. (2010). Life course stage in young adulthood and intergenerational congruence in family attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 117 – 134.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews. In B. M. Staw & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (pp. 345 – 423). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Caspi, A., Herbener, E. S., & Ozer, D. J. (1992). Shared experiences and the similarity of personalities: A longitudinal study of married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 281 – 291.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., & Feldman, M. W. (1981). *Cultural transmission and evolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- CBS (2008). *Jaarrapport integratie 2008*. Den Haag: CBS.
- Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control, and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 401 – 419.
- Chiswick, B. R., Lee, Y. L., & Miller, P. W. (2004). Immigrants' language skills: The Australian experience in a longitudinal study. *International Migration Review*, 38, 611 – 654.
- Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (1996). Ethnic networks and language proficiency among immigrants. *Journal of Population Economics*, 9, 19 – 35.
- Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2001). A model of destination-language acquisition: Application to male immigrants in Canada. *Demography*, 38, 391 – 409.
- Clark-Ibáñez, M., & Felmlee, D. (2004). Interethnic relationships: The role of social network diversity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 293 – 305.
- Coenders, M. (2001). *Nationalistic attitudes and ethnic exclusionism in a comparative perspective*. Nijmegen: ICS dissertation.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M., Scheepers, P., & Verkuyten, M. (2008). More than two decades of changing ethnic attitudes in the Netherlands. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 269 – 285.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conley, D., Pfeiffer, K. M., & Velez, M. (2007). Explaining sibling differences in achievement and behavioral outcomes: The importance of within- and between-family factors. *Social Science Research*, 36, 1087 – 1104.
- Cort, D. A. (2009). What happened to familial acculturation? *Ethnic and Racial studies*, 28, 313 – 335.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Davis, J. L., & Rusbult, C. E. (2001). Attitude alignment in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 65 – 84.

- De Graaf, N. D., De Graaf, P. M., & Kraaykamp, G. (2000). Parental cultural capital and educational attainment in the Netherlands: A refinement of the cultural capital perspective. *Sociology of Education*, 73, 92 – 111.
- De Leeuw, E. D., & De Heer, W. (2001). Trends in household survey nonresponse: A longitudinal and international comparison. In R. M. Groves, D. A. Dillman, J. L. Eltinge, & R. J. A. Little (Eds.), *Survey Nonresponse* (pp. 41 – 54). New York: Wiley.
- De Vries, J., Kalmijn, M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2009). Intergenerational transmission of kinship norms? Evidence from siblings in a multi-actor survey. *Social Science Research*, 38, 188 – 200.
- Demo, D. H., & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among black Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 364 – 374.
- Dietz, B. (2000). German and Jewish migration from the former Soviet Union to Germany: background, trends and implications. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 26, 635 – 652.
- Dixon, J. C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact theories of prejudice. *Social Forces*, 84, 2179 – 2204.
- Doohan, E. M., Carrère, S., Siler, C., & Beardslee, C. (2009). The link between the marital bond and future triadic family interactions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 892 – 904.
- Duckitt, J. H. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York: Praeger.
- Dyer, E. D. (1972). Upward mobility and extended family cohesion as perceived by the wife in Swedish urban families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 34, 713 – 724.
- Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). *Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study: A multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family Relationships, Wave 1*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Dykstra, P. A., Kalmijn, M., Knijn, T. C. M., Komter, A. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Mulder, C. H. (2007). *Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study: A multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 2*. Den Haag: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Eaves, L. J., Heath, A. C., Martin, N. G., Maes, H. H., Neale, M. C., Kendler, K. S., Kirk, K. M., & Corey, L. A. (1999). Comparing the biological and cultural inheritance of personality and social attitudes in the Virginia 30,000 study of twins and their relatives. *Twin Research*, 2, 62 – 80.
- Entzinger, H. (1994). Shifting paradigms: An appraisal of immigration in the Netherlands. In H. Fassman & R. Münz (Eds.), *European migration in the late twentieth century. Historical patterns, actual trends and social implications* (pp. 93 – 112). Hants/ Vermont: Edgar Elgar.
- Entzinger, H. (2003). The rise and fall of multiculturalism: The case of the Netherlands. In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation states* (pp. 59 – 86). London: Palgrave.

- Erikson, R., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (1992). *The constant flux: A study of class mobility in industrial societies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Esses, V. M., Hodson, G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2003). Public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: Determinants and policy implications. In C. M. Beach, A. G., Green, & J. G. Reitz (Eds.), *Canadian Immigration Policy for the 21st Century* (pp. 507 – 535). Montreal, Canada: McGill Queen's Press.
- Evans, G., & Need, A. (2002). Explaining ethnic polarization over attitudes towards minority rights in Eastern Europe: A multilevel analysis. *Social Science Research*, 31, 653 – 680.
- Felmlee, D. (2003). Interaction in social networks. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 389 – 409). New York: Plenum.
- Feng, D., & Baker, L. (1994). Spouse similarity in attitudes, personality, and psychological well-being. *Behavior Genetics*, 24, 357 – 364.
- Fiori, K. L., Antonucci, T. C., & Cortina, K. S. (2006). Social network typologies and mental health among older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 61, 25 – 32.
- Firebraugh, G., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Trends in anti-black prejudice, 1972-1984: region and cohort effects. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 251 – 272.
- Fishbein, H. D. (1996). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: Evolutionary, cultural, and developmental Dynamics*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Fishbein, H. D. (2002). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: Origins of prejudice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gaines, S. (2001). Coping with prejudice: personal relationship partners as sources of socioemotional support for stigmatized individuals. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 113 -129.
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 708 – 724.
- George, D., & Yancey, G. (2004). Taking stock of America's attitudes on cultural diversity: An analysis of public deliberation on multiculturalism, assimilation and intermarriage. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 35, 1 – 19.
- Glanville, J. L., & Paxton, P. (2007). How do we learn to trust? A confirmatory tetrad analysis of the sources of generalized trust. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70, 230 – 242.
- Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three-generation families: socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 685 – 698.
- Goldstein, H. (1995). *Multilevel statistical models. Second edition*. London: Arnold.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origin*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gottman, J. M., & Notarius, C. I. (2002). Marital research in the 20th century and a research agenda for the 21st century. *Family Process*, 41, 159 – 197.
- Groves, R. M., & Couper, M. P. (1998). *Nonresponse in household interview surveys*. New York: John Wiley.

- Grusec, J. E., & Goodnow, J. J. (1994). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values: A reconceptualization of current points of view. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 4 – 19.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (pp. 199 – 228). London: Wiley.
- Hagendoorn, L., Drogendijk, R., Tumanov, S., & Hraba, J. (1998). Inter-ethnic preferences and ethnic hierarchies in the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 484 – 503.
- Hagendoorn, L., & Hraba, J. (1987). Social distance toward Holland's minorities: Discrimination against and among ethnic groups. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 10, 120 – 133.
- Hagendoorn, L., Veenman, J., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2003). *Integrating immigrants in the Netherlands: Cultural versus Socio-economic integration*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Haller, A. O., & Portes, A. (1973). Status attainment process. *Sociology of Education*, 46, 51 – 91.
- Harris, T. M., & Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2000). Interracial dating: The implications of race for initiating a romantic relationship. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 11, 49 – 64.
- Hauser, R. M. (1988). A note on two models of sibling resemblance. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 93, 1401 – 1423.
- Hauser, R. M., & Mossel, P. A. (1985). Fraternal resemblance in educational attainment and occupational status. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91, 650 – 673.
- Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica*, 47, 153 – 161.
- Hello, E. (2003). *Educational attainment and ethnic attitudes. How to explain their relationship*. Nijmegen: ICS dissertation.
- Hello, E., Scheepers, P., Vermulst, A., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2004). Association between educational attainment and ethnic distance in young adults. Socialization by schools or parents? *Acta Sociologica*, 47, 253 – 275.
- Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorisation: A motivational theory of social identity processes. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* vol. 11 (pp. 223 – 255). London: Wiley.
- Hohmann-Marriott, B. E., & Amato, P. (2008). Relationship quality in interethnic marriages and cohabitations. *Social Forces*, 87, 825 – 855.
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 981 – 995.
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J. Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 747 – 770.
- Huijnk, W., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2010). Inter-marriage attitude among ethnic minority and majority groups in the Netherlands: The role of family relations and immigrant characteristics. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 41, 389 – 414.

- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon.
- Hwang, S., Saenz, R., & Aguirre, B. E. (1997). Structural and assimilationist explanations of Asian American intermarriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 758 – 772.
- Inglehart, R. (1990). *Cultural shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jaspers, E., Lubbers, M., & De Graaf, N. D. (2008). Measuring once twice: An evaluation of recalling attitudes in survey research. *European Sociological Review*, 25, 287 – 301.
- Jaspers, E., Lubbers, M., & De Vries, J. (2008). Parents, children and the distance between them: Long term socialization effects in the Netherlands. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 39, 39 – 58.
- Jennings, M. K. (1984). The intergenerational transfer of political ideologies in eight Western nations. *European Journal of Political Research*, 12, 261 – 276.
- Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, L. (2001). Political similarity and influence between husbands and wives. *Working Paper 2002-14*. Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Strength of identification and intergroup differentiation: The influence of group norms. *European Journal of Psychology*, 27, 603 – 609.
- Johnson, B. R., & Jacobson, C. K. (2005). Contact in context: An examination of social settings on whites' attitudes toward interracial marriage. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 387 – 399.
- Johnson, M. K., & Marini, M. M. (1998). Bridging the racial divide in the United States: The effect of gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61, 247 – 258.
- Jones, F. L., & Luijckx, R. (1996). Post-war patterns of intermarriage in Australia: the Mediterranean experience. *European Sociological Review*, 12, 67 – 86.
- Kagitçibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kalmijn, M. (1993). Spouse selection among the children of European immigrants: A comparison of marriage cohorts in the 1960 Census. *International Migration Review*, 27, 51 – 78.
- Kalmijn, M. (1998). Intermarriage and homogamy: Causes, patterns and trends. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 395 – 421.
- Kalmijn, M. (2005). Attitude alignment in marriage and cohabitation: The case of sex-role attitudes. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 521 – 535.
- Kalmijn, M. (2010). Consequences of racial intermarriage for children's social integration. *Sociological Perspectives*, 53, 271 – 286.
- Kalmijn, M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (in press). Non-response of secondary respondents in multi-actor surveys: determinants, consequences, and possible remedies. *Journal of Family Issues*.
- Kalmijn, M., & Van Tubergen, F. (2006). Ethnic intermarriage in the Netherlands: Confirmations and refutations of accepted insights. *European Journal of Population*, 22, 371 – 397.

- Kalmijn, M., Liefbroer, A. C., Van Poppel, F., & Van Solinge, H. (2006). The family factor in Jewish-Gentile intermarriage: A sibling analysis of the Netherlands. *Social Forces*, *84*, 1347–1358.
- Kenny, C. (1998). The behavioral consequences of political discussion: Another look at discussant effects on vote choice. *The Journal of Politics*, *60*, 231–244.
- Kenny, D. A., & Cook, W. (1999). Partner effects in relationship research: Conceptual issues, analytic difficulties, and illustrations. *Personal Relationships*, *6*, 433–448.
- Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *40*, 414–431.
- Knafo, A., & Galansky, N. (2008). The influence of children on their parents' values. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*, 1143–1161.
- Komter, A. E. (2006). *Social solidarity and the gift*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Komter, A. E., & Vollebergh, W. A. M. (2002). Solidarity in Dutch families: Family ties under strain? *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*, 171–188.
- Komter, A. E., & Knijn, T. C. (2006). The strength of family ties. In P. A. Dykstra, M. Kalmijn, T. C. Knijn, A. E. Komter, A. C. Liefbroer, & C. H. Mulder (Eds.), *Family solidarity in the Netherlands* (pp. 107–122). Amsterdam: Dutch University Press.
- Lambert, A. J., & Chasteen, A. L. (1997). Perceptions of disadvantage versus conventionality: Political values and attitudes toward the elderly versus Blacks. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 469–481.
- Levin, S., Taylor, P. L., & Caudle, E. (2006). Interethnic and interracial dating in college: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *24*, 323–341.
- Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sidanius J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 76–92.
- Levine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Levitt, P., & Schiller, N. G. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review*, *38*, 595–629.
- Lewis, R., Yancey, G., & Bletzer, S. S. (1997). Racial and nonracial factors that influence spouse choice in Black-white marriages. *Journal of Black Studies*, *28*, 60–78.
- Liebersohn, S. W., & Waters, M. C. (1988). *From many strands: Ethnic and racial groups in contemporary America*. New York: Russell.
- Liska, A. E. (1990). The significance of aggregate dependent variables and contextual independent variables for linking macro and micro theories. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *4*, 292–301.
- Lubbers, M., Gijsberts, M., & Scheepers, P. (2002). Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, *41*, 345–378.

