Consumption of products from heritage and host cultures: 
The role of acculturation attitudes and behaviors

Hatice Kizgin, Lecturer**
Swansea University, School of Management
Bay Campus, Fabian Way, Swansea SA1 8EN 
Phone: +44 (0)1792 604628
Email: Hatice.kizgin@swansea.ac.uk

Ahmad Jamal, Senior Lecturer
Cardiff University, Cardiff Business School
R36, Aberconway Building, Colum Road, Cathays, Cardiff, CF10 3EU
Phone: +44 (0)29 2087 6838
Email: jamala@cardiff.ac.uk

Marie-Odile Richard, Assistant Professor of Marketing
State University of New York Polytechnic Institute
Utica, NY 13502 U.S.A.
E-mail: richarm3@sunyit.edu

**Corresponding Author

Received: April 2015
Accepted: August 2017
Abstract

Prior research ignores the specific role of acculturation attitudes in predicting acculturation behaviors and consumption choices across public and private life domains. The study uses self-administered questionnaires to collect data from 530 Turkish-Dutch respondents. The findings underscore the overall significance of investigating domain-specific (public vs. private) acculturation attitudes and subsequent acculturation behaviors. Enculturation (acculturation) behaviors function as a mediating variable in the relationship between acculturation attitudes and consumption of food and entertainment products from the heritage (host) culture. The study is one of the first to investigate the simultaneous effects of acculturation attitudes and acculturation behaviors on the choice to consume foods and entertainment products from both heritage and host cultures. The article provides managerial implications and future research directions.
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1. Introduction

International migration levels are rising in the U.S.A. (Jamal, Peñaloza, & Laroche, 2015) and in Europe (Eurostat, 2015) and large ethnic-minority subcultures exist across the Western world (Jamal, 2003). The issues of cultural differences, interaction and change are at the heart of ethnic marketing research and practice (Jamal et al., 2015).

Consumer research uses the assimilation or melting pot model (Gordon, 1964; Wallendorf & Reilly, 1983)–which assumes that each ethnic minority group will blend into the host society–to determine whether immigrants’ consumption patterns reflect their culture of origin or their culture of residence. However, empirical studies show that the assimilation process is more than a linear progression from one culture to another (Laroche, Kim, Hui, & Joy, 1996) and that assimilation is only a small part of the total acculturation phenomenon (Gentry, Jun, & Tansuhaj, 1995), which refers to the notion of culture change that takes place as a result of contact with culturally dissimilar people and environments (Laroche & Jamal, 2015).

Consumer research implicitly acknowledges that immigrants engage not only in acculturation but also in enculturation, which is the process of learning one’s own culture (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010). Cleveland and his colleagues (2009), for example, report that immigrants “reside in a two-culture world–over time acquiring characteristics of the dominant culture, yet maintaining strong ties to their culture of origin” (p. 208). However, and despite the potential for navigating between two worlds, the authors do not find any research that simultaneously investigates the effects of acculturation and enculturation on consumption choices. The authors address this research gap by simultaneously investigating the effects of acculturation and enculturation on immigrants’ consumption choices.
Moreover, the mechanisms involving enculturation and acculturation do not operate in a social vacuum but occur in the context of intra-group relationships (Horenczyk, 1997; Jamal & Chapman, 2000). Jamal (2003) reports that the extent to which immigrants navigate between two cultural worlds depends on the attitudes they hold toward heritage and host cultures. Josiassen (2011) shows that the immigrants’ perception of rejection and devaluation by the host society, along with strong identification with religious and ethnic groups, can trigger disidentification with the host consumer culture. However, the consumer research literature remains silent on the explicit role of acculturation attitudes towards host and heritage cultures in explaining acculturation behaviors and consumption patterns.

Moreover, prior treatment of acculturation attitudes remains problematic. For example, the widely cited articles by Berry and his colleagues (Berry, 2005; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989) consider acculturation attitudes as “an individual’s preference about how to acculturate” (p. 704). Others see acculturation attitudes as referring to preferences given to the cultures involved in the process (Arends-Tóth, & van de Vijver, 2006). However, prior research does not elaborate, in conceptual terms, how and on what basis acculturation attitudes are formed and how they can actually shape behavior.

Drawing from the Fishbein (1967) model of measuring attitudes, this study considers consumer attitude as a function of the presence or absence and evaluation of beliefs and/or attributes (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2007). This helps identify and discuss the importance and desirability of specific salient beliefs involving host and/or heritage cultures. Acculturation attitudes are learned predispositions which can motivate consumers to act. While the prior acculturation literature argues for a distinction between acculturation attitudes and acculturation behaviors (Arends-Tóth & van de
Vijver, 2006; Berry, 1997), it generally remains silent in explaining the acculturation attitude-behavior link. This research contributes by investigating simultaneously the causal link from acculturation attitudes to acculturation behavior.

The social psychology literature (Quarasse & van de Vijver, 2004) acknowledges the impact of public and private life domains on acculturation/enculturation including psychological and sociocultural adaptations. The private-life domain involves personal spheres like child-rearing practices, marital preferences, and family interactions, whereas the public domain involves social life (educational and professional lives). However, prior consumer research only implicitly acknowledges the distinction between public and private domains by, for example, using language-based items to measure acculturation, so we do not know the extent to which immigrants’ preference for heritage (host) cultural maintenance (adaptation) across private- and public-life domains can impact their consumption patterns.

