

Stereotype Accommodation: A Socio-Cognitive Perspective on Migrants' Cultural
Adaptation

Adrian Stanciu

Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS)

and

Vechta University, Institute for Gerontology

Christin-Melanie Vauclair

Lisbon University Institute (ISCTE-IUL), Centre for Psychological Research and Social

Intervention (CIS)

This version of the manuscript has been accepted for publication at the Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18.04.2018.

To correctly cite this article please refer to its published version at the respective journal's website.

Address for Correspondence: Adrian Stanciu, Vechta University, Institute for Gerontology,
Driverstr. 23, Room R 234, 49377 Vechta Germany, adrian.stanciu@uni-vechta.de

Author Note:

Adrian Stanciu's contribution to this article was in part prepared during his doctoral degree at the Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS) and was supported in part by the FAZIT Foundation within the framework of doctoral completion grants.

Conflicts of Interest:

There were no conflicts of interest in the preparation of this article.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Christopher J. Cohrs, Katja Hanke and Fons J.R. van de Vijver for their invaluable input at different stages during the development of the present manuscript. Likewise, we would like to thank the editor and the two anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful insights toward making this publication possible. Last, but not least, the first author would like to thank the scientific community at the Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences (BIGSSS) for the academic input that has challenged and supported at the same time the earlier attempts in developing the present concept and framework.

Abstract

Cognitive heuristics, or people's stereotypes, are central to human interaction. Yet, the literature has been concerned with inter-ethnic stereotypes held by migrants and therefore has insufficiently addressed what might happen to individuals' cognitive heuristics in the process of acculturating to host cultures. The authors discuss this gap in the literature by drawing on the culture learning perspective and work on cultural adaptation to examine migrants' cognitive cultural adaptation. The concept of *stereotype accommodation* is introduced as a cognitive process whereby migrants incorporate the stereotype-relevant information learned in their host cultures into their pre-existing stereotypes. Furthermore, a framework is presented for how cross-cultural differences, learning opportunities, individual differences, and cognitive resources might contribute to stereotype accommodation. The conclusion of this analysis is that, like any other individuals, migrants hold cognitive heuristics about varying groups in society and, moreover, these can be influenced and potentially modified by the mental short-cuts that are relevant in their host cultures.

Keywords: stereotypes, acculturation, cultural adaptation, stereotype accommodation

Stereotype Accommodation: A Socio-Cognitive Perspective on Migrants' Cultural Adaptation

Living in a new country implies numerous psychological obstacles that individuals need to overcome. Am I happy here? How do I manage successfully the daily life routine? What is the 'right' way of thinking? The acculturation and adaptation literature has produced numerous studies that address the first (the affective domain) and second kind of questions (the behavioral domain) (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001), yet the third kind of question (the cognitive domain) has remained insufficiently addressed in our opinion. We seek to contribute to the existing literature by providing a fine-grained look at the cognitive domain in migrants' cultural adaptation. We focus on migrants' cognitive heuristics as a form of cognitive adaptation in host cultures. In doing so, we introduce the concept of *stereotype accommodation* as a cognitive process whereby migrants incorporate the stereotype-relevant information that they learn in their host cultures into their pre-existing set of beliefs.

We propose a theoretical approach to the cognitive domain of migrants' cultural adaptation that builds on the notion of culture learning (Rudmin, 2009). Our main intention is to stress one manifestation out of many manifestations of migrants' cognitive adaptation, clarify its novelty in the literature, and propose a theoretical framework that can guide the design of empirical studies. We also show how our framework differs from related work (e.g., Crisp & Turner, 2011). The paper is divided into five sections. The first section summarizes the literature on the core concepts. We then introduce the concept of stereotype accommodation and the framework's core postulates are presented in detail, followed by the potential scientific and practical benefits of the newly introduced concept and its framework. Finally, limitations, future research directions, and overall conclusions are discussed.

Section I: Theoretical Background

Stereotypes, Content of Stereotypes, Ethnic-Stereotypes, and Auto- and Hetero-Stereotypes

In early stages of life, people learn about the world that surrounds them, and gradually gain abilities for the communication of their feelings and beliefs. Concurrently, they learn about the appropriate and accepted norms in their societies. This has implications in social interactions—the way people approach others is largely dictated by their cognitive heuristics about social groups, or, in other words, by their pre-existing stereotypes (Crandall, Bahns, Warner, & Challer, 2011). Stereotypes are beliefs about the attributes of a social group (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996).

A stereotype therefore entails that a perceiver holds (1) specific beliefs (2) belonging to a social group. One prevailing view on stereotypes in the literature stems from the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). The SCM holds that stereotypes about any social category can be summarized as a combination of perceived warmth and competence. Whereas warmth specifies the perception of social relatedness, competence indicates the perceived agency. There can be four combinations of warmth-competence perceptions (Fiske et al., 2002): high warmth & high competence (HW-HC, e.g. family), high warmth & low competence (HW-LC, e.g. rich people), low warmth & high competence (LW-HC, e.g. elderly people), and low warmth & low competence (LW-LC, e.g. poor people). The literature shows that this bi-dimensional structure of stereotypes is across many different cultures valid (e.g., Asbrock, 2010; Cuddy et al., 2009). In short, the fundamental research approach of the SCM is to examine the *content* of stereotypes, or, in other words, what is the information that a perceiver attributes to a social group.

The concept of stereotypes is an encompassing term. In the context of multicultural societies, a specific typology of stereotypes is *ethnic stereotypes* (e.g., Triandis, 1972; Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967). They refer to people's beliefs about specific ethnic groups. For example, in the current European context a common topic of discussion is the belief that European citizens hold about migrants from Eastern-Europe and refugees or asylum seekers

from countries like Syria. Individuals can hold stereotypical beliefs about their own ethnic groups which are termed *auto-stereotypes* and beliefs about other ethnic groups which are referred to as *hetero-stereotypes* (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967; Vassiliou, Triandis, Vassiliou, & McGuire, 1972).

Content of Stereotypes at The Individual and Group Level

The SCM refers to two levels of ‘aggregation’ regarding the content of stereotypes. At the lower level are the subjective beliefs held by individuals and at the higher level are the beliefs commonly held by individuals in a given culture. Devine (1989) has proposed an identical organization of stereotypes. In this article, we discuss content of stereotypes at the individual level, as one’s subjective belief, and at the culture level, as an aggregation over beliefs of individuals within a culture¹. Next, we briefly introduce the concept of culture and then further specify our position on stereotype content.

Although there are various ways to define a culture, there are two recurring notions: culture as a system of meanings and behavioral tendencies that is socially shared (Baldwin, Faulkner, Hecht, & Lindsley, 2006) that influences various psychological processes related to cognition and behavior (Kitayama & Uskul, 2011). A culture is not a palpable physical object, rather, it is represented in the minds of people, maintained and developed through communication (Kashima, 2008), and can be identified as an external system of rituals and symbols (Schwartz, 2014). A culture is known to all its members, an outcome that is evidently the result of a learning process (Lehman, Chiu, & Schaller, 2004).

Since stereotypes are extensively defined as beliefs, their content is therefore inherent to a culture. In fact, culture level stereotypes are those beliefs about groups that are culturally embedded and often transmitted across generations (Kashima, 2000). Individuals first acquire/develop the content of their held stereotypes during the process of enculturation/early socialization when learning about the content of stereotypes that prevails in their surrounding

(Bigler & Liben, 2006; Ehrlich, 1973; Katz, 1976).² Individuals can modify or adjust this content later in life depending on their subjective experience (Hilton & Macrae, 2011; Hilton & von Hippel, 1996).

Cross-Cultural Variation in Stereotypes

An emic-etic view on stereotypes.

We know from cross-cultural research (Sam & Berry, 2006; Schwartz, 2014; Ward et al., 2001) that it would be close to a judgmental error to expect that people experience social reality in an identical manner across cultures. Cross-cultural studies applying the SCM have shown that, for instance, elderly people were similarly evaluated on the warmth dimension by Hong Kong, Japanese, and South Korean study participants, but received higher competence ratings by the Japanese study participants compared to the Hong Kong and South Korean participants (Cuddy et al., 2009). Further evidence stems from work by Durante and colleagues (2013). In a cross-cultural study conducted across thirty-seven different countries they showed that the more equal a society is in terms of wage distribution the more competitive groups are disliked and disrespected in the respective countries. In other words, the study reveals that the degree of income inequality in a society can correlate with the stereotype content at the culture level. This body of work provides reasonable grounds to expect that the content of stereotypes can vary across cultures. Yet, there is another way in which stereotypes can vary cross-culturally, namely with regards to *culturally relevant social groups*. In each culture there can be indigenous social groups that are unknown or irrelevant somewhere else, such as the Maori in New Zealand and Maneliști in Romania (Stanciu, 2015).

