

**THE IMPLICATIONS OF HUMILIATION ON ACCULTURATION AND  
ADAPTATION PROCESSES**

by

Buhlebenkosi B. Tshili

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY WITH SPECIALIZATION IN  
RESEARCH CONSULTATION**

at the

University of South Africa

Supervisor: Prof Kitty Dumont

January 2018

### **Declaration**

I, Buhlebenkosi B. Tshili (student number 50790013), declare that “The Implications of Humiliation on Acculturation and Adaptation Processes” is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at UNISA for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.

Name: Buhlebenkosi B. Tshili

Signature:

Date:

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgements.....   | v  |
| Abstract .....  | 1  |
| Introduction.....   | 2  |
| Humiliation as Self-conscious Emotion.....                                    | 5  |
| Antecedents of Humiliation .....  | 7  |
| Disrespect.....   | 8  |
| Status loss.....  | 9  |
| Social exclusion and social rejection .....                                   | 9  |
| Differences between Humiliation and other Self-conscious Emotions .....       | 10 |
| Humiliation as a Blended Emotion.....   | 11 |
| Acculturation Strategies.....   | 13 |
| Sociocultural and Psychological Adaptation .....                              | 16 |
| Perceived Rejection by Host Country .....                                     | 18 |
| Research Context of the Present Study .....                                   | 18 |
| The Present Study .....   | 20 |
| Participants.....   | 20 |
| Procedure .....   | 21 |
| Measurements .....  | 21 |
| Results.....  | 26 |
| Preliminary Analysis.....   | 26 |
| Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Inter-correlations of Variables ..... | 29 |
| Hypothesis Testing.....   | 31 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| The regulating role of anger and shame in the relationship between humiliation and behavioural responses .....  | 31 |
| Table 2. Model for Relationship-Challenging Responses .....   | 32 |
| Table 3. Mediation Model for Relationship-Maintaining Responses .....   | 34 |
| The relationships between behavioural responses of humiliation and acculturation strategies .....   | 36 |
| Relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation.....   | 37 |
| Perceived rejection from the host country as moderator of the effect of acculturation strategies on sociocultural and psychological adaptation .....  | 40 |
| Sociocultural adaptation model.....   | 40 |
| Table 4. Conditional effect of perceived rejection from the host country on the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation with assimilation and separation entered as covariates..... | 42 |
| Psychological adaptation model .....  | 44 |
| General Discussion .....  | 46 |
| References.....   | 54 |

## **Acknowledgements**

Without the Lord's grace, none of this would have been possible.

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Kitty Dumont for her unwavering support throughout this research project. I would also like to thank my colleagues at the Social Change Research Lab for their support and assistance. Finally, I would like to thank my husband Bernard, my daughter Bernice, my parents Rumbidzai and Musa, my aunt Raviro, my siblings Nkosilathi and Nkosinomusa and my friends Anja and Lindani for their support and understanding through this challenging transformation.

## **Abstract**

Humiliation as an emotion may result from everyday interactions between migrants and members of the host country by which the former feels unjustly rejected by the latter. The present study aimed to extend our understanding of whether humiliation influences the acculturation and adaptation processes of migrants. The following issues were addressed: (1) the behaviour and emotional responses to humiliation, (2) the behavioural implications of humiliation for the acculturation strategies, (3) the influence of acculturation strategies on sociocultural and psychological adaptation and (4) the moderating role of a humiliating climate in society on the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural/psychological adaptation. These issues were addressed in a cross-sectional study which was conducted with migrants ( $N = 132$ ) residing in Johannesburg, South Africa. The results showed that the behavioural responses to humiliation are indeed dependent on the accompanying emotions of anger and shame. In addition, the present study showed that the behavioural implications of humiliation indeed influenced the acculturation strategies. For instance, relationship-challenging responses to humiliation were likely to lead participants to separate and integrate less, while relationship-maintaining responses were likely to lead participants to integrate. In line with previous findings, the results also showed that integration is the most preferred, while assimilation is the least preferred acculturation strategy. Lastly, only the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation revealed to be conditional on a humiliating climate in society.