This shortcoming is addressed by investigating variations in attitudes about the heritage and host cultures, acculturation/enculturation preferences, and consumption choices across both private and public life domains. In doing so, this work joins a stream of research that argues in favor of capturing variations in immigrants’ preferences for adaptation and cultural maintenance across both private- and public-life domains (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2004). Unlike prior research, attitudinal predispositions toward maintaining cultural traditions in marriage and child rearing are treated as part of the private domain. Such attitudinal predispositions are seen as antecedents to subsequent preferences for acculturation or enculturation and, ultimately, for the choice to consume heritage or host culture products in the private- and public-life domains.

Finally, there is a sizeable Turkish diaspora to European countries, such as the
Netherlands, where Turkish-Dutch people are the most visible minority-ethnic group (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2007). Scholarly work like that of Josiassen (2011), demonstrates that second-generation Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands struggle to combine their subgroup with their host’s national identity. Those who want to maintain strong links with their Turkish heritage have a stronger propensity for disidentification with typical Dutch consumers. The current study complements this research stream.

Inspired by theories of attitudes (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003; Fishbein, 1967), consumer acculturation (Askegaard, Arnould, & Kjeldgaard, 2005; Laroche and Jamal, 2015), and domain-specific models of acculturation (Quarasse & van de Vijver, 2004), acculturation attitudes and acculturation behaviors are investigated in predicting consumption choices across the private- and public-life domains.

This paper is organized into four parts. First, the literature related to acculturation, attitudes toward host and heritage cultures and domain-specific models of acculturation is reviewed. Then the methodology is outlined and findings are reported. Finally, the theoretical, practical and policy implications of the findings and present suggestions for future research are discussed.

2. Literature review

2.1 Acculturation

Acculturation refers to the phenomenon that result when different cultures meet and interact (Schwartz et al., 2010). Prior research (Berry, 1980; 1997; Gentry et al., 1995) identifies four modes of acculturation: integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. The assimilation defines the individual’s preference for adopting the host culture’s values and traditions over a period of time while gradually losing interest in maintaining one’s heritage culture. In contrast, the separation strategy finds an
individual placing value on holding onto their heritage culture and avoiding interactions with the host culture. Integration occurs when there is an interest in maintaining one’s heritage culture while having daily interactions with the host culture (Berry, 1997). Finally, marginalization occurs when the individual feels rejected by the host culture but also has no aspirations or desire to maintain the heritage culture.

Peñaloza’s (1994) seminal work identifies conflicting sets of acculturation agents (e.g., family, friends, media, social and religious institutions), each aligned with the heritage and host cultures, which have effects on consumer acculturation outcomes. Subsequent work identifies entrenched subcultures (Wamwara-Mbugua, Cornwell, & Boller, 2008), and global consumer culture (Askegaard et al., 2005) as additional acculturation agents. The underlying assumption is that immigrant consumers continuously negotiate and renegotiate identity projects based on their understanding of and willingness to adopt or reject the push (pull) effects associated with multiple acculturation agents.

2.2 Bidimensional acculturation

Two acculturation models (unidimensional and bidimensional) explain how immigrants learn a new culture in attitudinal and behavioral terms (Segev, Ruvio, Shoham, & Velan, 2014). The unidimensional model assumes that the immigrant adopts the host culture while decreasing or losing emphasis on aspects of the ethnic heritage culture (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006). The adaptation to the host culture and the loss of the heritage culture are non-sequitur outcomes of immigration in which an individual maintains the home culture and simultaneously acquires the host culture (Chattaraman, Rudd, & Lennon, 2009). Immigrants may consume both home- and host-culture-related offerings (Askegaard et al., 2005).
Acculturation measurements have largely moved from unidimensional to bidimensional models (Yagmur & van de Vijver, 2012). The bidimensional acculturation model considers adjustment to the home culture and the host culture as independent processes (Berry, 1997) in studying immigrants’ consumption patterns (Chattaraman et al., 2009; Cleveland et al., 2009).

2.3 Public- and private-life domains

Arends-Tóth and van de Vijver (2006) argue that immigrants may “seek economic or work assimilation and linguistic integration, while maintaining separation in family and marriage” (p. 145). The private-life domain is a personal-value-related domain, whereas the public domain constitutes the functional areas of life (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003; 2006). For example, matters that relate to marriage and socialization of children belong to the private-life domain, whereas behavioral tendencies like language use and social interactions belong to the public-life domain (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2008). An immigrant may prefer to consume traditional cultural items (e.g., foods, music, dress and celebrations) while at home but mainstream cultural items while in the public domain. In other words, an immigrant may seek to maintain her heritage culture in the private domain (life within the family and personal spheres of life), but may seek to assimilate culturally when in a public domain like school and the workplace, where she has contact with the dominant group (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006). Support comes from multiple self (Markus & Nurius, 1986) and situational ethnicity (Stayman & Deshpandé, 1989) literatures that report consumers acting differently in different situations and with different individuals.

2.4 Acculturation attitudes

Per the attitude-toward-object model (Fishbein, 1967), an attitude is a function
of the presence or absence and evaluation of beliefs and/or attributes (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2007). For example, an immigrant may believe that the host society values and rewards hard work, promotes justice, safety and equality for all, and is strict in enforcing mainstream policies about migration. The total configuration of these beliefs about this host society represents the cognitive component of the immigrant’s attitude toward the host society. The information-integration process combines only the salient beliefs about the host society to form an overall evaluation of the concept (here the concept of the host society). Accordingly, acculturation attitudes reflect the importance and desirability of salient beliefs that involve host and/or heritage cultures.

An attitude is a learned predisposition to behave in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner (Evans et al., 2009), and as learned predispositions, attitudes have a motivational quality such that they propel (repel) consumers toward (against) a particular behavior (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2007).