To use the specialized terminology, we argue that stereotypes have both an etic (universal) and an emic (culture specific, indigenous) component (Cheung, van de Vijver, & Leong, 2011). The etic component of stereotypes can be two-fold: (i) social groups can be

universally relevant and (ii) the content of stereotypes about these groups can be universally valid as well, for example family members are almost universally seen as both warm and competent (Cuddy et al., 2009). The emic component of stereotypes can be two-fold likewise: (i) social groups can be specifically relevant to one culture and (ii) the content of stereotypes about one social group can be culturally specific. It is especially in the case of this emic component of stereotypes that the present paper aims to focus on.

Acculturation and adaptation to host cultures.

Individuals who migrate to other countries experience a process of acculturation, wherein they learn about the host country's culture. Acculturation is a period in people's lives where living in a new culture is associated with psychological changes (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). The acculturation process can be defined at the affective, behavioral, and cognitive level (Ward et al., 2001). Affective reactions are examined in the framework of stress and coping, in which the acculturation process is considered as a disruptive life experience that causes pathological symptoms to migrants (Berry, 1992). Potential cultural differences can be emotionally overwhelming for migrants, in that they can trigger depression and reduction in overall well-being (Sam & Berry, 2006; Ward et al., 2001). The way migrants cope with these tendencies is often related to their personality and social support (e.g., Podsiadlowski, Vauclair, Spiess, & Stroppa, 2013); for example extroverts and recipients of social support have typically less challenges in adapting to new cultures.

Behavioral reactions are typically studied in the framework of culture learning (Ward et al., 2001), in which it is proposed that migrants might be unaware of what is the appropriate behavior in the host culture. Migrants adapt by learning the appropriate behaviors in the new culture (Wilson, Ward, & Fischer, 2013). Adaptation to the sociocultural reality in the host society (sociocultural adaptation) is predicted by culture knowledge and contact with

locals (Searle & Ward, 1990) and is empirically assessed via measures of language skills, familiarity with social norms (Dimitrova, Bender, Chasiotis, & van de Vijver, 2013).

Lastly, cognitive responses are usually studied in the framework of ethnic and cultural identity (Ward et al., 2001). The framework holds that the acculturation process emphasizes individuals' self-definition in relation to their own and other ethnic groups. Initially, researchers assumed that migrants modify their self-definitions as members of their home ethnic group by gradually assimilating attitudes, behaviors, and values held by members of the host ethnic group (Gordon, 1964). The widely accepted view is the one proposed by Berry (1992). He proposes four types of acculturation orientations, as per combinations of migrant's desire to maintain identification with the home culture and desire to identify with the host culture, i.e., integration, separation, assimilation, and marginalization. The assimilationist perspective has been since extended, and now the bi-culturalism perspective holds that migrants develop a self-definition that is equally rooted in their home and host ethnic groups (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). The cognitive focus in this line of research has been on identification and inter-ethnic stereotypes, but has neglected the question of cognitive adaptation regarding other cognitive processes, such as stereotyping.

Perspectives on Stereotypes Held by Migrants in the Acculturation Process

The by-far prevailing approach in research on stereotypes held by migrants in the acculturation process is focused on inter-ethnic stereotypes and rooted in the contact hypothesis (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). Its core postulate states that sustained positive contact can modify any negative stereotypes that one might have concerning an ethnic or cultural group. Individuals' ethnic stereotypes can change because of contact with members of the stereotyped ethnic group (Pettigrew et al., 2011). For example, a study conducted in Germany revealed that the size of an ethnic group was positively associated with locals having less prejudice towards the group; it is noteworthy that this was

mediated by contact frequency between locals and foreigners (Wagner, Christ, Pettigrew, Stellmacher, & Wolf, 2006). Contact between individuals from different cultural background is also associated with the reduction of inaccurate stereotype contents. For example, in a study comparing the auto-stereotypes and hetero-stereotypes of U.S. Americans living in Greece and Greek locals, Triandis and Vassiliou (1967) showed that frequent contact between the two ethnic groups was associated with increased similarity between the two types of stereotypes. The more contact U.S. Americans had with Greek locals the more their hetero-stereotype about Greeks became similar to the Greek auto-stereotype, and vice versa. A more recent study reproduced these findings with samples of Ingrian-Finns who emigrated from Russia to Finland (Lonnqvist, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Verkasalo, 2013). Lonnqvist and colleagues (2013) showed that in a period of four years the hetero-stereotypes held by Ingrian-Finns about Finnish locals slowly became like the auto-stereotypes held by Finnish locals.

Crisp and Turner (2011) have provided an extensive discussion on stereotypes held by individuals in ethnically diverse contexts. They proposed the Categorization-Processing-Adaptation-Generalization (CPAG) model of cognitive adaptation to explain when and under which circumstances inaccurate hetero-stereotypes about the majority ethnic group can be reconciled. Building upon the contact hypothesis, the CPAG holds that when becoming aware of inconsistencies in their stereotype contents, people scrutinize it and reduce it depending on their motivations and abilities. Crisp and Turner's work is unprecedented in that it combines for the first time evidence from the cognitive, inter-ethnic contact, and society-related strands of research on cultural adaptation in exploring, as we here argue, *one* manifestation of the phenomenon of cognitive adaptation of migrants. We see an opportunity to further address the topic. The acculturating process presupposes social interactions among migrants and locals and therefore the adaptive outcomes of this event should not be restricted to inter-

ethnic stereotypes. Rather, this experience can also be considered as a trigger to a wider process of cognitive adaptation, in which migrants become aware of and learn about stereotypes related to other social groups that are relevant in their host cultures. In other words, the acculturating process can also trigger a process of adaptation of migrants' cognitive heuristics.

A More Comprehensive Perspective on Stereotype Change in Migrants

To start with, the acculturation research itself had been historically guided by an assimilationist perspective (Gordon, 1964; cf. Rudmin, Wang, & Castro, 2017). Current perspectives nevertheless posit that an individual *learns* about her host culture and as a result this will change her. Rudmin (2009) comments on three ways of learning about a new culture: (1) via culture-relevant information, (2) via cultural training and mentoring programs, and (3) via observational imitation. Learning of culture-relevant information is embedded in work on sociocultural adaptation (Searle & Ward, 1990) and the seminal piece by Triandis (1972) on subjective culture. This approach to culture learning holds that migrants become aware of what their host culture entails from a variety of sources like novels, movies or communicating with locals. Individuals have agency in 'choosing' whether to incorporate the learned information. A second perspective on culture learning, the intercultural training programs (Landis & Brislin, 1983) and mentoring programs (Earley & Ang, 2003), specifies a directed effort to systematically learn about host culture features. This line of reasoning stems from applied work and deals with the development of resources that individuals can use to gain intercultural competencies (Earley & Ang, 2003). A third approach on culture learning is the observational imitation which simply holds that one learns about features of the host culture by imitating the host culture locals, e.g. in regard to their behavior, emotional patterns, or values.

Culture learning is a process resulting in a form of intelligence, which has been coined cultural intelligence (CQ) (Earley & Ang, 2003). Cultural intelligence is a trait-like feature of the individual who can effectively adapt in a new culture. Cultural intelligence integrates three domains, (i) the cognitive and metacognitive, (ii) the motivational, and (iii) the behavioral (Earley & Ang, 2003). The cognitive and metacognitive domain of CQ specifies one's degree of knowledge content of one's new culture and one's 'know-how' to use existing cognitive resources (e.g., patterns of thought and situational interpretation) in making sense of the new culture. The motivational domain of CQ specifies one's motivations, goals and agency in adapting to a new culture. The behavioral domain of CQ indicates one's repertoire of habits and traditions, overt behavioral displays in short, with regards to a new culture.