- Marsden, P. V. (1987). Core discussion networks of Americans. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 122 – 131.
- Martinović, B., Van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2008). Dynamics of inter-ethnic contact: A panel study of immigrants in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 24, 1 – 16.
- McLaren, L. M. (2003). Anti-immigrant prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants. *Social Forces*, 81, 909 – 936.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily and social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415 – 444.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2001). Attachment theory and intergroup bias: Evidence that priming the secure base schema attenuates negative reactions to out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 97 – 115.
- Mills, J. K., McGrath, D., Sobkoviak, P., Stupec, S., & Welsh, S. (1995). Differences in expressed racial prejudice and acceptance of others. *The Journal of Psychology*, 129, 357 – 359.
- Moen, P., Erickson, M. A., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1997). Their mother's daughters? The intergenerational transmission of gender attitudes in a world of changing roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 281 – 293.
- Mok, T. A. (1999). Asian American dating: Important factors in partner choice. *Cultural Diversity and Minority Psychology*, 5, 103 – 117.
- Mosher, D. L., & Scodel, A. (1960). Relationships between ethnocentrism in children and the ethnocentrism and authoritarianism rearing practices of their mothers. *Child Development*, 31, 369 – 376.
- Muir, D. E., & McGlamery, D. C. (1984). Trends in integration attitudes on a deep south campus during the first two decades of desegregation. *Social Forces*, 62, 963 – 972.
- Mulder, C. H., & Hooimeijer, P. (1999). Residential relocations in the life course. In L. P. A. Van Wissen & P. A. Dykstra (Eds.), *Population issues: An interdisciplinary focus* (pp. 159 – 186). New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Myers, R. H. (1990). *Classical and modern regression with applications (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Duxbury Press.
- Myers, S. M. (1996). An interactive model of religiosity inheritance: The importance of family context. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 858 – 866.
- Nauck, B. (2001). Intercultural contact and intergenerational transmission in immigrant families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 159 – 173.
- Okun, B. S. (2001). The effects of ethnicity and educational attainment on Jewish marriage patterns: Changes in Israel, 1957-1995. *Population Studies*, 55, 49 – 64.
- Oliver, E. J., & Wong, J. J. (2003). Intergroup prejudice in multi-ethnic settings. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47, 567 – 582.
- Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D., & Russell C. S. (1983). Circumplex model of marital and family systems I: Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types and clinical applications. *Family Process*, 22, 69 – 83.
- Olzak, S. (1992). *The dynamics of ethnic competition and conflict*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Owen, C. A., Howard C. E., & McFaul, T. R. (1981). A half-century of distance research: National replication of the Bogardus' studies. *Sociology and Social Research*, 66, 80 – 98.
- Park, R., & Burgess, E. (1969 [1921]). *Introduction to the science of sociology* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family socialization and interaction process*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V. L., & Brown, R. (2009). National identification and anti-immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72, 24 – 38.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65 – 85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Jackson, J. S., Brika, J. B., Lemaine, G., Meertens, R. W., Wagner, U., et al. (1997). Outgroup prejudice in Western Europe. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (pp. 241 – 273). New York: Wiley.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57 – 75.
- Pfafferott, I., & Brown, R. (2006). Acculturation preferences of majority and minority adolescents in Germany in the context of society and family. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 703 – 717.
- Phalet, K., & Schönplflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts: The case of Turkish families in Germany and Turkish and Moroccan families in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 186 – 201.
- Phinney, J. S., Romero, I., Nava, M., & Huang, D. (2001). The role of language, parents, and peers in ethnic identity among adolescents in immigration families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30, 135 – 153.
- Pinquart, M., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2004). Transmission of values from adolescents to their parents: The role of value content and authoritative parenting. *Adolescence*, 39, 83 – 100.
- Polek, E., & Schoon, I. (2008). The socio-cultural adaptation of Polish brides in the Netherlands: Marital and occupational status. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 39, 353 – 370.
- Popenoe, D. (1988). *Disturbing the nest: Family change and decline in modern societies*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Poppe, E., & Hagendoorn, L. (2003). Titular identification of Russians in former Soviet Republics. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 55, 771 – 787.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial studies*, 22, 217 – 237.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: A portrait* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001) *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2006) *Immigrant America: A portrait* (3rd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Political and Social Sciences*, 530, 74 – 96.
- Prentice, D. A., Miller, D. T., & Lightdale, J. R. (1994). Asymmetries in attachments to groups and to their members: Distinguishing between common-identity and common-bond groups. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 484 – 493.
- Priem, J. S., Solomon, D. H., & Steuber, K. R. (2009). Accuracy and bias in perceptions of emotionally supportive communication in marriage. *Personal Relationships*, 16, 531 – 552.
- Qian, Z. (1997). Breaking the racial barriers: Variations in interracial marriage between 1980 and 1990. *Demography*, 34, 478 – 500.
- Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. T. (2001). Measuring marital assimilation: Intermarriage among natives and immigrants. *Social Science Research*, 30, 289 – 312.
- Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. T. (2007). Social boundaries and marital assimilation: Interpreting trends in racial and ethnic intermarriage. *American Journal of Sociology*, 72, 68 – 94.
- Quillian, L. (1995). Prejudice as a response to perceived group threat: Population composition and anti-immigrant and racial prejudice in Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 585 – 611.
- Reis, H. T., Collins, W. A., & Berscheid, E. (2000). The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 844 – 872.
- Reiter, M. J., & Gee, C. B. (2008). Open communication and partner support in intercultural and interfaith romantic relationships: A relational approach. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27, 539 – 559.
- Reynolds, T. (2006). Caribbean families, social capital and young people's diasporic identities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29, 1087 – 1103.
- Roberts, R. E. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1993). Relationships with parents, self-esteem, and psychological well-being in young adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56, 263 – 277.
- Roberts, R. E. L., & Bengtson, V. L. (1996). Affective ties to parents in early adulthood and self-esteem across 20 years. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59, 96 – 106.
- Roberts, R. E. L., Richards, L. N., & Bengtson, V. L. (1991). Intergenerational solidarity in families: untangling the ties that bind. *Marriage and Family Review*, 16, 11 – 46.
- Rodríguez-García, J., & Wagner, U. (2009). Learning to be prejudiced: A test of unidirectional and bidirectional models of parent-offspring socialization. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 516 – 523.
- Roest, A. M. C. (2009). *Value similarity and transmission among family members*. Nijmegen: Dissertation.
- Roest, A. M. C., Dubas, J. S., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). Value transmissions between fathers, mothers, and adolescent and emerging adult children: The role of the family climate. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 146 – 155.

- Roest, A. M. C., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R. M., & Engels, R. C. M. E. (2006). Disentangling value similarities and transmissions in established marriages: A cross-lagged longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1132 – 1146.
- Rohan, M. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1996). Value transmission in families. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium, vol. 8* (pp. 253 – 275). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rosenfeld, M. J. (2008). Racial, educational and religious endogamy in the United States: A comparative historical perspective. *Social Forces*, 87, 1 – 31.
- Rossi, A. S., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life-course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Rotolo, T., & Wilson, J. (2006). Substitute or complement? Spousal influence on volunteering. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 305 – 319.
- Royston, P. (2005). Multiple imputation of missing values: Update. *Stata Journal*, 5, 88 – 102.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 3 – 37.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 106 – 123.
- Rumbaut, R. (1994). The crucible within: Ethnic identity, self-esteem and segmented assimilation among children of immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 18, 748 – 794.
- Ryan, L., Sales, R., Tilki, M., & Siara, B. (2009). Family strategies and transnational migration: Recent Polish migrants in London. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35, 61 – 77.
- Ryan, R. M., & Solky, J. A. (1996). What is supportive about social support? On the psychological needs for autonomy and relatedness. In G. R. Pierce, B. R. Sarason, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Handbook of social support and the family. Plenum series on stress and coping* (pp. 249 – 267). New York: Plenum Press.
- Sabatier, C. (2008). Ethnic and national identity among second-generation immigrant adolescents in France: The role of social context and family. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31, 185 – 205.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sam, D. L., & Virta, E. (2003). Intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and host-national families and their impact on psychological adaptation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26, 213 – 231.
- Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., & Coenders, M. (2002). Ethnic exclusionism in European countries: Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic threat. *European Sociological Review*, 18, 17 – 34.
- Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., & Hello, E. (2002). Religiosity and prejudice against ethnic minorities in Europe: Cross-national tests on a controversial relationship. *Review of Religious Research*, 43, 242 – 265.