Acculturation attitudes involving personal beliefs, such as those related to marriage and rearing children, belong to the private-life domain, while acculturation behaviors involving the broader social aspects of life, such as language use, socializing, eating out, seeking help and advice from others, following the news, and taking part in public celebrations, relate to the public-life domain (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003; 2006; 2008). Accordingly, acculturation attitudes are placed under the private domain and acculturation behaviors (labelled as enculturation of the heritage culture and acculturation of the host culture) under the public-life domain (Figure 1). Positive acculturation attitude is labelled as “Attitude Dutch Culture” and negative acculturation attitude as “Attitude Turkish Culture.”

As per in-group and out-group categorization theory (Tajfel, 1981), an immigrants’ perceptions of self and their ethnic identity are often dependent on social
comparisons that they make with out-groups (the host society), resulting in a favorable assessment and evaluation of the in-group (the heritage cultural group). The presence of a positive affect toward the in-group, combined with the absence of positive feelings toward out-groups often leads to bias and prejudices (Brewer & Brown, 1998; Tajfel, 1981). Accordingly, an immigrant may develop a negative acculturation attitude and attach importance to having a partner from the heritage culture and rearing children in the heritage culture’s traditions (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2008).

On the other hand, immigrants may value certain aspects of the host culture (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2008; Jamal, 2003), especially in pursuit of economic advantages and success in the host society. Accordingly, they may develop a positive acculturation attitude, attaching importance to having a partner from the host culture and rearing children in the host culture’s traditions. Therefore, the first set of hypotheses are:

**H1**: Negative acculturation attitudes relate positively to a) enculturation of the heritage culture and b) consumption of the heritage culture’s foods and entertainment products.

**H2**: Positive acculturation attitudes relate positively to a) acculturation of the host culture and b) consumption of the mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment products.

### 2.4.1 Effects of heritage culture enculturation and host culture acculturation

Large ethnic-minority subcultures across the Western world (Jamal, 2003) facilitate enculturation, which reflects the social processes by which immigrants learn, maintain and reinforce their own heritage’s culture. Wamwara-Mbugua et al. (2008) report the effects of “entrenched subcultures,” when immigrants access hair-care...
services, nightclub entertainment and church services. Jamal (2003; 2005) reports the extent to which ethnic commercial institutions, community networks and religious institutions take an active interest in the creation and reinforcement of an ethnic minority’s consumer culture. Immigrants are more prone to consuming ethnically consistent products (foods, music and dress) when the consumption context is ethnically relevant (e.g., spending time with family) than when it is associated with the mainstream or another ethnic group (Jamal, 2003; Stayman & Deshpandé, 1989). Chattaraman et al. (2009) show that acculturation behavior relates to immigrants’ participation in heritage- and host-related consumption. Segev et al. (2014) also examine the impact of acculturation behaviors on heritage and mainstream brands and stores. The findings concur with research on acculturation, revealing that immigrants’ heritage and host culture orientations are manifested in their consumption of heritage and host cultural practices (Laroche, Kim, Tomiuk, & Belisle, 2005). Based on this discussion, the following hypotheses are:

**H3**: Enculturation of the heritage culture 
1) positively impacts the consumption of the heritage culture’s foods and entertainment products and 
2) negatively impacts consumption of the mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment products.

**H4**: Acculturation of the host culture 
1) positively impacts consumption of the mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment products and 
2) negatively impacts consumption of the heritage culture’s foods and entertainment products.

The conceptual framework and subsequent hypothesized relationships presented so far suggest that enculturation and acculturation may act as mediating variables. Therefore, the next set of hypotheses are:

**H5**: The effect of negative acculturation attitudes on the consumption of the heritage culture’s foods and entertainment products is mediated positively through
enculturation of the heritage culture.

**H6**: The effect of positive acculturation attitudes on the consumption of the mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment products is mediated positively through acculturation of the host culture.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Sample and data collection

The data used in this study come from the largest non-Western ethnic group in the Netherlands, the Turkish using Markteffect’s panel, which is based on a probability sample of individuals that includes a representative sample of immigrants and majority-group members who participate in surveys. To ensure that the respondents have a Turkish background, a screening question (‘‘Do you have a Turkish background?’’) was sent by email. The 1,197 respondents who positively answered the screening question were asked to continue with the survey, and 530 of these respondents completed the self-administered questionnaire, for a response rate of 44.3 percent. Sixty percent of the respondents were male and 40 percent were female. The majority of the respondents (56%) were born in the Netherlands (n= 297), 41% were born in Turkey (n=218) and the remaining 3% in other European countries (n= 15).

The respondents’ ages ranged between 18 and 74 years. The sample is well spread out in terms of age, occupation, education and location within the Netherlands. The respondents are representative of the target population, the Turkish-Dutch.

#### 3.2 Measures

Consistent with prior research, we measure attitudinal and behavioral acculturation using separate subscales (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006; 2007).
Acculturation attitudes concerning issues related to the private-life domain (e.g., “It is important to have a partner/relationship with a person with a Turkish background” and “It is important to have a partner/relationship with a person with a Dutch background”) were measured using a 7-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The items (from Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006) refer to acculturation attitudes involving the Turkish and Dutch cultures, so they are directly transferable to the context and setting of this research and its assessment of the private-life domain. The two-dimensional scales (Dutch vs. Turkish) were further informed by the work of Hui et al. (1992) and Jun, Ball and Gentry (1993), which recognize the two-dimensional nature of acculturation: the individual’s self-identification with the host culture and the extent of adaptation to the host culture.