The cognitive and metacognitive domain of CQ provides some promising leads in our proposed discussion of the cognitive adaptation of migrants. This domain of the CQ explicitly deals with information that pertains to a culture, both the declarative (factual) and the procedural (functional) type of cultural information (Earley & Ang, 2003). For example, individuals possess high levels of CQ when they know of the concept of *face* (declarative knowledge) and likewise know how to apply and interpret it in social situations (procedural knowledge). Cultural intelligence is nevertheless a concept that operates at a high level of abstraction (Ang et al., 2007; Triandis, 1972). That is, it describes one's knowledge of the culture *overall*, its traditions, habits, or norms. In contrast, we are advocating a type of cultural information that is at a lower level of abstraction (i.e., *more focused*) (Triandis, 1972). We propose stereotype accommodation as referring to individuals' cognitive heuristics (mental shortcuts, stereotypes) regarding social groups, as it is informed by cultural emic information. This perspective is discussed in detail in the following sections.

Section II: The Concept of Stereotype Accommodation

The literature on migrants' cognitive adaptation addresses insufficiently the perception and stereotypical evaluation of diverse social groups in society. To contribute to this gap in the literature we propose the concept of *stereotype accommodation* as one of many possible manifestations of migrants' cognitive adaptation. Stereotype accommodation is a cognitive process by which migrants incorporate the stereotype-relevant information that they learn in their host culture into pre-existing stereotypes. Thus, it goes beyond existing perspectives on inter-ethnic stereotypes (e.g., Crisp & Turner, 2011) and empirical work on ethnic auto- and hetero-stereotypes (e.g., Lonnqvist et al., 2013; Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967; Vassiliou et al., 1972). Stereotype accommodation occurs due to a process of culture learning (Rudmin, 2009) in regard to cognitive heuristics and has three potential outcomes. First, migrants do not incorporate the stereotype-relevant information learned in the host culture into their pre-existing stereotypes; in this instance, pre-existing stereotypes are 'preserved'. Second, migrants incorporate systematically the stereotype-relevant information learned in the host culture into their pre-existing stereotypes; in this instance pre-existing stereotypes are 'adapted' to the host culture. Third, migrants incorporate unsystematically some of the stereotype-relevant information learned in the host culture into their pre-existing stereotypes; in this case pre-existing stereotypes are modified in such a way that they differ from culturally relevant stereotypes in both their home or host cultures.

Stereotype accommodation occurs primarily in the case of stereotype-relevant information that is culturally emic, namely, in regard to (i) social groups that are indigenous in a migrant's host culture and (ii) content of stereotypes that is *culturally specific* in a migrant's host culture. In situations in which one has no previous knowledge of a social group that is culturally relevant in one's host culture, one learns what the group stands for and implicitly what are the associated beliefs. In situations in which one has knowledge of a

social group that is culturally relevant in both one's home and host cultures, one learns what are the associated beliefs in one's host culture. Take for instance the case of the New Zealand specific Maori and of the universally present 'elderly people.' An international student who first moves to New Zealand is almost surely unaware of this social group, unless, of course, she either has friends from the local population or has by chance read books in which the term is used. The student experiences stereotype accommodation by becoming aware of this culturally relevant social group and of the associated beliefs. The term 'elderly people' requires no explanation because the reader is surely familiar with what it stands for regardless of his/her culture. Nevertheless, one might have distinct beliefs associated with the group, part of which stems from the relevant beliefs in one's culture. For example, two migrants adapting to Japan or Romania will become aware of different age stereotypes in these host cultures. Both the migrant in Japan and in Romania will experience stereotype accommodation by learning the culturally associated beliefs about elderly people.

In the next section, we introduce a theoretical framework (Figure 1) that can inform the design of empirical studies to examine cross-cultural differences, learning opportunities, individual factors, and cognitive resources that contribute to stereotype accommodation and its outcomes. The list in Figure 1 is by no means exhaustive. It depicts nevertheless the overarching constructs that are of immediate relevance, with the concrete typologies given as illustrations. In what follows, we will refer back to this figure when we introduce our specific theoretical considerations as 'Propositions'.

Section III: A Framework for the Study of Stereotype Accommodation

Mechanisms of Stereotype Accommodation

Literature on the cognitive adaptation of migrants holds that inter-ethnic relations should be experienced in a way that challenges existing pre-stereotypes (Crisp & Turner, 2011). In a similar vein, in situations where migrants are aware of social groups in their host

cultures, stereotype accommodation requires that migrants learn about information that is inconsistent with (disconfirms) their pre-existing stereotypes. It is conceivable that there are culturally relevant stereotypes in the host culture that are different compared to the home culture; what we previously referred to as the emic component of stereotypes. Depending on the amount (whether a small or large part of the local population shares this information) and dispersion of this information (whether the elements that make up the inconsistent stereotype information is dispersed across varying channels of communication or is all concentrated in one channel, e.g., mass-media, friendship networks, and work environment), there are three mechanisms that can trigger stereotype accommodation: bookkeeping, conversion, and subtyping (Hewstone, Hopkins, & Routh, 1992; Hewstone, Johnston, & Aird, 1992; Johnston & Hewstone, 1992).

‘Bookkeeping’ is a mechanism in which inconsistent information gradually changes pre-existing stereotypes held by migrants. In this instance, regardless of amount and dispersion, any slight inconsistency with pre-existing stereotypes can determine stereotype accommodation. Stereotype accommodation is a lengthy process because of sustained exposure to novel information. ‘Conversion’ is a mechanism in which major inconsistencies trigger radical changes in pre-existing stereotypes held by migrants. In this instance, any inconsistent information that is concentrated in a communication channel, that migrants are frequently exposed to, can predict a drastic accommodation of stereotypes. Finally, ‘subtyping’ is a mechanism in which inconsistent information, that is dispersed across communication channels, fine-tune migrants’ pre-existing stereotypes. Migrants learn that their pre-existing stereotypes are not applicable to all members of a social group, and, as a result, incorporate the novel information by creating sub-types.

In situations where migrants are not aware of social groups in their host culture, any novel information about such groups (i.e., the social group label itself and associated beliefs)

will trigger a straightforward mechanism—the novel stereotype-relevant information will or will not be incorporated into the pre-existing stereotypes. That is, individuals will either incorporate the novel social group label and associated beliefs as a separate stereotype-relevant typology or will ‘merge’ the newly learned information with pre-existing information. For example, some migrants in New Zealand might associate the social group Maori with another social group in their home cultures based on their apparent similarities on aspects such as gender, employment status, religion, etc. (Roccas & Brewer, 2002).

Stereotype Accommodation in Private and Public Life Domains at the Implicit and Explicit Levels of Cognition

Acculturation research has shown that migrants can have distinct patterns of adaptation in private and public domains of life (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004; Navas, Garcia, Sanchez, Rojas, Pumares, & Fernandez, 2005). Or, put differently, individuals’ adaptation is not necessarily constant across domains of the ecological context (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). Ward and Geeraert (2016) speak of three domains³. The private domain is the familial context in which one experiences the process of cultural adaptation in a ‘safe’ environment—typically together with at least one other (i.e., parent or partner) who shares the same cultural background or with intimate friends. The immediate public domain is the institutional and organizational context in which one experiences the process of cultural adaptation as a classmate, student, or employee in a firm. In such a domain one typically interacts with known others with whom there is a sense of safety/trustworthiness, yet, not as strongly as in the familial context. The distant public domain is the societal context in which one experiences a formal and procedural process of cultural adaptation as, for example a simply street pedestrian, a customer of a shop or through interactions with state authorities. We propose that migrants can show varying patterns of cognitive adaptation across these life domains and this can be observed as a discrepancy at the implicit and explicit levels

(Carlston, 2010) of stereotype accommodation (see Figure 1, **Proposition 1: P1**). At the implicit level, beliefs are automatically activated and impulsively applied. At the explicit level, beliefs that are activated are rationalized and effortful scrutinized before their application (Strack & Deutsch, 2004). As we further discuss below, individuals with a strong motivation and sufficient abilities to engage in a process of scrutiny regarding the learned information rely typically on factual knowledge and therefore do not take a situation for granted (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Across life domains there can be distinct pressures to cultural adaptation (Ward & Geeraert, 2016) implying therefore varying motivations and abilities on behalf of the individual (e.g., Ward et al., 2001). That is, in the more private domains individuals are more likely to activate and apply pre-existing stereotype-relevant information and in the more public domains they are more likely to activate and apply newly learned stereotype-relevant information (P2).⁴

Core Factors that Influence Stereotype Accommodation

This section is meant as an initial guide for empirical research to examine specific aspects or as a whole the process of stereotype accommodation and its outcomes. The sub-section 'I' is particularly interesting to cross-cultural research perspectives. The sub-section 'II' is of high relevance to group level comparative social psychological research. The sub-section 'III' is in effect especially relevant to comparative individual-level study approaches. The final section 'IV' is aimed at research concerned particularly with the individual cognition aspects of the process of stereotype accommodation. These propositions can be studied either separately or combined as a puzzle that best fits the research question.