- Scheepers, P., & Van der Slik, F. W. P. (1998). Religion and attitudes on moral issues: Effects of individual, spousal and parental characteristics. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 678 – 691.
- Schlueter, E., & Scheepers, P. (2009). The relationship between outgroup size and anti-outgroup attitudes: A theoretical synthesis and empirical test of group threat- and intergroup contact theory. *Social Science Research*, 39, 285 – 295.
- Schönpflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of values: The role of transmission belts. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 174 – 185.
- Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., & Krysanm M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations* (revised ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sears, D. O. (1993). Symbolic politics: A socio-psychological theory. In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 113 – 149). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sharkey, P. (2008). The intergenerational transmission of context. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 931 – 969.
- Shavit, Y., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (1993). *Persistent inequality: Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries*. London: Westview Press.
- Shelton, N. J., Trail, T. E., West, T. V., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2010). From strangers to friends: The interpersonal process model of intimacy in developing interracial friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27, 71 – 90.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 248 – 279.
- Sieben, I. J. P. (2001). *Sibling similarities and social stratification: The impact of family background across countries and cohorts*. Nijmegen: ICS Dissertation.
- Silverstein, M., & Long, J. D. (1998). Trajectories of grandparents' received solidarity with adult grandchildren: A growth curve analysis over 23 years. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 912 – 923.
- Sinclair, S. A., Dunn, E., & Lowery, B. S. (2005). The relationship between parental racial attitudes and children's implicit prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 283 – 289.
- Slonim-Nevo, V., Mirsky, J., Rubinstein, L., & Nauck, B. (2009). The impact of familial and environmental factors on the adjustment of immigrants. A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30, 92 – 123.
- Smith, D. B., & Moen, P. (1998). Spousal influence on retirement: His, her, and their perceptions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 734 – 744.
- Smokowski, P. R., Rose, R., & Bacallao, M. L. (2008). Acculturation and Latino family processes: How cultural involvement, biculturalism, and acculturation gaps influence family dynamics. *Family Relations*, 57, 295 – 308.
- Sniderman, P. M., & Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When ways of life collide: Multiculturalism and its discontents in the Netherlands*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (2004). *Moslim in Nederland: Publieke discussie over de Islam in Nederland*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

- Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (2005). *Jaarrapport integratie 2005*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (2007). *Jaarrapport integratie 2007*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (2009). *Jaarrapport integratie 2009*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Sokol-Katz, J., Dunham, R., & Zimmerman, R. (1997). Family structure versus parental attachment in controlling adolescent deviant behaviour: A social control model. *Adolescence*, 32, 199 – 216.
- Sorensen, A. B., & McLanahan, S. S. (1987). Married women's economic dependency, 1940-1980. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93, 659 – 687.
- Spickard, P., & Fong, R. (1995). Pacific islander Americans and multi-ethnicity: A vision of America's future? *Social Forces*, 73, 1365 – 1383.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 25, 78 – 90.
- Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 729 – 743.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157 – 176.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). *Intergroup relations*. Boulder: Westview.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23 – 46). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Strabac, Z., & Listhaug, O. (2008). Anti-muslim prejudice in Europe: A multilevel analysis of survey data from 30 countries. *Social Science Research*, 37, 68 – 286.
- Sumner, W. G. (1959 [1906]). *Folkways. A study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals*. New York: Dover.
- Surra, C. A., & Milardo, R. M. (1991). The social psychological context of developing relationships: Interactive and psychological networks. In: W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in Personal Relationships* (pp. 1 – 36). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79 – 97.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7 – 24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Taylor, M. C. (1998). How white attitudes vary with the racial composition of local populations: Numbers count. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 512 – 535.
- Te Grotenhuis, M. T., & Scheepers, P. (2001). Churches in Dutch: causes of religious disaffiliation in the Netherlands, 1937-1995. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 591 – 606.
- Tolsma, J., Lubbers, M., & Coenders, M. (2008). Ethnic competition and opposition to ethnic intermarriage in the Netherlands: A multi-level approach. *European Sociological Review*, 24, 215 – 230.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Troy, A. B., Lewis-Smith, J., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2006). Inter-racial and intra-racial romantic relationships: The search for differences in satisfaction, conflict, and attachment style. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 65 – 80.
- Tseng, V., & Fuligni, A. J. (2000). Parent-adolescent language use and relationships among immigrant families with East Asian, Filipino and Latin American background. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 465 – 476.
- Tuch, S. A. (1987). Urbanism, region, and tolerance revisited: The case of racial prejudice. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 504 – 510.
- Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6 – 34). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tyler, T. R., Boeckmann, R. J., Smith, H. J., & Huo, Y. (1997). *Social justice in a diverse society*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Alfaro, E. C., Bámaca, M. Y., & Guimond, A. B. (2009). The central role of familial ethnic socialization in Latino adolescents' cultural orientation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 46 – 60.
- Uskul, A. K., Lalonde, R. N., & Cheng, L. (2007). Views on interracial dating among Chinese and European Canadians: The roles of culture, gender, and mainstream cultural identity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 891 – 911.
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002). *The moral foundations of trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. G. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 93 – 104.
- Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Phalet, K. (2004). Assessment in multicultural groups: The role of acculturation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53, 215 – 236.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2004). *The integration of immigrants in cross-national perspective*. Utrecht: ICS dissertation.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2007). Religious affiliation and participation among immigrants in a secular society: A study of immigrants in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, 747 – 765.
- Van Tubergen, F., & Kalmijn, M. (2005). Destination-language proficiency in cross-national perspective: A study of immigrant groups in nine Western countries. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 1412 – 1457.
- Van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2007). Ethnic intermarriage among immigrants in the Netherlands: An analysis of population data. *Social Science Research*, 36, 1065 – 1086.
- Veniegas, R. C., & Conley, T. D. (2000). Biological research on women's sexual orientations: Evaluating the scientific evidence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 267 – 282.
- Verkuyten, M., & Kinket, B. (2000). Social distance in a multi-ethnic society: The ethnic hierarchy among Dutch preadolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 75 – 85.

- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Racist victimization among children in the Netherlands: the effect of ethnic group and school. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25, 310 – 331.
- Verkuyten, M., & Zaremba, K. (2005). Inter-ethnic relations in a changing political context. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 375 – 386.
- Vollebergh, W. A. M., Iedema, J., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. W. (2001). Intergenerational transmission and formation of cultural orientations in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1185 – 1198.
- Voorpostel, M., & Blieszner, R. (2008). Family solidarity and support between siblings. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 157 – 167.
- Wagner, U., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T. F., Stellmacher, J., & Wolf, C. (2006). Prejudice and minority proportion: Contact instead of threat effects. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69, 380 – 390.
- Wang, H., Kao, G., & Joyner, K. (2006). Stability of inter-racial and intra-racial romantic relationships among adolescents. *Social Science Research*, 35, 435 – 453.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Psychological and socio-cultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions: A comparison of secondary students overseas and at home. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 129 – 147.
- Ward, C., Leong, C. H., & Low, M. (2004). Personality and sojourner adjustment. An exploration of the big five and the cultural fit proposition. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 137 – 151.
- Warner, W. L., & Srole, L. (1945). *The social systems of American ethnic groups*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Whitbeck, L. B., & Gecas, V. (1988). Value attributions and value transmission between parents and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 829 – 840.
- White, F. A. (1996). Family processes as predictors of adolescents' preferences for ascribed sources of moral authority. *Adolescence*, 31, 121 – 133.
- White, F. A., & Gleitzman, M. (2006). An examination of family socialization processes as moderators of racial prejudice transmission between adolescents and their parents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 247 – 260.
- Wilcox, B. W. (1998). Conservative protestant childrearing: Authoritarian or authoritative? *American Sociological Review*, 63, 796 – 809.
- Wilson, J. W., & Constantine, M. G. (1999). Racial identity attitudes, self-concept, and perceived family cohesion in black college students. *Journal of Black Studies*, 29, 354 – 366.
- Wood, W. (2000). Attitude change: Persuasion and social influence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 539 – 570.
- Zhang, Y., & Hook, J. V. (2009). Marital dissolution among inter-racial couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71, 95 – 107.
- Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review*, 31, 975 – 1008.
- Zhou, M., & Bankston, C. L. (1998). *Growing up American: How Vietnamese children adapt to life in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Zhou, Q., Eisenberg, N., Losoya, S. H., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Guthrie, I. K. et al. (2002). The relations of parental warmth and positive expressiveness to children's empathy-related responding and social functioning: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 73, 893 – 915.
- Zontini, E. (2007). Continuity and change in transnational Italian families: The caring practices of second-generation women. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, 1103 – 1119.