Acculturation to the host culture and enculturation of the heritage culture were measured using eighteen items that capture the public-life domain. The questions are based on Arends-Tóth and van de Vijver (2007) using the “two-statement method”; first one assesses the respondent’s behavior in relation to the host culture (e.g., “How often do you spend social time with Dutch people?”) and second one assesses the respondent’s behavior of one’s own ethnic heritage (e.g., “How often do you spend social time with Turkish people?”), each containing a balanced 7-point Likert scale, ranging from “1=never” to “7=always.”

Consumption of foods and entertainment products from the heritage and mainstream cultures was measured using eight items adapted from Xu, Shim, Lotz, and Almeida (2004). Each item was scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “1=never” to “7=always.”
4. Data analyses and findings

This study examines a set of variables derived from the literature. The new setting and application (translated into Dutch), as well as the sample, require exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to examine the instruments before proceeding with the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modelling (SEM) to test the theory and the hypotheses.

4.1 Exploratory factor analysis

EFA of the six items that measure acculturation attitudes (private-life domain) identified a two-factor solution with *Attitude-Turkish Culture* and *Attitude-Dutch Culture* accounting for 72 percent of the total variance (eigenvalues of 2.7 and 2.2, respectively). The eighteen items used to measure Turkish enculturation and Dutch acculturation were subjected to EFA, an examination of the factor solution, the item loadings and the anti-image correlation matrix. Two items (“How often do you spend social time with Dutch people?” and “How often do you speak the Dutch language with parents and family members?”) were deleted from further analysis because of high cross-loading. Subsequent EFA identified a two-factor solution with *Turkish enculturation* and *Dutch acculturation*, each of which involves the public-life domain: *social interactions* and *language use*. The two-factor solution accounts for 63 percent of the total variance (eigenvalues of 5.9 and 4.2, respectively).

The EFA of the eight items that measured the consumption of foods and entertainment products (food-related habits, music, movies and attendance at cultural performances) from the heritage culture and the host culture estimated a two-factor solution that accounts for 64 percent of the total variance (eigenvalues of 3.1 and 2.7, respectively).
4.2 Confirmatory factor analysis

The second stage of data analysis involved the execution of CFA using Amos 22 to confirm the factor structure. Two items were deleted, one item for *Turkish enculturation* (“How often do you participate in Turkish public celebrations?”) and one item for the heritage culture’s foods and entertainments (“How often do you attend Turkish cultural performances (theater and concerts)?”), based on the modification indices’ revealing misspecifications associated with the pairing of error terms (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). The deletion of these two items does not significantly change the construct as initially conceptualized nor does it compromise the study’s theoretical underpinnings. The CFA shows that all of the remaining fifteen acculturation items, six attitude items and seven foods and entertainment items load highly on their corresponding factors and provide strong empirical evidence of their validity.

All remaining constructs have high factor loadings, greater than the recommended threshold of 0.5 (Hair *et al.*, 2010; Kline, 2011) and suggest convergent validity (Kline, 2011). Further assessment of convergence validity using the average variance extracted (AVE) shows that all constructs are above the 0.50 cut-off point (Hair *et al.*, 2010), with the AVE estimates (Table 1) between 0.61 and 0.81. The composite reliability scores for each construct exceed the 0.70 threshold suggested by Field (2000). Using Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) assessment of discriminant validity by comparing the AVE with the corresponding inter-construct squared correlation estimates reveals that the AVE for all constructs is greater than the squared correlation between the constructs, supporting discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Based on the results provided by the standardized factor loadings, AVEs and reliability scores, there is satisfactory evidence of the measurement model’s validity.
The measurement model and the standardized loadings, along with CRs (Critical Ratios) and AVEs are presented in Table 1. The square-roots values of the AVEs compared with the corresponding construct inter-correlations are shown in Table 2.

| Table 1 here |
| Table 2 here |

Chi-square values are affected by sample size, so incremental and absolute fit indices are used (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). The measurement model indicates an acceptable fit (parsimony fit $\chi^2/df= 4.22$, comparative fit index (CFI) =0.91; incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.91; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.07; standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = 0.06).

Following Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003), a common method bias test is conducted. Harman’s single factor test is used to determine whether all variables can be accounted for by one latent factor, which would indicate that common method bias is not likely (total variance of 30.2% by a single factor). However, Podsakoff et al. (2003) claim that Harman’s test may be incomplete and insensitive. Therefore, a common method factor assesses whether the measurement model is robust against common method variance. The results demonstrate that the average explained variance of the indicators is .70, while the average method-based variance is .13, indicating a small method variance (a ratio of about 55:1). The results of the common method bias tests, with the evidence from the correlations, show that common method bias does not pose a serious threat to the measurement model and its findings.

4.2.1 Measurement model equivalency

A follow-up test examined whether country of birth is a boundary condition
with regard to acculturation attitudes, acculturation/enculturation and consumption of foods/entertainment (CFE). Two groups are constructed, one of respondents who were born in Turkey (n= 218) and the other of those born in the Netherlands (n= 297), excluding the group born in other European countries (n=15). The mean scores and effect sizes are shown in Table 3.

To ensure measurement model invariance, multi-group CFA assesses model equivalence using a number of hierarchical steps in which the baseline model is compared against the other models (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). The test for equivalence requires validating the factorial structure of the measurement model for each group separately—that is, whether the same CFA is valid for the group born in Turkey and the group born in the Netherlands—before simultaneously testing for invariance across the groups (Byrne, 2009).