I – Cross-cultural differences as a source of disconfirming/novel information.

The degree of disconfirming/novel information that migrants can experience in their host cultures can be traced back to cross-cultural differences in terms of individualism-collectivism and tightness-looseness (Triandis, 1989). The dimension of individualism-

collectivism specifies the degree to which people in a culture prioritize self-interests over the well-being of groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In individualist cultures people tend to construct themselves in an egocentric fashion, whereas in collectivistic cultures people emphasize their interdependence to various social groups. The more people identify with their culture, the greater the chance that they endorse the respective behavioral tendencies in the culture (Jetten et al., 2002). For instance, people in collectivistic cultures seem more likely to conform to their group norms than people in individualistic cultures (Triandis, 2001). The dimension of tightness-looseness specifies a culture's degree of conformity to norms and penalizing of deviant behavior (Pelto, 1968). In tight cultures norms are followed strictly and any deviant behavior is drastically discouraged, on the contrary, in loose cultures norms are less strictly adhered to and deviant behavior is relatively tolerated. Individuals in tight cultures show more frequent prevention behaviors and a higher need for structure relative to individuals in loose cultures (Gelfand, 2012). These dimensions may serve as templates that migrants use to assimilate information on how to relate to societal groups (Lehman et al., 2004). To illustrate, migrants from individualistic cultures can be exposed to and endorse the societal norm that social groups with agentic traits are desirable, which can contrast the norm in a collectivistic culture that social groups with sociable traits are desirable (for a study on how individualism-collectivism can be associated with a preference for groups with a specific trait see Schroder, Rogers, Ike, Mell, & Scholl, 2013). Furthermore, in cases in which the home culture of migrants is loose and collectivistic, individuals who deviate from the norm of sociability may be tolerated by the community (Gelfand et al., 2011). If migrants from these types of societies maintain their home culture, it can cause critical incidents in social situations if their host culture happens to be tight, and collectivistic (Gelfand et al., 2011). Thus, information that disconfirms migrants' pre-existing stereotypes can arise when there is a discrepancy between what migrants are accustomed to (in terms of

social relations and deviant behavior) and the cultural norms in their host society. In line with literature on cultural distance (Galchenko & van de Vijver, 2007) we argue that large cross-cultural differences are associated with great inconsistencies/novelities in the stereotype-relevant information, which should have a greater effect on stereotype accommodation (**P3**).

II – Opportunities to learn about disconfirming/novel information.

Migrants need to have opportunities for learning about prevailing stereotypes in their host culture. Learning opportunities are a set of contextual factors that might foster (or undermine) migrants' chances and likelihood to learn about culturally relevant stereotypes in their host culture. One contextual factor is the size of an ethnic group. A sociological perspective proposes that the size of migrants' ethnic group can determine their likelihood of cultural adaptation (Esser, 2010). Migrants living in small ethnic communities have plenty of opportunities for developing contact with locals. One outcome is that migrants have regular interactions with members of the host culture and therefore can learn about the culturally relevant stereotypes (Zajonc, 1968). Indeed, contact quantity can cater individuals' stereotypes about other ethnic groups (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Wagner et al., 2006). Similarly, we state that the relative size of migrants' ethnic group is associated with stereotype accommodation. The probability of learning about stereotype disconfirming/novel information is higher for migrants living in small ethnic communities than for migrants living in large ethnic communities (**P4**).

The vitality of an ethnic group (ethnic vitality), i.e., the ability of a group to act as a distinctive and collective entity (Esser, 2010; Gordon, 1964), can also influence migrants' cultural adaptation (Giles, Bourhis, & Taylor, 1977). In other words, the more vital a migrant's community, the more likely it is that migrants have access to an ad-hoc job market, shops, and other relevant services that could emulate life in their home culture. Migrants' perceptions that their home culture is well represented in the host culture alleviates feelings

of migration-based anxiety, and, at the same time, provides them with support toward sociocultural adaptation (Galchenko & van de Vijver, 2007). Such evidence, especially concerning migrants' sociocultural adaptation, provides us with reasons to expect that members of the ethnic community also communicate among them stereotype-relevant information. Yet, we propose that migrants in a vital ethnic community are less probable to learn stereotype disconfirming/novel information (**P5**) because in such an instance individuals are likely to reproduce their home culture features (Kashima, 2000).

Furthermore, the length of stay in the host culture can also provide opportunities to learn about stereotype-inconsistent/novel information. As previously indicated, in general, cultural adaptation follows a pattern wherein during its initial phases migrants experience a so-called culture shock and gradually after which they adapt both psychologically and socioculturally. Similarly, we propose that a longer stay in the host culture provides migrants with more opportunities to learn about information that is inconsistent/novel with their existing stereotypes (**P6**). Subsequently, there can be different patterns of stereotype accommodation over time regarding different social groups (e.g., unemployed people and rich people) (Demes & Geeraert, 2015) (**P7**). That is, there is no one size fits all outcome of stereotype accommodation—pre-existing stereotypes about a social group will accommodate independently from pre-existing stereotypes about another social group.

III – Individual differences to stereotype accommodation.

Not all individuals experience the process of incorporating disconfirming/novel stereotype-relevant information in an identical manner. We distinguish three domains of individual-related differences that are relevant to stereotype accommodation. First, individuals differ in their reliance on stereotypes in general. For example, individuals' personal need for structure (PNS), i.e., the desire to mentally structure elements of the external environment into categories, seems to be responsible for stereotyping others

(Schaller, Boyd, Yohannes, & O'Brien, 1995). Individuals with high levels of PNS are more likely to apply stereotypes in social interactions, compared to individuals with low levels of PNS. There is also evidence showing that highly prejudiced people are more likely to endorse racial stereotypes in their home culture (Devine, 1989) which suggests that prejudiced people are more likely to make use of stereotypes (Crandall et al., 2011). Nonetheless, there is evidence that higher levels of education can disrupt the reliance on stereotypes; although this seems to be explained by several moderators, such as social status and group deprivation (Wagner & Zick, 1995). We propose therefore that stereotype accommodation is more likely among individuals with lower levels of education, increased levels of PNS, and among prejudiced people overall; because they tend to rely on cognitive heuristics more frequently in daily situations (**P8**).

Second, individuals differ with respect to their predisposition to incorporate disconfirming/novel stereotype-relevant information. Age is a highly pertinent factor. Research in the area of Developmental Psychology suggests that, young age is associated with a steep learning curve, whereas older age is associated with a comparably flatter learning curve (e.g., Meeus, van de Schoot, Keijsers, & Branje, 2012; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006; Soto, John, Gosling, & Potter, 2011). At a young age, individuals develop personalities and identities, and, at the same time, cultivate guiding principles in life. During adolescence, individuals usually experience a major progress in psychological development. Compared to previous life stages, people in this stage experience conflicting life events, and feel internal or external pressure, coming from parents and peers, to achieve a stable identity and personality. In subsequent periods of life, the learning curve stabilizes and even declines in some cases. These major stages of life are often associated with distinct patterns of adaptation to host societies. Children and young adolescent migrants experience higher levels of adaptation compared to late adolescents or adults (Beiser et al., 1988), which can make

them even undistinguishable from locals (Abu-Rayya, 2013). Regarding stereotypes, young migrants acquire stereotypes relevant in their host cultures, rather than accommodating newly learnt information into their pre-existing stereotypes (Oppedal, 2006; Sam & Oppedal, 2002). Therefore, we propose that age influences the degree of stereotype accommodation in a manner that resembles a decreasing concave-down slope, i.e., apart from the early stage of life when migrants acquire the culturally relevant stereotypes in their host cultures, at the age of early adolescence migrants experience strong stereotype accommodation, a process that is less pronounced for adults, and even less so for elderly migrants (**P9**). In addition to age, openness to experience can also be associated with the learning of new stereotype-relevant information (Flynn, 2005). It is widely known that individuals with this personality type are 'open' to engage in and to learn from new life experiences. Thus, we propose that migrants with high levels of this personality type are more likely to incorporate the stereotype-relevant information from their host culture into their pre-existing stereotypes (**P10**). Furthermore, fluency in the language of the host society is a necessary condition for the learning of stereotypes in the host culture. Language, in the sense indicated above, provides migrants a common ground with locals to communicate and understand the host culture's stereotypes (Kashima, 2000). The better the commanding of the local language, the better one's understanding of the relevant stereotypes in the host culture (**P11**).