Acknowledgements

Tegenwind kan je doen opstijgen, maar ook omverblazen. Na een turbulente periode is het proefschrift nu klaar. Iedereen die heeft bijgedragen aan de totstandkoming ervan wil ik heel hartelijk bedanken. Een aantal mensen wil ik in het bijzonder noemen.

Allereerst bedank ik natuurlijk mijn (co-)promotoren Maykel Verkuyten en Marcel Coenders voor de wijze waarop ze mij in de loop van de jaren hebben begeleid en geholpen. Beste Maykel, na een moeizaam begin hebben we het dan toch nog mooi voor elkaar gekregen. Je snelheid en niveau van denken en werken is uniek en indrukwekkend. Ik heb heel veel van je geleerd. Marcel, het feit dat jij halverwege in het project bent gestapt zorgde duidelijk voor een positieve impuls. Bedankt voor je bijdragen, je scherpe oog voor structuur en constructieve commentaar op mijn teksten. Het was ook prettig en leerzaam om samen met je te werken aan ons andere gezamenlijke project voor het Anti Discriminatiebureau (Iederigelijk).

Dit proefschrift is het resultaat van onderzoek binnen de vakgroep ASW en de onderzoeksgroepen ICS en ERCOMER. Ik ben dank verschuldigd aan vele verschillende mensen binnen deze groepen, zoals de medewerkers van het secretariaat, de leden van het Work & Family seminar, en de deelnemers aan de forumdagen van het ICS. Hierbij wil ik expliciet Louk en Aafke bedanken voor hun bijdragen, met name voor de hulp aan het begin van het project. Mariëlle Bedaux, dank voor je steun, wijze woorden en verhelderende blik op zaken. Verder wil ik de leden van de leescommissie bedanken voor de tijd en moeite om deze dissertatie kritisch te bestuderen. Mijn speciale dank gaat ook uit naar Aat Liefbroer die mij heeft begeleid tijdens mijn periode op het NIDI. Ik heb onze samenwerking – zowel inhoudelijk als persoonlijk – als zeer prettig ervaren.

De vele aangename collega's op de universiteit hebben gezorgd voor een plezierige werksfeer en voor veel mooie ervaringen. Er zijn er teveel om allemaal bij naam te noemen. Met veel plezier denk ik bijvoorbeeld terug aan de sportdagen, de voetbalwedstrijden tegen de sociologen, de Batavierenrace, de uitgaansavondjes en de talrijke gezamenlijke lunches. Het was prettig om onderdeel te zijn van het charmante gezelschap van de ICS-jaargroep 2005. Lieke, Borja, Anne, Renske, Michal, en in het bijzonder de enige andere (ex-)ASW-ster Marieke: bedankt voor jullie gezelligheid en gezelschap. Door de verhuizing van ERCOMER naar de 20e verdieping van het Van Unnikgebouw werden mijn banden met de overige ERCOMER-leden sterk aangehaald. Marcel L., Jochem, Edwin, Anouk, Thomas, Cha Hsuan, Fenella, Roza en alle anderen, bedankt voor de prettige werksfeer en ik zal jullie missen als collega's.

Een drietal zeer gewaardeerde ERCOMER-collega's wil ik in het bijzonder noemen. Beste Hidde, bedankt voor de uitermate prettige tijd die ik met jou mocht doorbrengen als kamergenoot! Maike, mijn favoriete buurvrouw: het was gezellig om veel passies samen met jou te delen, bijvoorbeeld lost (Dudel!), de voetbal- en tourpools (Huti!) en de verschillende sportactiviteiten (Bata!). Marty, mijn kleine, ietwat eigenwijze Bengtsonbroertje. Fijn om je als buurman (lees: kamergenoot) gehad te hebben. Onze trip naar Jyväskylä samen met onze derde broer was legendarisch. Dank ook voor je praktische steun gedurende het project.

15.30! Nee, ik bedoel geen tussenstand bij het tennis, maar de kamer waar ik de eerste jaren van mijn AiO-tijd heb doorgebracht. Arieke, het was erg gezellig om een kamer met je te delen, en leuk dat we ook nog even collega's zijn geweest op het NIDI. Beste Freek, in de afgelopen jaren ben je mijn collega, broer, ex-rookmaatje, en vriend geworden. Al deze rollen passen je uitzonderlijk goed. Bedankt voor je onuitputtelijke steun – op alle fronten – die je mij de afgelopen jaren hebt gegeven. Bedankt ook voor de talloze – dikwijls ronduit gënante – slappe lach momenten die we tijdens congressen, presentaties, in de trein, in de lift of gewoon op onze kamer hebben gehad. Het is fantastisch dat we nu wederom collega's zijn bij het SCP.

Allerbeste Wilfred, jij bent de beste vriend die iemand zich kan wensen. Een kwart eeuw diepe vriendschap is niet in één zin of woord te bevatten. Ik ben blij en trots dat jij als paranimf naast mij staat, zoals je er altijd voor mij bent geweest. Beste Bjorn (hombre!), wat hebben we toch veel mooie gezamenlijke ervaringen: de zomer van 2007, Ryan & d'n Admiraal, simply ut Zesd, de festivals, en zo kan ik nog wel even doorgaan. Jeroen, sociologievriend van het eerste uur, bedankt voor je fijne vriendschap. Noor, ook al gingen onze wegen uiteindelijk een ander kant op, ik wil je bedanken voor je steun en onze gezamenlijke tijd. Het is mooi om te zien dat we er allebei beter van geworden zijn. Assie, Liset, Wilko, Sjoerd en andere vrienden, bedankt! Ook mijn vrienden uit Eindhoven en de vrienden van het eiland mogen niet onvermeld blijven: Balasz, Ibi, Otje, Fred, Kate en Jack. Vol bewondering heb ik jullie aanschouwd.

Tot slot wil ik mijn familie bedanken. Beste pa en ma, Jacco, Julius, Janneke, lieve Rein(tje) en oma, wat fijn dat jullie mijn familie zijn. Broers, erg leuk dat we weer samen in dezelfde stad wonen.

Allerliefste Mieke, jij was mijn secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarde die promoveren zo veel leuker maakte. Je pakte me tijdens het K-feest bij de hand, en hebt die gelukkig niet meer losgelaten. Bedankt voor al je hulp, je steun en vooral je liefde. Ik wil met jou alleen in alle sloten samen.

Curriculum Vitae

Willem Huijnk was born in Eindhoven, the Netherlands, on March 21, 1979. He started his undergraduate studies in sociology at Radboud University Nijmegen in 2000, obtaining his Master's degree in Sociology cum laude in 2005. In September 2005, he became a PhD student at the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS) at Utrecht University. There he conducted the present research at the Department of Interdisciplinary Social Science from 2005 to 2010. In early 2009, a research traineeship was carried out at the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI) in The Hague. Since September 2010, he holds a position as a scientific researcher at The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) in the Hague.