The recommended Goodness-of-fit criteria for the invariance assessment are chi-square, CFI, RMSEA and SRMR (Hu & Bentler, 1999). However, research has suggested that invariance decisions should not be based on the chi-square values (Byrne & van de Vijver, 2010; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002) because chi-square is sensitive to sample size and a high number of parameters. The differences in CFI values are set as equal to 0.01 and -0.01 as an indication of a substantial practical improvement for not rejecting invariance (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). The estimation of the configural invariance model first show that the model fit statistics indicates an overall acceptable fit ($\chi^2$/df = 3.07, CFI = .886, RMSEA = .064).

Modification Indices (MIs) are consulted to identify misspecifications that are due to nonequivalence of particular items across two groups (Byrne & van de Vijver, 2010; Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998) found that the expected parameter change
(EPC) statistics of four items’ factor loadings and item scores fell outside the normal range. The MIs for Turkish language (EL5), Dutch language use (AL1), attitude Dutch culture (DC2) and mainstream CFE (MFE3) are .34, .29, .26 and .23, respectively. The EPC statistics indicate that the factor loadings of these items differ considerably between groups, so these four items were deleted because of model misspecification and lack of coherence (Byrne, 2009). Deletion of these items resulted in improvement in the configural invariance test. The deleted items showed differences between groups, but neither factor’s content is altered by deleting the four items. These modifications result in an acceptable fit of the baseline model for the group born in Turkey ($\chi^2$/df = 2.74, CFI = .906, RMSEA = .007) and the group born in the Netherlands ($\chi^2$/df = 3.06, CFI = .912, RMSEA = .007). The baseline measurement model 1, i.e. configural model across groups indicates a good fit; $\chi^2$/df = 2.90, CFI = .909, RMSEA = .061, SRMR = .061 (Table 4). All factor loadings are highly significant, and all standardized factor loadings exceed .61, allowing us to conclude the configural invariance of the hypothesized multi-group model with an acceptably good fit across the group that was born in Turkey and the group that was born in the Netherlands.

The next step involves metric invariance by increasing constraints on the invariant parameters. The metric invariance model (model 1a) in Table 4 shows that there is a significant decrease in chi-square between the configural model and full metric invariance model ($\Delta \chi^2 (16) = 26.89, p < .05$). Full metric invariance is usually not achieved, so the condition of partial measurement invariance should be reached (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998). Byrne (1989) states that full metric invariance is not a pre-condition for further tests of invariance. The differences in the values of $\Delta$RMSEA and $\Delta$CFI between models 1 and 1a are within the threshold of 0.01 in measurement equivalence testing.
Finally, scalar invariance is tested, which refers to the constraints of measurement intercepts (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). The intercepts of the invariant factor loadings are constrained to be equal. Full scalar invariance for this model is not supported, as shown in model 1b (Table 4). The increase in terms of chi-square is highly significant ($\Delta \chi^2 (24) = 89.70, p < .001$). The fit indices also show an overall decrease in model fit. Inspection of MIs indicates that the intercepts for Dutch language items (DL2 and DL4), heritage CFE (HFE1) and Turkish social interactions (ESI1) are not invariant across groups. Subsequently relaxing these four constraints yields a significant improvement in fit in model 1c (Table 4) in comparison to the full scalar invariance model (model 1b). Partial scalar invariance is supported by the insubstantial decrease in goodness-of-fit (GOF) indices in the partial scalar invariance test compared with the GOF indices in the configural model ($\Delta \chi^2 (24) = 31.85, \Delta \text{CFI} = -.002, \Delta \text{RMSEA} = -.001$).

Additional conditions of invariance (i.e., covariance invariances and invariant factor variance) are tested. The covariance invariances in model 1d are accepted ($\Delta \chi^2 (7) = 44.18, p < .001$), as are the invariant factor variances in model 1e after relaxing the factor constraint of Dutch social interactions (because of a difference in factor invariance between the two groups, as indicated by a high MI). The difference in the chi-square terms is significant ($\Delta \chi^2 (2) = 22.98, p < .001$), while the fit indices CFI and SRMR increase and RMSEA remains the same. Covariance invariances and invariant factor variances (models 1d and 1e) are also accepted.

Considering the number of parameters, measurement equivalence of the model for each behavioral construct (i.e., heritage CFE and host CFE) must be assessed separately. The models result in good, conventional cut-off levels (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The difference between the configural measurement model’s $\Delta \chi^2$ and the metric
invariance model’s $\Delta \chi^2$ is significant ($\Delta \chi^2 (16) = 29.28, p < .05$; $\Delta \chi^2 (16) = 44.50, p < .05$), while the fit indices CFI, RMSEA and SRMR are not significantly improved. Therefore, partial measurement invariance and model fit is accepted for two behavior categories: *heritage CFE* and *mainstream CFE*.

The measurement invariance assessment criterion in this study are $\chi^2$, CFI, RMSEA, SRMR and the examination of the overall fit for the invariant model, while considering that chi-square is sensitive to sample size. The sequential testing of invariance indicates partial measurement invariance. In keeping with the measurement invariance literature (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998), stepwise measures of configural, metric, scalar, covariance and factor invariance are tested. The invariance test shows evidence for measurement invariance when four intercepts are freed to hold partial scalar invariance and the invariance constraint on Dutch social interactions is relaxed. Partial measurement invariance is accepted with less than 20 percent of freed parameters (Byrne, 1989). The factorial invariance (model 1e), which supports the meaning of the constructs, is the same in both groups (born in Turkey and born in the Netherlands). The conclusion of the invariance test is partial measurement invariance for the CFA measurement model across the two groups. The factor invariance test provides evidence of homogeneity in the factor scores (Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 1998) for the sample.

[Table 4 here]

### 4.3 Structural equation modelling

After the measurement model was validated, structural equation analysis using Amos 22 assessed the relationships among the latent variables (Figure 1 and Table 6).