Third, degree of identification with a social category can provide biases to what information is incorporated into pre-existing stereotypes. There is a direct link between group identification and categorization processes, which can lead people to see their ingroups in a more favorable manner compared to their outgroups (Demoulin & Teixeira, 2010; Oakes et al., 1991). Regarding stereotype accommodation, migrants can therefore be more likely to maintain a favorable image of their ingroups compared to outgroups (e.g., young-adults, students, rich people, etc.). In other words, if the stereotype-relevant information learned in

the host culture is unfavorable regarding their own ingroups, migrants would maintain (and articulate even more pronouncedly) their pre-existing stereotypes (**P12**). The reciprocal should also be valid. If the stereotype-relevant information learned in the host culture is favorable regarding their own ingroups, migrants would incorporate the information into their existing stereotypes (**P13**).

IV – Cognitive resources for the incorporation of disconfirming/novel information.

Considering research on the cognitive adaptation of migrants (Crisp & Turner, 2011) and the dual process models of cognition (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), we propose two core postulates to stereotype accommodation. The first is that people desire to hold beliefs about objects or other individuals and social groups that are consistent with beliefs that prevail in their immediate contexts (**P14**). Although there is individual variation in striving for cognitive consistency (e.g., social acceptance and materialistic benefits), people can use social comparison as a means to constantly evaluate themselves (Festinger, 1954). Through this socio-cognitive mechanism (information processing), migrants can reduce any inconsistencies between their pre-existing stereotypes and stereotypes that are relevant in the host culture. The second postulate is that there is heterogeneity in the degree of processing inconsistent/novel information depending on whether cognitive elaboration is high or low, expressed through thorough vs. superficial scrutiny (**P15**). High elaboration is more likely to be associated with the reduction of any discrepancy in existing information so that resolution is expected to persist over time (Petty & Wegener, 1999). Whether elaboration is high or low depends on individuals' motivation and ability to resolve the information discrepancy (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) (**P16**).

The motivation to resolve information-inconsistencies is influenced (among others) by personal relevance (Johnson & Eagly, 1989; Petty, Cacioppo, & Goldman, 1981). In a study on persuasion effectiveness, Petty and colleagues (1981) showed that in a personally relevant

scenario students were more motivated to engage in cognitive processing of the received message, which elicited favorable attitudes towards an otherwise undesirable policy. We propose that for migrants it is personally relevant to resolve inconsistencies between their existing stereotypes and stereotypes in their host cultures, as it is determined by their acculturation orientation. That is, acculturation orientation can provide the motivation for engaging in a cognitive process that is required to reduce these inconsistencies. Past research has shown that acculturation orientation can determine migrants' cultural adaptation (De Leersnyder et al., 2011; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Therefore, we suggest that an interest to adopt the host culture will be positively associated with the incorporation of novel stereotype-relevant information (**P17a**). In contrast, a desire to maintain the home culture will be negatively associated with the incorporation of novel stereotype-relevant information (**P17b**). It remains to be explored by future research how exactly this pans out in relation to Berry's (1992) four acculturation orientations typology, which has been as of late under scrutiny (Rudmin, 2009; Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007).

Constraints can limit individuals' ability to process any stereotype-relevant information that disconfirms their pre-existing stereotypes. Constraints often trigger reactive responses, i.e. active efforts to resolve the threatened state (Miron & Brehm, 2006). Regarding stereotype accommodation, migrants may incorporate any information that disconfirms their pre-existing stereotypes, or is entirely novel, if they are 'free' to resolve these inconsistencies in their own terms; if they perceive no constraints in their adaptation. Otherwise, constraints may lead to discarding of the information. The acculturation process is challenging in itself and the ecological context in which it happens can add obstacles to migrants' adaptation (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). For example, perceptions of strong assimilationist pressures in society can result in migrants rejecting the host culture and

therefore it is less likely that novel stereotype-relevant information is incorporated into the pre-existing stereotypes (**P18**).

Section IV: Theoretical and Practical Implications

The cultural adaptation literature has insufficiently addressed migrants' stereotypes about the variety of social groups in society. We have situated our work in the literature on cognitive adaptation of migrants because we aimed at disentangling the many manifestations of migrants' cognitive adaptation in their host cultures. We have theorized what might happen to stereotypes when migrants learn the stereotypes that are relevant in their host cultures. We have clarified the difference between ethnic stereotype change as a result of interethnic contact (this perspective prevails in the literature and is studied in the contact hypothesis perspective) and stereotype accommodation as a result of learning about stereotypes relevant in the host culture. Drawing on the existing literature on stereotypes (especially the SCM), we have proposed that individuals hold stereotypes about a variety of social groups in society and, furthermore, individuals can go through a process of learning the stereotype-relevant information from their host culture and incorporating that into their pre-existing stereotypes. Moreover, we have suggested a framework which specifies how cross-cultural differences, learning opportunities, individual differences, and cognitive processes might affect stereotype accommodation and its outcomes. In short, we suggested that migrants' cultural adaptation can also involve cognitive heuristics like stereotypes.

Theoretical Implications

The present review has implications for further elaborations on individuals' cultural adaptation and cultural intelligence (CQ). Our theoretical stance on stereotypes and stereotype accommodation is similar to what Earley and Ang (2003) call declarative type of knowledge; or Triandis (1972) would refer to as lower level of subjective culture abstraction. The cognitive and metacognitive domain of the theory of CQ holds that knowledge content

that people learn in their new cultures concerns the culture overall, yet, not about specific types of knowledge content. Whereas CQ indeed specifies an individual's knowledge of a culture's norms, values, practices, language, etc., it does not address individuals' cognitive heuristics as they are informed by cultural emic information. Our contribution to the literature lies in the argument that cultural cognitive adaptation, or enhancing one's cultural intelligence, can also entail gaining knowledge about predominant stereotypical perceptions about social groups in the host society. This perspective zooms in and disentangles the variety of social groups in society. This new perspective matters because social interactions are governed by cognitive heuristics as we have shown above. Thus, people can in theory change their stereotypes about social groups when exposed to a new culture. What do people think of the elderly in Japan, is it identical to what people think of them in Romania? What do people think of homosexual people in the USA, is it identical to how people think of them in Australia? It is especially in the case of cross-cultural differences that people became aware of the varying ways of how a social group can be perceived. A Romanian that first moves to Japan might not hold the here-culturally normative belief that elderly should be treated with respect. Therefore, this person might go through the process of stereotype accommodation to reconcile this incongruity. In our view, one manifestation of migrants' (cognitive) cultural adaptation, and therefore also a more pronounced level of CQ, is achieved when a person has gained the culturally consistent knowledge of what locals think of specific groups in their society. In short, we suggest that migrants' cognitive cultural adaptation can also take place at the cognitive heuristic level.

The present work can provide also a foot-in-the door for an alternative take on the behavioral domain in migrants' cultural adaptation. Although existing theories have extensively looked at the cognitive (Crisp & Turner, 2011) or the behavioral adaptation of migrants (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999), the linkage between the two are yet to be explored in

a way that goes beyond ethnicity. The reliance of the present framework on the predictive validity of the SCM (Fiske et al., 2002) can be extended to incorporate elements of the 'Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes' (BIAS map) (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007). The BIAS Map postulates that stereotypes and discrimination are closely interconnected, in that stereotypes coincide with specific behavioral tendencies. Cuddy and colleagues (2007) have argued that the warmth dimension of stereotypes corresponds with active facilitation (e.g., helping) and prevent active harm (e.g., attacking) behaviors, while the competence dimension correlates with passive facilitation (e.g., affiliation) and prevent passive harm (e.g., excluding) behaviors. In applying such a strategy, one might find that behavioral patterns directed to specific social groups in society (e.g., elderly people or rich people) also show cross-cultural differences and a cultural adaptive prospect.