ICS Dissertation Series

The ICS-series presents dissertations of the Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology. Each of these studies aims at integrating explicit theory formation with state-of-the-art empirical research or at the development of advanced methods for empirical research. The ICS was founded in 1986 as a cooperative effort of the universities of Groningen and Utrecht. Since 1992, the ICS expanded to the University of Nijmegen. Most of the projects are financed by the participating universities or by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). The international composition of the ICS graduate students is mirrored in the increasing international orientation of the projects and thus of the ICS-series itself.

- 1) C. van Liere (1990). *Lastige leerlingen. Een empirisch onderzoek naar sociale oorzaken van probleemgedrag op basisscholen*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 2) Marco H.D. van Leeuwen (1990). *Bijstand in Amsterdam, ca. 1800 - 1850. Armenzorg als beheersings- en overlevingsstrategie*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 3) I. Maas (1990). *Deelname aan podiumkunsten via de podia, de media en actieve beoefening. Substitutie of leereffecten?* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 4) M.I. Broese van Groenou (1991). *Gescheiden netwerken. De relaties met vrienden en verwanten na echtscheiding*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 5) Jan M.M. van den Bos (1991). *Dutch EC policy making. A model-guided approach to coordination and negotiation*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 6) Karin Sanders (1991). *Vrouwelijke pioniers. Vrouwen en mannen met een 'mannelijke' hogere beroepsopleiding aan het begin van hun loopbaan*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 7) Sjerp de Vries (1991). *Egoism, altruism, and social justice. Theory and experiments on cooperation in social dilemmas*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 8) Ronald S. Batenburg (1991). *Automatisering in bedrijf*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 9) Rudi Wielers (1991). *Selectie en allocatie op de arbeidsmarkt. Een uitwerking voor de informele en geïnstitutionaliseerde kinderopvang*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 10) Gert P. Westert (1991). *Verschillen in ziekenhuisgebruik*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 11) Hanneke Hermsen (1992). *Votes and policy preferences. Equilibria in party systems*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 12) Cora J.M. Maas (1992). *Probleemleerlingen in het basisonderwijs*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.

- 13) Ed A.W. Boxman (1992). *Contacten en carrière. Een empirisch-theoretisch onderzoek naar de relatie tussen sociale netwerken en arbeidsmarktposities.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 14) Conny G.J. Taes (1992). *Kijken naar banen. Een onderzoek naar de inschatting van arbeidsmarktkansen bij schoolverlaters uit het middelbaar beroepsonderwijs.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 15) Peter van Roozendaal (1992). *Cabinets in multi-party democracies. The effect of dominant and central parties on cabinet composition and durability.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 16) Marcel van Dam (1992). *Regio zonder regie. Verschillen in en effectiviteit van gemeentelijk arbeidsmarktbeleid.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 17) Tanja van der Lippe (1993). *Arbeidsverdeling tussen mannen en vrouwen.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 18) Marc A. Jacobs (1993). *Software: kopen of kopiëren? Een sociaal-wetenschappelijk onderzoek onder PC-gebruikers.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 19) Peter van der Meer (1993). *Verdringing op de Nederlandse arbeidsmarkt. Sector- en sekseverschillen.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 20) Gerbert Kraaykamp (1993). *Over lezen gesproken. Een studie naar sociale differentiatie in leesgedrag.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 21) Evelien Zeggelink (1993). *Strangers into friends. The evolution of friendship networks using an individual oriented modeling approach.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 22) Jaco Baveling (1994). *Het stempel op de besluitvorming. Macht, invloed en besluitvorming op twee Amsterdamse beleidsterreinen.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 23) Wim Bernasco (1994). *Coupled careers. The effects of spouse's resources on success at work.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 24) Liset van Dijk (1994). *Choices in child care. The distribution of child care among mothers, fathers and non-parental care providers.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 25) Jos de Haan (1994). *Research groups in Dutch sociology.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 26) K. Boahene (1995). *Innovation adoption as a socio-economic process. The case of the Ghanaian cocoa industry.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 27) Paul E.M. Ligthart (1995). *Solidarity in economic transactions. An experimental study of framing effects in bargaining and contracting.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 28) Roger Th. A.J. Leenders (1995). *Structure and influence. Statistical models for the dynamics of actor attributes, network structure, and their interdependence.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 29) Beate Völker (1995). *Should auld acquaintance be forgot...? Institutions of communism, the transition to capitalism and personal networks: the case of East Germany.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 30) A. Cancrinus-Matthijssse (1995). *Tussen hulpverlening en ondernemerschap. Beroepsuitoefening en taakopvattingen van openbare apothekers in een aantal West-Europese landen.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.

- 31) Nardi Steverink (1996). *Zo lang mogelijk zelfstandig. Naar een verklaring van verschillen in oriëntatie ten aanzien van opname in een verzorgingstehuis onder fysiek kwetsbare ouderen*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 32) Ellen Lindeman (1996). *Participatie in vrijwilligerswerk*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 33) Chris Snijders (1996). *Trust and commitments*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 34) Koos Postma (1996). *Changing prejudice in Hungary. A study on the collapse of state socialism and its impact on prejudice against Gypsies and Jews*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 35) Jooske T. van Busschbach (1996). *Uit het oog, uit het hart? Stabiliteit en verandering in persoonlijke relaties*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 36) René Torenvlied (1996). *Besluiten in uitvoering. Theorieën over beleidsuitvoering modelmatig getoetst op sociale vernieuwing in drie gemeenten*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 37) Andreas Flache (1996). *The double edge of networks. An analysis of the effect of informal networks on cooperation in social dilemmas*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 38) Kees van Veen (1997). *Inside an internal labor market: Formal rules, flexibility and career lines in a Dutch manufacturing company*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 39) Lucienne van Eijk (1997). *Activity and well-being in the elderly*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 40) Róbert Gál (1997). *Unreliability. Contract discipline and contract governance under economic transition*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 41) Anne-Geerte van de Goor (1997). *Effects of regulation on disability duration*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 42) Boris Blumberg (1997). *Das Management von Technologiekooperationen. Partnersuche und Verhandlungen mit dem Partner aus Empirisch-Theoretischer Perspektive*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 43) Marijke von Bergh (1997). *Loopbanen van oudere werknemers*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 44) Anna Petra Nieboer (1997). *Life-events and well-being: A prospective study on changes in well-being of elderly people due to a serious illness event or death of the spouse*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 45) Jacques Niehof (1997). *Resources and social reproduction: The effects of cultural and material resources on educational and occupational careers in industrial nations at the end of the twentieth century*. ICS dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 46) Ariana Need (1997). *The kindred vote. Individual and family effects of social class and religion on electoral change in the Netherlands, 1956-1994*. ICS dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 47) Jim Allen (1997). *Sector composition and the effect of education on wages: an international comparison*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- 48) Jack B.F. Hutten (1998). *Workload and provision of care in general practice. An empirical study of the relation between workload of Dutch general practitioners and the content and quality of their care*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.