*Attitudes toward Turkish (Dutch) cultures* relate to *Turkish enculturation (Dutch*
acculturation) and consumption of the heritage (mainstream) CFE. Turkish enculturation (Dutch acculturation) relates to consumption of the heritage (mainstream) CFE. This analysis further confirms that the proposed factor structure is an appropriate representation of the underlying data. The GOF statistics show an acceptable fit, given the large sample size of 530 (Hair et al., 2010): $\chi^2$/df = 4.32, CFI = 0.92, IFI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.07. The structural model accounts for 68 percent of the variance in respondents’ consumption of the heritage culture’s products and 64 percent of the variance in consumption of the mainstream culture’s products.

4.4 Hypotheses

Reviewing the structural parameter estimates (Table 5) shows that, except for H1b, H2b and H4b, all remaining paths are significant. The analysis reveals a significant positive influence of Attitude toward Turkish culture on Turkish enculturation ($\beta = .73 \ p = .000$) and a non-significant influence on consumption of the heritage CFE ($\beta = .09$, n.s.). Therefore, H1a is supported and H1b is not.

Attitude toward Dutch culture has a significant and positive influence on Dutch acculturation ($\beta = .63 , \ p = .000$) and a non-significant influence on consumption of the mainstream CFE ($\beta = .03$, n.s.). Therefore, H2a is supported and H2b is not.

Turkish enculturation has a positive and significant influence on the consumption of the heritage CFE ($\beta = .75 , \ p = .000$) and is negatively associated with the mainstream CFE ($\beta = -.12 , \ p = .000$). These findings support H3a and H3b.

Dutch acculturation has a positive and significant influence on consumption of the mainstream CFE ($\beta = .771 , \ p = .000$) and a negative and non-significant influence on consumption of the heritage CFE ($\beta = -.03$, n.s.). Findings provide support for H4a but not for H4b.
4.5 Mediation analysis

The mediation analysis is conducted to determine whether enculturation and acculturation act as mediating variables. As Preacher and Hayes (2004) recommend, the bootstrapping methodology based on 5000 bootstrap resamples is used. The results, presented in Table 6, show that the effect of Attitude toward Turkish culture on consumption of the heritage CFE becomes significant (β = .55, p = .000), demonstrating that Turkish enculturation mediates the effect of Attitude toward Turkish Culture on the heritage CFE. The effect of Attitude toward Dutch culture on the consumption of the mainstream CFE strengthens (β = .48, p = .000) with the mediating effect of Dutch acculturation. According to Preacher and Hayes (2004), to test for the significance of the mediating effect, the bias-corrected and accelerated confidence intervals (CIs) must be evaluated. When Turkish enculturation and Dutch acculturation are examined as mediating factors, 95% bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap of CIs were obtained. Zero is not included within the 95% CIs in the lower and upper bounds of these CIs (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The results indicate that Turkish enculturation has a significant indirect effect on the relationship between attitude toward Turkish culture and consumption of the heritage and mainstream CFE. Dutch acculturation shows a significant indirect effect on the relationship between attitude toward Dutch culture and consumption of the mainstream CFE, with an insignificant indirect effect in the relationship between attitude toward Dutch culture and consumption of the heritage CFE. In support of H5 and H6, Turkish enculturation and Dutch acculturation act as mediators in the relationships between negative (positive) acculturation attitudes and consumption of the heritage (mainstream) CFE.
5. Discussion

This study finds that acculturation attitudes especially those related to marriage and rearing children (private-life domain) play a significant role in predicting acculturation behaviors that involve broader social aspects of life, such as language use and social interactions. Our findings are in line with those reported by others (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2008). It appears that those who attach some importance to having a partner from the heritage culture and rearing children in the heritage culture’s traditions favor using their own ethnic language and mostly interact with people of their own culture. It could be that being Turkish resonates with being Muslim in Netherlands (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007), and a heightened sense of religious, cultural and ethnic identity (Jamal & Shukor, 2014; Sandikci & Ger, 2010) may underpin their preference for Turkish enculturation.

Similarly, those who attach some importance to having a partner from the host culture and rearing children in the host culture’s traditions favor using the Dutch language and mostly interact with people of Dutch origin. It could be that such respondents’ needs for education and employment and for regular interactions with mainstream media and friends fuel their desire to participate in the host culture (Maldonado & Tansuhaj, 2002), and hence a preference for Dutch acculturation. It could also be that such respondent value Dutch society’s focus on rewarding hard work, promoting justice, safety, and equality for all. Whatever the case, the findings support previous research that reports immigrants valuing certain aspects of the host culture (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2008; Jamal, 2003), especially in pursuit of economic advantages and success in the host society.
Immigrants, as our findings suggest, tend to be bicultural consumers in terms of acquiring the skills and knowledge that are relevant to their functioning in the host (Dutch) culture, while maintaining strong identification with their heritage (Turkish) culture. The findings point to the complex and dynamic nature of living in a multicultural marketplace, where immigrants live with the need to maintain their culture at home but show solidarity with and become adjusted to the host culture.

Thus, immigrants are influenced by both cultures (Askegaard et al., 2005), while they coexist in a way in which culture is not traditionally defined. The findings suggest that marketers for both the heritage culture’s and the host culture’s products have potential consumers in the long-established and identifiable Turkish community that does not appear to be seeking separation in terms of consumption choices.