Practical Implication

There is also one practical implication of the present work. In multicultural contexts, individuals of varying cultural upbringings need to find middle ways towards a successful coexistence. Often, however, prejudice and discrimination based on ethnicity are challenges to overcome; an aspect addressed in intercultural training programs (Landis & Brislin, 1983). Among its six major approaches, the fact-oriented method is most relevant to stereotype accommodation. In this method, the concept of stereotypes is introduced as an individual thought process which describes how people make judgments about their own and others' behaviors. The method focuses on changing any inaccurate (mostly negative) inter-ethnic stereotypes that individuals from a specific culture may have about people from a different culture. Yet, the literature suggests that addressing negative inter-ethnic stereotypes alone may be too restrictive. This article has presented a theoretical approach that stereotypes, in general, held by individuals are to a large extent shaped by stereotypes which are culturally consistent in their immediate environments—the home or the host cultures. Thus, a systematic

understanding that many social interactions are governed by stereotypes, which are largely shaped by culture, can prove useful to programs dedicated to deconstructing prejudice, especially in multicultural contexts. We argue that prejudice deconstruction programs should first unfold the overarching ethnic category (ethnic/cultural group) into social categories (social groups) and then aim to reduce any negative stereotypes about the specific social groups. For example, rather than addressing solely any negative stereotypes about Romanians in general, a company in Germany, that wants to hire Romanian employees, might benefit better from programs that address any negative stereotypes about Romanian employees held by its workers.

Closing Remarks

Limitations

Although this work is unprecedented in many ways, its claims have several limitations. One critique can be that the concept of stereotype accommodation does not specify whether migrants' stereotypes can modify the stereotypes that are culturally relevant in their host cultures. Some literature suggests that there is a dynamic exchange and accumulation of culture-relevant information among locals and migrants (Horenczyk et al., 2013). As research on cultural dynamics would suggest (Kashima, 2008), this might have the result of modifying stereotypes in host cultures such that the stereotype-relevant information held by migrants is gradually incorporated into the stereotypes held by locals. Whereas we consider this an outcome that is highly probable, it goes beyond the scope of the present review.

Recent evidence shows that stereotypes that are relevant in a culture can vary across regions of the country (Stanciu, Cohrs, Hanke, & Gavreliuc, 2017). That is, there can be regional specifics, like ethnic density, that can be associated with a pattern of stereotypes that is unique when compared to other regions in the country. The degree to which such within-

culture variation of stereotypes influences stereotype accommodation is yet to be addressed. One possible outcome might be that migrants with the same cultural background who live in different regions of one host country will show varying patterns of stereotype accommodation. We expect that the proposed framework can be also applied in the study of stereotype accommodation at the level of within-country migration. In doing so, it can be applied to examine migration contexts between specific regions of migrants' home and host cultures.

So far, our focus has been on first generation migrants. Postulating that second and later generations of migrants accommodate their pre-existing stereotypes to stereotypes that are culturally relevant in their host culture would contradict the basic assumption of enculturation/early socialization. We consider that the second generation migrants are in fact individuals who grew up in two distinct cultures (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013). For instance, children of migrants have access to the culture of their parents and in other domains they are exposed also to their host culture. The dual cultural exposure facilitates development of an identity wherein elements of both cultures are incorporated (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). Concerning stereotypes held by individuals, there can be a balance among the stereotype-relevant information from her home and host cultures. That is, bi-cultural individuals do not experience stereotype accommodation—they *acquire* the stereotypes relevant in their home and host cultures. For bi-cultural individuals it is possible that one or the other culturally relevant stereotype information is activated depending on one's context, i.e., interacting with members of the home culture or the migrant culture (Luna, Ringberg, & Peracchio, 2008).

Suggestions for The Empirical Study of Stereotype Accommodation

The theoretical propositions in this chapter can be complemented by future empirical research. Since the proposed concept of 'stereotype accommodation' is just now introduced, the literature is lacking empirical evidence on its practicability. We therefore propose

potential cross-sectional and longitudinal approaches in its examination. In situations where it is not possible to conduct a causal test of stereotype accommodation, the concept can also be studied in a cross-sectional design. Rather than focusing on causality, future studies could examine whether the here proposed framework has universal applications. Research could address whether there are socio-demographic factors, like education level, as well as type of migrant group (e.g., sojourners, work migrants, and refugees) that can differentiate among different types of migrants in their levels of stereotype accommodation. The operationalization of stereotype accommodation in a cross-sectional design requires that data is available both concerning stereotypes that are relevant in both migrants' home and host cultures as well as stereotypes held by migrants. In a first attempt to empirically test the concept, Stanciu, Vauclair, and Rodda (2018) argued that a proxy measure to stereotype accommodation could be computed by using the Euclidean Distance (ED). Considering the SCM's warmth-competence as a bi-modal space in which stereotypes are measured, they evaluated relative distances between stereotypes held by Romanian migrants to stereotypes in their host cultures (Germany and France) and home culture (Romania). Whereas stereotypes held by individuals were depicted as variable, culturally relevant stereotypes were assumed as constant—one constant per type of culture and target of stereotype. Then, using EDs they calculated two indices, i.e., distances from one's stereotype to constant scores in home and host cultures. In a final step, they used the newly created indices as dependent variables to regress the length of stay and acculturation orientation across five different social groups. The findings showed that for the social group with highest cross-cultural differences in stereotype-knowledge (politicians), a longer stay in the host culture and an interest to adopt the host culture were associated with stereotype accommodation. The authors provide a detailed account of how to compute, apply and interpret this equation.

Since the core expectation is that stereotypes held by migrants accommodate because of culture learning processes over time, an ideal tool would be a longitudinal study design. The literature shows a number of studies that are exemplar in this regard (e.g., Varjonen et al., 2013; Ward et al., 1998). For assessing causality, an ideal procedure would require (a) that a migrant group is surveyed before entering the host country until a specific period after, and (b) that two control groups are compared against the migrant group, one with members of the host society and one with members who remained in the home society. In doing so, future researchers can ensure that any change in stereotypes held by migrants is a consequence of the acculturating process, instead of a change in stereotypes society in general.

Overall, we recommend that future research employs techniques for measuring stereotype accommodation at both the implicit and explicit level (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji, 1995). Findings could show a discrepancy between the two levels, and in doing so, they can reveal that stereotype accommodation serves as either the function of social connectivity (i.e., explicit stereotype accommodation) (Clark & Kashima, 2007) or the function of resolving any inaccurate content of stereotypes (i.e., implicit-explicit stereotype accommodation) (Crisp & Turner, 2011).

Because stereotypes usually have negative connotations, individuals may answer in socially desirable ways to questionnaires (Fisher & Katz, 1993). One way to avoid this bias is to apply the qualitative methodology of biographical interviewing, which has been proven useful in gaining access to people's beliefs and assumptions that guide their behavior (Frese, 1982). The goal of this approach is to examine in great detail the whole life of a few individuals and in doing so a researcher can have a detailed account of their long-term development process (Howe, 1982). With regards to stereotype accommodation, asking migrants to recollect their life in their home cultures as well as their early periods of living in their host cultures might prove beneficial in determining how the acculturation process has

influenced their pre-existing stereotypes. Because this strategy is explorative it would inform theory development and novel insights could be discovered about the phenomenon of cognitive adaptation of migrants.

Conclusion

This work draws upon the cross-cultural psychology literature as well as the social psychological literature on stereotypes and proposes a research agenda for the study of migrants' (cognitive) cultural adaptation using a culture learning approach. Throughout this paper we have argued that it is important to consider a perspective on cultural adaptation and migrants' cognitive heuristics that goes beyond existing work which focuses on inter-ethnic stereotypes. We introduced the term of stereotype accommodation as a cognitive process whereby migrants incorporate the stereotype-relevant information learned in their host cultures into their pre-existing stereotypical beliefs. By doing so, this article provides a theoretical perspective to systematically study migrants' cognitive cultural adaptation.

¹ Possible distinct interpretations of the term 'cultural level stereotypes' are acknowledged, namely (1) as meta-stereotypes of individuals—the predominant rationale in the SCM literature—, (2) as stereotypes of the typical individual in a culture—the rationale stemming from the empirical assessment of values—or (3) as meta-stereotypes of the typical individual in a culture—a combination of the previous two rationales. At this stage, we consider these perspectives as varying approaches in the theoretical conceptualization and empirical assessment of cultural level stereotypes.

² In the article, we use enculturation and early socialization as interchangeably, given that these concepts are highly inter-related. The difference between them is however that enculturation refers to learning that occurs without any deliberate effort and socialization refers to a deliberate effort in the shaping of an individual through teaching (Sam & Berry, 2006).