- 49) Per B. Kropp (1998). *Berufserfolg im Transformationsprozeß. Eine theoretisch-empirische Studie über die Gewinner und Verlierer der Wende in Ostdeutschland*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 50) Maarten H.J. Wolbers (1998). *Diploma-inflatie en verdringing op de arbeidsmarkt. Een studie naar ontwikkelingen in de opbrengsten van diploma's in Nederland*. ICS dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 51) Wilma Smeenck (1998). *Opportunity and marriage. The impact of individual resources and marriage market structure on first marriage timing and partner choice in the Netherlands*. ICS dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 52) Marinus Spreen (1999). *Sampling personal network structures: Statistical inference in ego-graphs*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 53) Vincent Buskens (1999). *Social networks and trust*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 54) Susanne Rijken (1999). *Educational expansion and status attainment. A cross-national and over-time comparison*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 55) Mérove Gijsberts (1999). *The legitimation of inequality in state-socialist and market societies, 1987-1996*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 56) Gerhard G. Van de Bunt (1999). *Friends by choice. An actor-oriented statistical network model for friendship networks through time*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 57) Robert Thomson (1999). *The party mandate: election pledges and government actions in the Netherlands, 1986-1998*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- 58) Corine Baarda (1999). *Politieke besluiten en boeren beslissingen. Het draagvlak van het mestbeleid tot 2000*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 59) Rafael Wittek (1999). *Interdependence and informal control in organizations*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 60) Diane Payne (1999). *Policy making in the European Union: an analysis of the impact of the reform of the structural funds in Ireland*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 61) René Veenstra (1999). *Leerlingen - klassen - scholen. Prestaties en vorderingen van leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Amsterdam, Thela Thesis.
- 62) Marjolein Achterkamp (1999). *Influence strategies in collective decision making. A comparison of two models*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 63) Peter Mühlau (2000). *The governance of the employment relation. A relational signaling perspective*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 64) Agnes Akkerman (2000). *Verdeelde vakbeweging en stakingen. Concurrentie om leden*. ICS dissertation, Groningen.
- 65) Sandra van Thiel (2000). *Quangocratization: Trends, causes and consequences*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 66) Rudi Turksema (2000). *Supply of day care*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 67) Sylvia E. Korupp (2000). *Mothers and the process of social stratification*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 68) Bernard A. Nijstad (2000). *How the group affects the mind: Effects of communication in idea generating groups*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.
- 69) Inge F. de Wolf (2000). *Opleidingsspecialisatie en arbeidsmarktsucces van sociale wetenschappers*. ICS dissertation, Utrecht.

- 70) Jan Kratzer (2001). *Communication and performance: An empirical study in innovation teams*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 71) Madelon Kroneman (2001). *Healthcare systems and hospital bed use*. ICS/NIVEL-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 72) Herman van de Werfhorst (2001). *Field of study and social inequality. Four types of educational resources in the process of stratification in the Netherlands*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 73) Tamás Bartus (2001). *Social capital and earnings inequalities. The role of informal job search in Hungary*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 74) Hester Moerbeek (2001). *Friends and foes in the occupational career. The influence of sweet and sour social capital on the labour market*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 75) Marcel van Assen (2001). *Essays on actor perspectives in exchange networks and social dilemmas*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 76) Inge Sieben (2001). *Sibling similarities and social stratification. The impact of family background across countries and cohorts*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 77) Alinda van Bruggen (2001). *Individual production of social well-being. An exploratory study*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 78) Marcel Coenders (2001). *Nationalistic attitudes and ethnic exclusionism in a comparative perspective: An empirical study of attitudes toward the country and ethnic immigrants in 22 Countries*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 79) Marcel Lubbers (2001). *Exclusionistic electorates. Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 80) Uwe Matzat (2001). *Social networks and cooperation in electronic communities. A theoretical-empirical analysis of academic communication and internet discussion groups*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 81) Jacques P.G. Janssen (2002). *Do opposites attract divorce? Dimensions of mixed marriage and the risk of divorce in the Netherlands*, ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 82) Miranda Jansen (2002). *Waardenoriëntaties en partnerrelaties. Een panelstudie naar wederzijdse invloeden*, ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 83) Anne Rigt Poortman (2002). *Socio-economic causes and consequences of divorce*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 84) Alexander Gattig (2002). *Intertemporal decision making*, ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 85) Gerrit Rooks (2002). *Contract en conflict: strategisch management van inkooptransacties*, ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 86) Károly Takács (2002). *Social networks and intergroup conflict*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 87) Thomas Gautschi (2002). *Trust and exchange, effects of temporal embeddedness and network embeddedness on providing and dividing a surplus*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 88) Hilde Bras (2002). *Zeeuwse meiden. Dienen in de levensloop van vrouwen, ca. 1850 – 1950*. Aksant Academic Publishers, Amsterdam.
- 89) Merijn Rengers (2002). *Economic lives of artists. Studies into careers and the labour market in the cultural sector*, ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.

- 90) Annelies Kassenberg (2002). *Wat scholieren bindt. Sociale gemeenschap in scholen*, ICS-dissertation, Groningen
- 91) Marc Verboord (2003). *Moet de meester dalen of de leerling klimmen? De invloed van literatuuronderwijs en ouders op het lezen van boeken tussen 1975 en 2000*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 92) Marcel van Egmond (2003). *Rain falls on all of us (but some manage to get more wet than others): political context and electoral participation*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 93) Justine Horgan (2003). *High performance human resource management in Ireland and the Netherlands: Adoption and Effectiveness*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 94) Corine Hoeben (2003). *LETS' be a community. Community in local exchange trading systems*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 95) Christian Steglich (2003). *The framing of decision situations. Automatic goal selection and rational goal pursuit*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 96) Johan van Wilsem (2003). *Crime and context. The impact of individual, neighborhood, city and country characteristics on victimization*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 97) Christiaan Monden (2003). *Education, inequality and health. The impact of partners and life vourse*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 98) Evelyn Hello (2003). *Educational attainment and ethnic attitudes. How to explain their relationship*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 99) Marnix Croes en Peter Tammes (2004). *Gif laten wij niet voortbestaan. Een onderzoek naar de overlevingskansen van joden in de Nederlandse gemeenten, 1940-1945*. Aksant Academic Publishers, Amsterdam.
- 100) Ineke Nagel (2004). *Cultuurdeelname in de levensloop*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 101) Marieke van der Wal (2004). *Competencies to participate in life. Measurement and the impact of school*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 102) Vivian Meertens (2004). *Depressive symptoms in the general population: a multifactorial social approach*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 103) Hanneke Schuurmans (2004). *Promoting well-being in frail elderly people. Theory and intervention*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 104) Javier Arregui (2004). *Negotiation in legislative decision-making in the European Union*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 105) Tamar Fischer (2004). *Parental divorce, conflict and resources. The effects on children's behaviour problems, socio-economic attainment, and transitions in the demographic career*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 106) René Bekkers (2004). *Giving and volunteering in the Netherlands: Sociological and psychological perspectives*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 107) Renée van der Hulst (2004). *Gender differences in workplace authority: An empirical study on social networks*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 108) Rita Smaniotto (2004). *'You scratch my back and I scratch yours' versus 'Love thy neighbour'. Two proximate mechanisms of reciprocal altruism*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.