The findings point to acculturation attitudes’ being better predictors of acculturation behaviors than consumption choices are, perhaps because immigrant and host communities differ in their approaches to cultural maintenance and adaptation (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003). Immigrants face two fundamental issues: first, a decision about maintaining their culture of origin, and second, the extent to which they want to have contact with and participate in the host culture (Berry, 1997). Such issues influence ethnic identity (Jamal & Chapman, 2000; Tajfel, 1981) and immigrants construct personal and social identities on an ongoing basis based on their everyday conception of reality, which involves interactions within and outside immigrant groups (Jamal, 2003). The findings suggest that immigrants’ acculturation attitudes involving their heritage and host cultures underpin the social construction of ethnic identity and, hence, have a significant impact on enculturation and acculturation.

This study finds that enculturation of the heritage culture positively impacts the consumption of the heritage culture’s products (e.g., foods, movies, music) and
negatively impacts the consumption of the host culture’s products. These findings support those reported by previous research (Grier et al., 2006; Peñaloza, 1994; Ratner & Kahn 2002) and strengthen the notion that entrenched ethnic subcultures (Jamal, 2003; Wamwara-Mbugua et al., 2008) facilitate the consumption of the heritage culture’s products.

This study finds that acculturation of the host culture positively impacts consumption of the host culture’s products, and suggest that immigrants who are in frequent contact with the host culture learn and take part in the host culture to a greater extent and are more receptive and influenced by the host culture than are those who have fewer contact with mainstream consumers. While such consumers become more acculturated (Kara & Kara, 1996), they still appear to have a strong association with their heritage culture (Jamal, 2003). Other findings suggest that immigrants do not necessarily lose aspects of their heritage culture when they simultaneously adopt aspects of the host culture (Kim et al., 2001).

6. Managerial implications

Recent forecasts indicate that European populations will become more ethnically diverse and that the current majority indigenous population will soon be a minority in some countries (Eurostat, 2015). Furthermore, ethnic subgroups are younger on average than the rest of the Dutch population, so they are particularly attractive to marketers (CBS, 2014). The current model is relevant to Turkish-Dutch people in the Netherlands but has the potential to be adopted in similar immigration contexts.

The Turkish-Dutch segment is the largest non-Western immigrant group in the Netherlands, representing 10 percent of the population of immigrants in a total population of about 16 million (CBS, 2014). This study finds that those who favor their own cultures in their private lives also prefer to consume their own culture’s foods and
entertainment products. Together with these findings, growth in the Turkish-Dutch population suggests strong entrepreneurial opportunities for businesses that want to target Turkish-Dutch consumers with culturally authentic products (Jamal, 2005). It is possible that the consumption preferences of Turkish-Dutch people in the Netherlands differ from those of others in Turkey, which provides opportunities for ethnic-product marketers to innovate and offer new products to meet the requirements of those in the Netherlands (Jamal, 2005). In addition, given the importance that Turkish-Dutch consumers attach to maintaining their culture at home, there are opportunities for businesses to improve how they reach and connect with these consumers by developing advertising messages that depict their cultural values (e.g., spending time with one’s partner and children at home) and symbols (e.g., models of Turkish-Dutch lineage). This suggestion is in line with self-referencing theory (Lee, Fernandez, & Martin, 2002; Meyers-Levy & Perachio 1996), which argues that consumers are more likely to remember and like advertising messages that relate to the consumers’ self-concepts.

This research also finds that Turkish-Dutch consumers favor both their own culture and that of the host country in the public-life domain in terms of acculturation behaviors. The current political and policy debates on immigration in the Netherlands highlight the need for immigrant communities to integrate into the mainstream culture, and findings suggest that intercultural activities and programs that involve Turkish-Dutch people in the mainstream culture and media as both audience and producers can promote such integration. These findings also suggest that Turkish-Dutch consumers are willing to participate in public celebrations that provide opportunities for ethnic-product marketers to participate and introduce themselves to the wider community. This proposition is in line with the literature that reports that businesses develop stronger relationships with minority consumers by participating in public events that minority
consumers enjoy (Jamal, 2005).

7. Limitations and future research

7.1 Limitations

This study has limitations. It took place in the Netherlands, so its findings may be relevant only to the Turkish-Dutch citizens in the Netherlands and may not be generalizable to other immigrant communities. Although the study focuses on young adults aged 18-24, students and young adults often live with their parents and depend on resources from family, which may also affect their decisions related to consumption and spending.