³ Another organization of life domains in the acculturation process has been proposed by Navas and colleagues (2005): religious beliefs, ways of thinking, social relations, family relations, economic, work, and politics and government. From top to bottom these domains have been proposed as resulting in progressively fewer obstacles to migrants' cultural adaptation. Whereas these categories can also spawn interesting findings concerning stereotype accommodation, for simplicity reasons, we decided to use the three-level labeling

provided by Ward and Geeraert (2016), which encompasses the Navas and colleagues' typologies.

⁴Propositions 1 and 2 describe the outcome of stereotype accommodation and the subsequent Propositions 3-18 describe the process of incorporating disconfirming/novel information. By that, we propose that Propositions 3-18 will hold across the different life domains, yet, the potential across-life domains differences in the outcome of stereotype outcome will become visible when distinguishing the implicit and explicit levels of cognition.

Figure Caption

Figure 1. A framework of the cross-cultural differences, learning opportunities, individual differences, and cognitive resources in the study of how disconfirming/novel stereotype-relevant information is incorporated towards stereotype accommodation.

Note. 'P' stands for Proposition and it refers to in-text propositions.

References

- Abu-Rayya, H. M. (2013). Psychological and socio-cultural adaptation of immigrant and national adolescents in Australia: A test of the acculturative stress hypothesis. *American Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2, 1–6. Doi:10.11648/j.ajap.20130201.11
- Arends-Tóth, J., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2004). Domains and dimensions in acculturation: Implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28, 19–35. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2003.09.001
- Arends-Tóth, J., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Acculturation attitudes: A comparison of measurement methods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 1462–1488. Doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00222.x
- Asbrock, F. (2010). Stereotypes of social groups in Germany in terms of warmth and competence. *Social Psychology*, 41, 76–81. Doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000011
- Baldwin, J. R., Faulkner, S. L., Hecht, M. L., & Lindsley, S. L. (Eds.). (2006). *Redefining culture. Perspectives across disciplines*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Beiser, M., Barwick, C., Berry, J. W., da Costa, G., Fantino, A., Ganesan, S., ... Vela, E. (1988). *After the door has been opened: Mental health issues affecting immigrants and refugees in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada: Ministries of Multiculturalism and Citizenship, and Health and Welfare.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1015–1050. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00337.x
- Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. *International Migration*, 30, 69–85.

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2006). A developmental intergroup theory of social stereotypes and prejudice. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, *34*, 39–89.

Doi:10.1016/S0065-2407(06)80004-2

Binggeli, S., Krings, F., & Sczesny, S. (2014). Stereotype content associated with immigrant groups in Switzerland. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *73*, 123–133. Doi:10.1024/1421-0185/a000133

Bruckmüller, S., & Abele, A. E. (2013). The density of the big two. *Social Psychology*, *44*, 63–74. Doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000145

Carlston, D. (2010). Models of implicit and explicit mental representation. In B. Gawronski & B. K. Payne (Eds.), *Handbook of implicit social cognition. Measurement, theory, and applications* (pp. 38-61). New York, US: The Guilford Press.

Clark, A. E., & Kashima, Y. (2007). Stereotypes help people connect with others in the community: A situated functional analysis of the stereotype consistency bias in communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 1028–39.

Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.1028

Crandall, C. S., Bahns, A. J., Warner, R., & Schaller, M. (2011). Stereotypes as justifications of prejudice. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*, 1488–98.

Doi:10.1177/0146167211411723

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2011). Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*, 242–266. Doi:10.1037/a0021840

Cheung, F. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 1–11.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0022389>

- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 631–648.
Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., Kwan, V. S. Y., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J.-P., ... Ziegler, R. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 1–33.
Doi:10.1348/014466608X314935
- De Leersnyder, J., Mesquita, B., & Kim, H. S. (2011). Where do my emotions belong? A study of immigrants' emotional acculturation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 451–63. Doi:10.1177/0146167211399103
- de Paula Couto, M. C. P., & Koller, S. H. (2012). Warmth and competence: Stereotypes of the elderly among young adults and older persons in Brazil. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation, 1*, 52–62.
Doi:10.1037/a0027118
- Demes, K. A., & Geeraert, N. (2015). The highs and lows of a cultural transition: A longitudinal analysis of sojourner stress and adaptation across 50 countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*, 316–337. Doi:10.1037/pspp0000046
- Demoulin, S., & Teixeira, C. P. (2010). Social categorization in interpersonal negotiation: How social structural factors shape negotiations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*, 765–777. Doi:10.1177/1368430210376636
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51*, 629–636. Doi:10.1037/h0046408

- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 5–18. Doi:10.1037//0022-3514.56.1.5
- Dimitrova, R., Bender, M., Chasiotis, A., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2013). Ethnic identity and acculturation of Turkish-Bulgarian adolescents. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37, 1–10. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.04.005
- Durante, F., Fiske, S. T., Kervyn, N., Cuddy, A. J. C., Akande, A. D., Adetoun, B. E., ... Storari, C. C. (2013). Nations' income inequality predicts ambivalence in stereotype content: how societies mind the gap. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 726–46. Doi:10.1111/bjso.12005
- Earley P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence. Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Standford Business Books.
- Esser, H. (2010). Assimilation, ethnic stratification, or selective acculturation? Recent theories of the integration of immigrants and the Model of Intergenerational Integration. *Sociologica*, 1, 1–28. Doi:10.2383/32055
- Ehrlich, H. J. (1973). Socialization and the supporting mechanisms of prejudice. In H. J. Ehrlich, *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*, (pp.110-165). New York, US: John Wiley.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117–140. Doi:10.1177/001872675400700202
- Fisher, R. J., & Katz, J. E. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of self-reported values. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 303–315.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and

- competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902.
Doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878
- Flynn, F. J. (2005). Having an open mind: the impact of openness to experience on interracial attitudes and impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 816–826. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.816
- Frese, M. (1982). Occupational socialization and psychological development: An underemphasized research perspective in industrial psychology. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55, 209–224. Doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1982.tb00095.x
- Galchenko, I., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). The role of perceived cultural distance in the acculturation of exchange students in Russia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 181–197. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.03.004
- Gelfand, M. J. (2012). Culture's constraints: International differences in the strength of social norms. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21, 420–424.
Doi:10.1177/0963721412460048
- Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332, 1100–1104. Doi:10.1126/science.1197754
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 307–348). London, UK: Academic Press.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life. The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York, US: Oxford University Press.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. a., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27. Doi:10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4

- Guan, Y., Deng, H., & Bond, M. H. (2010). Examining Stereotype Content Model in a Chinese context: Inter-group structural relations and Mainland Chinese's stereotypes towards Hong Kong Chinese. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *34*, 393–399. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.04.003
- Hewstone, M., Hopkins, N., & Routh, D. A. (1992). Cognitive models of stereotype change: (1) Generalization and subtyping in young people's views of the police. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *22*, 219–234. Doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420220303
- Hewstone, M., Johnston, L., & Aird, P. (1992). Cognitive models of stereotype change: (2) Perceptions of homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *22*, 235–249. Doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420220304
- Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*, 237–71. Doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237
- Horenczyk, G., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2013). Mutuality in acculturation: Toward an integration. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, *221*, 205–213. Doi:10.1027/2151-2604/a000150
- Howe, M. J. A. (1982). Biographical evidence and the development of outstanding individuals. *American Psychologist*, *37*, 1071–1081. Doi:10.1037/0003-066X.37.10.1071
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & McAuliffe, B. J. (2002). “We’re all individuals”: Group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*, 189–207. Doi:10.1002/ejsp.65
- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Effects of involvement on persuasion: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*, 290–314.