- 109) Maurice Gesthuizen (2004). *The life-course of the low-educated in the Netherlands: social and economic risks*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 110) Carlijne Philips (2005). *Vakantiegemeenschappen. Kwalitatief en kwantitatief onderzoek naar gelegenheid en refreshergemeenschap tijdens de vakantie*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 111) Esther de Ruijter (2005). *Household outsourcing*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 112) Frank van Tubergen (2005). *The integration of immigrants in cross-national perspective: origin, destination, and community effects*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 113) Ferry Koster (2005). *For the time being. Accounting for inconclusive findings concerning the effects of temporary employment relationships on solidary behavior of employees*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 114) Carolien Klein Haarhuis (2005). *Promoting anti-corruption reforms. Evaluating the implementation of a world bank anti-corruption program in seven African countries (1999-2001)*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 115) Martin van der Gaag (2005). *Measurement of individual social capital*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 116) Johan Hansen (2005). *Shaping careers of men and women in organizational contexts*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 117) Davide Barrera (2005). *Trust in embedded settings*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 118) Mattijs Lambooi (2005). *Promoting cooperation. Studies into the effects of long-term and short-term rewards on cooperation of employees*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 119) Lotte Vermeij (2006). *What's cooking? Cultural boundaries among Dutch teenagers of different ethnic origins in the context of school*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 120) Mathilde Strating (2006). *Facing the challenge of rheumatoid arthritis. A 13-year prospective study among patients and cross-sectional study among their partners*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 121) Jannes de Vries (2006). *Measurement error in family background variables: The bias in the intergenerational transmission of status, cultural consumption, party preference, and religiosity*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 122) Stefan Thau (2006). *Workplace deviance: Four studies on employee motives and self-regulation*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 123) Mirjam Plantinga (2006). *Employee motivation and employee performance in child care. The effects of the introduction of market forces on employees in the Dutch child-care sector*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 124) Helga de Valk (2006). *Pathways into adulthood. A comparative study on family life transitions among migrant and Dutch youth*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 125) Henrike Elzen (2006). *Self-management for chronically ill older people*. ICS-Dissertation, Groningen.
- 126) Ayse Güveli (2007). *New social classes within the service class in the Netherlands and Britain. Adjusting the EGP class schema for the technocrats and the social and cultural specialists*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 127) Willem-Jan Verhoeven (2007). *Income attainment in post-communist societies*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.

- 128) Marieke Voorpostel (2007). *Sibling support: The exchange of help among brothers and sisters in the Netherlands*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 129) Jacob Dijkstra (2007). *The effects of externalities on partner choice and payoffs in exchange networks*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 130) Patricia van Echtelt (2007). *Time-greedy employment relationships: Four studies on the time claims of post-Fordist work*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 131) Sonja Vogt (2007). *Heterogeneity in social dilemmas: The case of social support*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 132) Michael Schweinberger (2007). *Statistical methods for studying the evolution of networks and behavior*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 133) István Back (2007). *Commitment and evolution: Connecting emotion and reason in long-term relationships*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 134) Ruben van Gaalen (2007). *Solidarity and ambivalence in parent-child relationships*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 135) Jan Reitsma (2007). *Religiosity and solidarity – Dimensions and relationships disentangled and tested*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 136) Jan Kornelis Dijkstra (2007). *Status and affection among (pre)adolescents and their relation with antisocial and prosocial behavior*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 137) Wouter van Gils (2007). *Full-time working couples in the Netherlands. Causes and consequences*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 138) Djamila Schans (2007). *Ethnic diversity in intergenerational solidarity*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 139) Ruud van der Meulen (2007). *Brug over woelig water: lidmaatschap van sportverenigingen, vriendschappen, kennissenkringen en veralgemeend vertrouwen*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 140) Andrea Knecht (2008). *Friendship selection and friends' influence. Dynamics of networks and actor attributes in early adolescence*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 141) Ingrid Doorten (2008). *The division of unpaid work in the household: A stubborn pattern?* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 142) Stijn Ruiter (2008). *Association in context and association as context: Causes and consequences of voluntary association involvement*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 143) Janneke Joly (2008). *People on our minds: When humanized contexts activate social norms*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 144) Margreet Frieling (2008). *'Joint production' als motor voor actief burgerschap in de buurt*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 145) Ellen Verbakel (2008). *The partner as resource or restriction? Labour market careers of husbands and wives and the consequences for inequality between couples*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 146) Gijs van Houten (2008). *Beleidsuitvoering in gelaagde stelsels. De doorwerking van aanbevelingen van de Stichting van de Arbeid in het CAO-overleg*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 147) Eva Jaspers (2008). *Intolerance over time. Macro and micro level questions on attitudes towards euthanasia, homosexuality and ethnic minorities*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.

- 148) Gijs Weijters (2008). *Youth delinquency in Dutch cities and schools: A multilevel approach*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 149) Jessica Pass (2009). *The self in social rejection*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 150) Gerald Mollenhorst (2009). *Networks in contexts. How meeting opportunities affect personal relationships*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 151) Tom van der Meer (2009). *States of freely associating citizens: comparative studies into the impact of state institutions on social, civic and political participation*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 152) Manuela Vieth (2009). *Commitments and reciprocity in trust situations. Experimental studies on obligation, indignation, and self-consistency*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 153) Rense Corten (2009). *Co-evolution of social networks and behavior in social dilemmas: Theoretical and empirical perspectives*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 154) Arieke J. Rijken (2009). *Happy families, high fertility? Childbearing choices in the context of family and partner relationships*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 155) Jochem Tolsma (2009). *Ethnic hostility among ethnic majority and minority groups in the Netherlands. An investigation into the impact of social mobility experiences, the local living environment and educational attainment on ethnic hostility*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 156) Freek Bucx (2009). *Linked lives: Young adults' life course and relations with parents*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 157) Philip Wotschack (2009). *Household governance and time allocation. Four studies on the combination of work and care*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 158) Nienke Moor (2009). *Explaining worldwide religious diversity. The relationship between subsistence technologies and ideas about the unknown in pre-industrial and (post-)industrial societies*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 159) Lieke ten Brummelhuis (2009). *Family matters at work. Depleting and enriching effects of employees' family lives on work outcomes*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 160) Renske Keizer (2010). *Remaining childless. Causes and consequences from a life course perspective*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 161) Miranda Sentse (2010). *Bridging Contexts: The interplay between family, child, and peers in explaining problem behavior in early adolescence*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 162) Nicole Tieben (2010). *Transitions, tracks and transformations. Social inequality in transitions into, through and out of secondary education in the Netherlands for cohorts born between 1914 and 1985*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 163) Birgit Pauksztat (2010). *Speaking up in organizations: Four studies on employee voice*. ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 164) Richard Zijdeman (2010). *Status attainment in the Netherlands, 1811-1941. Spatial and temporal variation before and during industrialization*. ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 165) Rianne Kloosterman (2010). *Social background and children's educational careers. The primary and secondary effects of social background over transitions and over time in the Netherlands*. ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.

- 166) Olav Aarts (2010). *Religious diversity and religious involvement. A study of religious markets in Western societies at the end of the twentieth century.* ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 167) Stephanie Wiesmann (2010). *24/7 Negotiation in couples transition to parenthood.* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 168) Borja Martinovic (2010). *Interethnic contacts: A dynamic analysis of interaction between immigrants and natives in Western countries.* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 169) Anne Roeters (2010). *Family life under pressure? Parents' paid work and the quantity and quality of parent-child and family time.* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 170) Jelle Sijtsema (2010). *Adolescent aggressive behavior: Status and stimulation goals in relation to the peer context.* ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 171) Kees Keizer (2010). *The spreading of disorder.* ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 172) Michael Mäs (2010). *The clustering puzzle. Explaining clustering and polarization of opinions.* ICS-dissertation, Groningen.
- 173) Marie-Louise Damen (2010). *Cultuurdeelname en CKV. Studies naar effecten van kunsteducatie op de cultuurdeelname van leerlingen tijdens en na het voortgezet onderwijs.* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.
- 174) Marieke van de Rakt (2011). *Two generations of crime: The intergenerational transmission of convictions over the life course.* ICS-dissertation, Nijmegen.
- 175) Willem Huijnk (2011). *Family life and ethnic attitudes. The role of the family for attitudes towards intermarriage and acculturation among minority and majority groups.* ICS-dissertation, Utrecht.