Key words: humiliation, shame, anger, avoidance, revenge, acculturation, and sociocultural/psychological adaptation

## **Introduction**

South Africa has the reputation of being one of the rather hostile destinations in the world for African immigrants, following the widespread attacks against foreigners in 2008 and 2015 (Claassen, 2017). The xenophobic violence in 2008 left 62 people killed, 670 wounded and 100 000 displaced (Misago, Monson, Polzer, & Landau, 2010). In 2015 another wave of xenophobic attacks took place, leaving eight people killed (Hall, 2015). Between these two internationally reported incidences, 350 foreigners were killed because of their perceived national origins (Hall, 2015). However, attitudinal xenophobia existed among South Africans before 2008. Mattes, Taylor, McDonald, Poore, and Richmond (1999) reported, based on data from the 1995 World Value Survey, that South Africa was the most xenophobic nation of the 18 nations included in the study. Another survey conducted in 1998 found that 72% of South African respondents supported the proposition that foreigners should carry identification documents at all time, while 66% supported the proposition that South Africa's border should be electrified (Crush, 2001). The picture was not different in 2006, when a survey found that almost half of the sample wanted foreign nationals (regardless of their legal status) to be deported (Southern African Migration Project [SAMP], 2008).

Although the above-mentioned attacks against foreigners resulted in sharp international reactions (e.g., criticism by the United Nations Security Council, as well as by leaders of Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Malawi, as well as the recalling of the Nigerian ambassador, as described by Essa and Patel as cited in Claassen, 2017); migrants in South Africa, particularly from other African countries, still face rejection on a daily basis (Everatt, 2011). A more recent nationally representative study by Afrobarometer (2010, p. 1-2) on South African attitudes towards foreigners shows that the majority of South Africans are distrustful towards foreigners (83%) and that almost two-thirds (64%) of respondents would prefer to restrict entry for foreigners into South Africa.

Much research has been conducted to explore South Africans' xenophobic attitudes and behaviour (Peberdy, Crush, & Msibi, 2004; Landau, Ramjathan-Keogh & Singh, 2005; Everatt, 2011; Tafira, 2011, Claassen, 2017); however, less research exists addressing the consequences of these attitudes and behaviour for migrants' acculturation and adaptation processes.

Being a migrant requires an individual to come to terms with the meaning and possible consequences of this social category. When individuals are categorised as migrants, they may have to deal with representations of being an intruder (in relation to the host country, as outlined above) and/or of being a traitor (in relation to the home culture (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000). These different representations may place individuals in danger of prejudice and stereotyping (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000), such as xenophobic attitudes and behaviours which reduce interactions between locals and migrants thereby undermining the positive results of migration (Crush & Ramachandran, 2010). Thus, attitudes towards migrants by host countries are important, as they may not only support, but also hinder, the acceptance of migrants and their ability to acculturate and adapt (Constant, Kahanec, & Zimmermann, 2009; Kalitanyi, 2010).

Acculturation and adaptation are largely a result of daily and continuous interactions between the migrant and his/her social environment (Horenczyk, 1997). According to Bhugra (2004), it is important for migrants to positively acculturate and adapt socioculturally and psychologically in their host country, because these increase psychological and physical well-being and minimise the danger of mental disorders (see also Berry, 1997). As such, for positive acculturation and adaptation to take place, migrants need to feel welcomed and valued by their host country.

Being devalued by their host country means that migrants might experience that they are not recognised; that they are ignored, rejected or even excluded (Fangen, 2006). These experiences are commonly known as antecedents for the feeling of humiliation (Oravec, Hardi, & Lajtai, 2004; Otten & Jonas, 2014; Veldhuis, Gordijn, Veenstra, & Lindenberg, 2014). Humiliation is an intensely distressing emotion (Lazare & Levy, 2011; MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Shultziner & Rabinovici, 2012). Previous research has shown that humiliation is accompanied by other negative emotions such as shame (Walker & Knauer, 2011) and anger (Fangen, 2006; Silver, Conte, Miceli, & Poggi, 1986), which seem to regulate the behavioural responses to humiliation which range from avoidance to approach (Vorster & Dumont, under review). These behavioural responses serve to regulate the interactions between the humiliator and the humiliated person. Because both acculturation and adaptation result from the interactions between the migrant and his/her social environment, it can be assumed that the behavioural implications of humiliation influence migrants' acculturation strategies and their sociocultural and psychological adaptation to the host country.

Humiliation as an emotion results from concrete interactions between migrants and members of the host country by which the former feels unjustly rejected by the latter (Lazare & Levy, 2011). However, host countries' policies, practices and attitudes with regard to migrants might also be perceived by migrants as rejection which does not necessarily lead to the emotion of humiliation (as inter-individual difference variable), but rather to a humiliating climate in society (as situational variable). The present study argues that the interplay between acculturation strategies and psychological and sociocultural adaptation is not only influenced by the behavioural implications of humiliation as an emotion, but also by the humiliating climate in society.