7.2 Future research

This study highlights a number of potentially interesting research projects. Findings related to the role of public/private life domains and acculturation attitudes in explaining acculturation behaviors and consumption choices may be equally applicable to other immigrant groups (e.g., Moroccans, Indonesians and Icelanders living in the Netherlands), different product types (hedonic, value expressive but also utilitarian), consumption and usage situations (e.g., publicly consumed vs. privately consumed), different cultural orientations (e.g., collectivistic vs. individualistic).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage culture enculturation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .943, Composite reliability= 0.884, AVE= 0.794)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain social interactions</strong></td>
<td>ES1-How often do you spend social time with Turkish people?</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain language use</strong></td>
<td>ES1-How often do you speak the Turkish language?</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .906, Composite reliability= 0.909, AVE= 0.770)</em></td>
<td>ES1-How often do you ask for help/advise of Turkish students/colleagues?</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>24.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES1-How often do you eat with Turkish friends/ colleagues?</strong></td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>27.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .941, Composite reliability= 0.953, AVE= 0.803)</em></td>
<td>EL1-How often do you speak the Turkish language?</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL2-How often do you speak the Turkish language with Turkish friends?</strong></td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>38.237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL3-How often do you speak the Turkish language with parents and family?</strong></td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>29.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL4-How often do you speak the Turkish language with children and young family members?</strong></td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>34.407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETL5-How often do you follow the Turkish news?</strong></td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>26.475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host culture acculturation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .887, Composite reliability= 0.865, AVE= 0.774)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain social interactions</strong></td>
<td>AS1-How often do you participate in Dutch public celebrations?</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public domain language use</strong></td>
<td>AS1-How often do you speak the Dutch language?</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>18.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .828, Composite reliability= 0.836, AVE= 0.630)</em></td>
<td>AS1-How often do you eat with Dutch friends/colleagues?</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>17.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASI2-How often do you eat with Dutch friends/colleagues?</strong></td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>23.411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASI3-How often do you ask help or advice of Dutch students/colleagues?</strong></td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>17.218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASI4-How often do you eat with Turkish friends?</strong></td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>20.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASI5-How often do you follow the Dutch news?</strong></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>21.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Turkish</strong></td>
<td>TC1-It is important to rear children in the Turkish culture</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .925, Composite reliability= 0.927, AVE= 0.810)</em></td>
<td>TC2-It is important to have a partner/relationship with a person with Turkish background</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>28.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TC3-It is important to have the Turkish culture in my life</strong></td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>29.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Dutch</strong></td>
<td>DC1-It is important to rear children in the Dutch culture</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .820, Composite reliability= 0.824, AVE= 0.610)</em></td>
<td>DC2-It is important to have a partner/relationship with a person with Dutch background</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>17.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DC3-It is important to have the Dutch culture in my life</strong></td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>15.949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .860, Composite reliability= 0.874, AVE= 0.698)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFE1-How often do you eat Turkish meals/foods?</strong></td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>16.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFE3-How often do you watch Turkish movies?</strong></td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>18.374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HFE4-How often do you listen to Turkish music?</strong></td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>19.875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(α = .865, Composite reliability= 0.863, AVE= 0.613)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFE1-How often do you listen to Dutch music?</strong></td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>fixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFE2-How often do you watch Dutch movies?</strong></td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>17.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFE3-How often do you attend Dutch cultural performances? (Theater and concerts)</strong></td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>15.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFE4-How often do you eat Dutch meals/food?</strong></td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>16.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Construct correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Attitude Turkish culture</th>
<th>Attitude Dutch culture</th>
<th>Turkish Enculturation</th>
<th>Dutch Acculturation</th>
<th>Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</th>
<th>Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Enculturation</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Mean differences between consumers born in Turkey and the Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Born in Turkey</th>
<th>Born in the Netherlands</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture</td>
<td>4.65, 1.69</td>
<td>4.20, 1.75</td>
<td>.27, n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture</td>
<td>3.86, 1.65</td>
<td>3.84, 1.51</td>
<td>.01, n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Enculturation</td>
<td>4.66, 1.24</td>
<td>4.37, 1.31</td>
<td>.23, n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Acculturation</td>
<td>4.49, 1.25</td>
<td>4.80, 1.01</td>
<td>.09, n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>4.74, 1.25</td>
<td>4.53, 1.26</td>
<td>.02, n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>4.09, 1.27</td>
<td>4.08, 1.50</td>
<td>.00, n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant at the $p<0.001$; ** Significant at $p<0.01$; *Significant at $p<0.05$, Effect size is defined as the difference of the Turkish and Dutch mean score, divided by the standard deviation of the difference scores. Scores closer to zero refer to less preference of either culture.

### Table 4: Multi-group model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$ (df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Configural invariance</td>
<td>1344.65*** (464)</td>
<td>2.898</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Metric invariance</td>
<td>1371.54*** (480)</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>26.89*** (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Full scalar invariance</td>
<td>1461.24*** (504)</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>89.70*** (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Partial scalar invariance</td>
<td>1376.50*** (490)</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>84.74*** (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Factor covariances invariance</td>
<td>1420.68*** (497)</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>44.18*** (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Factor invariance</td>
<td>1397.70*** (488)</td>
<td>2.864</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>22.98*** (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Configural invariance</td>
<td>1125.97*** (348)</td>
<td>3.236</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Metric invariance</td>
<td>1155.25*** (364)</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>29.28*** (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Configural invariance</td>
<td>1015.38*** (350)</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Metric invariance</td>
<td>1059.88*** (366)</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>44.5*** (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Structural model estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>St.Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture → Turkish enculturation</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>18.178</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture → Heritage culture’s food and entertainment</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1.774</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture → Dutch acculturation</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>8.226</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture → Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Turkish enculturation → Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>10.934</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Turkish enculturation → Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-3.350</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Dutch acculturation → Mainstream culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>9.988</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Dutch acculturation → Heritage culture’s foods and entertainment</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-1.050</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goodness-of-fit statistics of the model:**
- Chi square = 1032.490
- degrees of freedom (df) = .239, p = .000
- $\chi^2$/df = 4.32
- Comparative-Fit-Index (CFI) = .919
- Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .919
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.07
- Standardized RMR = 0.07

### Table 6: Mediation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect paths</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Confidence Upper</th>
<th>Confidence Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture → Heritage culture’s products (a)</td>
<td>.546***</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Turkish culture → Mainstream culture’s products (b)</td>
<td>-.088**</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture → Mainstream culture’s products (b)</td>
<td>.484***</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Dutch culture → Heritage culture’s products (a)</td>
<td>-.021, n.s.</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) mediator is Turkish Enculturation, (b) mediator is Dutch Acculturation
*** Significant at the p< 0.001; ** Significant at p<0.01; *Significant at p<0.05
Figure 1: Structural equation model
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*** Significant at the $p<0.001$; ** Significant at $p<0.01$; *Significant at $p<0.05$