- Johnston, L., & Hewstone, M. (1992). Cognitive models of stereotype change: (3) Subtyping and the perceived typicality of disconfirming group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28*, 360–386. Doi:10.1016/0022-1031(92)90051-K
- Kashima, Y. (2000). Maintaining cultural stereotypes in the serial reproduction of narratives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 594–604.
Doi:10.1177/0146167200267007
- Kashima, Y. (2008). A social psychology of cultural dynamics: Examining how cultures are formed, maintained, and transformed. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 107–120. Doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00063.x
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28*, 280–290. Doi:10.1037/h0074049
- Katz, P. A. (1976). The acquisition of racial attitudes in children. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 125–154). New York, NY, US: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kitayama, S., & Uskul, A. K. (2011). Culture, mind, and the brain: current evidence and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 419–49. Doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145357
- Koch, A., Imhoff, R., Dotsch, R., Unkelbach, C., & Alves, H. (2016). The ABC of stereotypes about groups: Agency/ socio-economic success, conservative-progressive beliefs and communion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*, 675–709.
Doi:10.1037/pspa0000046
- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 234–249. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234

- Lehman, D. R., Chiu, C., & Schaller, M. (2004). Psychology and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 689–714. Doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141927
- Landis, D., & Brislin, R. W. (1983). *Handbook of Intercultural Training: Issues in Theory and Design (Vol. I)*. New York, US: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Lonnqvist, J.-E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Verkasalo, M. (2013). Group-level and intraindividual stability of national stereotypes: A four-year longitudinal study on Ingrian Finn immigrants' pre-and postmigration stereotypes of a typical Finn. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*, 765–785. Doi:10.1177/0022022112466592
- Luna, D., Ringberg, T., & Peracchio, L. A. (2008). One individual, two Identities: Frame switching among biculturals. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*, 279–293. Doi:10.1086/586914
- Mahonen, T. A., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Finell, E. (2010). Perceived importance of contact revisited: Anticipated consequences of intergroup contact for the ingroup as predictors of the explicit and implicit ethnic attitudes of youth. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*, 19–30. Doi:10.1177/1368430210378300
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224–253.
- Matsunaga, M., Hecht, M. L., Elek, E., & Ndiaye, K. (2010). Ethnic identity development and acculturation: A longitudinal analysis of Mexican-heritage youth in the southwest United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*, 410–427. Doi:10.1177/0022022109359689
- Meeus, W., van de Schoot, R., Keijsers, L., & Branje, S. (2012). Identity statuses as developmental trajectories: A five-wave longitudinal study in early-to-middle and middle-to-late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*, 1008–1021. Doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9730-y

- Miller, A. M., Wang, E., Szalacha, L. a, & Sorokin, O. (2009). Longitudinal changes in acculturation for immigrant women from the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*, 400–415. Doi:10.1177/0022022108330987
- Miron, A. M., & Brehm, J. W. (2006). Reactance theory-40 years later. *Zeitschrift Für Sozialpsychologie, 37*, 3–12. Doi:10.1024/0044-3514.37.1.3
- Navas, M., García, M. C., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernández, J. S. (2005). Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 21–37. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.04.001
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2013). Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*, 122–159. Doi:10.1177/0022022111435097
- Oakes, P. J., Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (1991). Perceiving people as group members: The role of fit in the salience of social categorizations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 125–144. Doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1991.tb00930.x
- Pelto, P. J. (1968). The differences between “tight” and “loose” societies. *Transaction, 5*, 37–40.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85. Doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65
- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271–280. Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 123-205. Doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60214-2

- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Goldman, R. (1981). Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 847–855. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.41.5.847
- Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1998). Matching versus mismatching attitude functions: Implications for scrutiny of persuasive messages. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 227–240. Doi:0803973233
- Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1999). The Elaboration Likelihood Model: Current status and controversies. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology*, (pp. 37–72). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Podsiadlowski, A., Vauclair, C.-M., Spiess, E., & Stroppa, C. (2013). Social support on international assignments: The relevance of socioemotional support for locals. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*, 563–573. Doi:10.1080/00207594.2012.669042
- Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Swaab, R. I. (2005). Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *16*, 1–42. Doi:10.1080/10463280440000062
- Oppedal, B. (2006). Development and acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*, (pp. 97-112). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Quadflieg, S., & Macrae, C. N. (2011). Stereotypes and stereotyping: What's the brain got to do with it? *European Review of Social Psychology*, *22*, 215–273.
- Roberts, B. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2001). The kids are alright: Growth and stability in personality development from adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 670–683. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.4.670

Roberts, B. W., & DelVecchio, W. F. (2000). The rank-order consistency of personality traits from childhood to old age: A quantitative review of longitudinal studies.

Psychological Bulletin, 126, 3-25. Doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.1.3

Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies.

Psychological Bulletin, 132, 1–25. Doi:10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88–106. Doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0602_01

Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33, 106–123.

Doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.001

Rudmin, F., Wang, B., & de Castro, J. (2017). Acculturation research critiques and alternative research designs. In S. J. Schwartz & J. Unger (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of acculturation and health* (pp. 75-95). New York, US: Oxford University Press.

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

Sam, D. L., & Oppedal, B. (2002). Acculturation as a developmental pathway. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, S. A. Hayes, & D. N. Sattler (Eds.), *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture (Unit 8, Chapter 6)*, Center for Cross-Cultural Research, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington USA.

Schaller, M., Boyd, C., Yohannes, J., & O'Brien, M. (1995). The prejudiced personality revisited: Personal need for structure and formation of erroneous group stereotypes.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 544–555. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.3.544

- Schröder, T., Rogers, K. B., Ike, S., Mell, J. N., & Scholl, W. (2013). Affective meanings of stereotyped social groups in cross-cultural comparison. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 16*, 717–733. Doi:10.1177/1368430213491788
- Schwartz, S. H. (2014). Rethinking the concept and measurement of societal culture in light of empirical findings. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 45*, 5–13. Doi:10.1177/0022022113490830
- Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Zamboanga, B. L., & Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the concept of acculturation: Implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist, 65*, 237–251. Doi:10.1037/a0019330
- Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 449–464. Doi:10.1016/0147-1767(90)90030-Z
- Sorrentino, R. M., & Roney, C. J. R. (1990). Uncertainty orientation: Individual differences in the self-inference process. In J. M. Olson & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Self-inference processes: The Ontario symposium*, Vol.6. (pp. 239–257). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Soto, C. J., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2011). Age differences in personality traits from 10 to 65: Big Five domains and facets in a large cross-sectional sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 330–348. Doi:10.1037/a0021717
- Stanciu, A. (2015). Four sub-dimensions of stereotype content: Explanatory evidence from Romania. *International Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 14-20.
- Stanciu, A., & Cohrs, J.-C., Hanke, K., & Gavreliuc, A. (2017). Within-culture variation in the content of stereotypes: Application and development of the Stereotype Content Model in an Eastern European culture. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 157*, 611-628. Doi:10.1080/00224545.2016.1262812

- Stanciu, A., & Vauclair, C-M., & Rodda, N. (2018). *Stereotype accommodation: Do migrants incorporate the stereotype-relevant information learned in host societies into their existing stereotypes?* Unpublished manuscript.
- Stangor, C., Lynch, L., Duan, C., Glas, B., & Glass, B. (1992). Categorization of individuals on the basis of multiple social features. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*, 207–218. Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.207
- Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *8*, 220–247.
Doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_1
- Tadmor, C. T., & Tetlock, P. E. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*, 173–190. Doi:10.1177/0022022105284495
- Triandis, H. C. (Ed.) (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York, US: Wiley-Interscience.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 506–520. Doi:10.1037/0033-295X.96.3.506
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-Collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 909–924. Doi:10.1111/1467-6494.696169
- Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. (1967). Frequency of contact and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *7*, 316–328. Doi:10.1037/h0025077
- van Knippenberg, A., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2000). Social categorization and stereotyping: A functional perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *11*, 105–144.
Doi:10.1080/14792772043000013

- Varjonen, S., Arnold, L., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2013). "We're Finns here, and Russians there": A longitudinal study on ethnic identity construction in the context of ethnic migration. *Discourse & Society*, 24, 110–134. Doi:10.1177/0957926512463632
- Vassiliou, V., Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, G., & McGuire, H. (1972). Interpersonal contact and stereotyping. In H. C. Triandis (Ed.), *The analysis of subjective culture* (pp.89-116). New York, US: Wiley-Interscience.
- 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. Doi:10.1177/019027250606900406
- Ward, C., & Geeraert, N. (2016). Advancing acculturation theory and research: The acculturation process in its ecological context. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 98–104. Doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.021
- Ward, C., Okura, Y., Kennedy, A., & Kojima, T. (1998). The U-curve on trial: A longitudinal study of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transition. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 277–291. Doi:10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00008-X
- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and Adaptation Revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30, 422–442. Doi:10.1177/0022022199030004003
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. East Sussex, UK: Routledge.
- Wilson, J., Ward, C., & Fischer, R. (2013). Beyond Culture Learning theory: What can personality tell us about cultural competence? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 44, 900–927. Doi:10.1177/0022022113492889
- Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1–27.