The present study addressed the following issues; first, it aimed to replicate previous findings that the accommodating emotions of anger and shame regulate the relationship between humiliation and the behavioural responses of approach and avoidance. Second, it explored the implications of the behavioural responses to humiliation for the acculturation strategies. Third, it explored the influences of acculturation strategies on the sociocultural and psychological adaptations of migrants. Lastly, it tested whether a humiliating climate in society influences the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation.

### **Humiliation as Self-conscious Emotion**

According to Kemeny, Gruenewald, and Dickerson (2004), there are two possible classes of emotions. The first class consists of basic or primary emotions, which are presumed to be subjective states or feelings expressed by both humans and animals (Mason & Capitanio, 2012). They provide the biological foundations for all emotions in response to stimuli present in the environment and are believed to be quick and involuntary (Arnstein, Mazure, & Sinha, 2012; Izard, 2007).

The second class of emotions are self-conscious or secondary emotions. Self-conscious emotions include, among others, guilt, shame, embarrassment and humiliation (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). These emotions are present only in humans and they require an evaluative sense of the self and the capacity for cognitive explanation about the impacts of events on the self (Allpress, Brown, Giner-Sorolla, Deonna, & Teroni, 2014). Fischer and Tangney (1995) assert that self-conscious emotions involve self-relevant, emotional states and behaviours. They provide internal feedback about an individual's worth or standard that might have been violated and which might be specific to particular self-conscious emotions (Beer & Keltner, 2004; Lewis, 1993). These standards depend on the respective culture in

which they are acquired through socialisation. However, “most self-conscious emotions do not have discrete, universally recognised facial expressions” (Tracy & Robins, 2007b, p. 6).

Self-conscious emotions are distinguished as inter-personal and intergroup emotions. According to Mackie, Smith, and Ray (2008), inter-personal emotions relate to an individual’s personal identity, while intergroup emotions relate to an individual’s social identity. Moreover, self-conscious emotions are defined as “process that reflects the cognitive activity, physiological arousal, action tendencies, motor expression, and subjective feeling in reaction to salient events in the environment” (Scherer, Mortillaro, & Mehu, 2013, p. 48). According to the Appraisal Theory of Emotion, the subjective feeling in reaction to an event is determined by how the event is appraised (Frijda, 1986; Roseman, 1984; Scherer, 1984). There are a number of appraisal dimensions which make it possible for an event to be interpreted. These dimensions consist of how important the event is, its certainty, the responsible mediator, and how possible it is to control the event (Scherer, 2001). However, a small difference in any appraisals may lead to different emotional experiences through subtle variations (Ellsworth, 2013). Accordingly, evaluations and interpretations of events determine emotional responses (Frijda, 1986; Roseman, 1991; Scherer, 1982; Siemer, Mauss, & Gross, 2007); or, to put it differently, it is the evaluation and interpretation of an event that causes emotions (Roseman & Smith, 2001).

Humiliation is a negative, socially undesirable, self-conscious emotion with high intensity in which individuals feel that another person or group has unfairly or unjustly lowered, debased, degraded, or brought them down to an inferior position by which they are not receiving the respect and dignity they consider they deserve (Lazare & Levy, 2011; MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Shultziner & Rabinovici, 2012). Thus, humiliation is experienced as a degradation of one’s self.

According to Klein (1991, p. 9), “a prototypical humiliation experience involves a triangle between humiliator, victim and witness which is shaped by how society handles individual processes”. Jacobson (2013) and Silver et al. (1986) assert that humiliation typically occurs in contexts where there are inequalities of power and status. It often occurs as a result of another person’s behaviour (Margalit, 1996; Neuhauser, 2011). Although humiliation appears to be intrinsically public (Jackson, 2000; Margalit, 1996), Silver et al. (1986) argue that an audience is not necessary for an individual to feel humiliated. For example, a migrant may have to eat leftovers because of diminished funds. S/he may feel humiliated upon reflecting on his or her situation, even though no one can tell what s/he would have eaten.

Thus, for humiliation to take place, there has to be a discrepancy between how individuals view themselves and how they perceive to be viewed by others. For the purposes of the present study, humiliation will be defined as an emotional reaction which occurs when there is a discrepancy between how a person perceives him- or herself and how s/he assumes others perceive her or him (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999).

### **Antecedents of Humiliation**

Silver et al. (1986) argue that humiliation is provoked by the trivialities of everyday life such as being ignored, slightly patronised or even being pitied. Fernandez, Saguy, and Halperin (2015), who conducted an experimental study in which they manipulated key appraisals of various emotions such as humiliation, shame, anger and embarrassment, found that humiliation arises mainly from the devaluation of the self, which would have been appraised as unjust. Different antecedents can determine whether an event is perceived as devaluating to the self. Based on existing research on humiliation, three antecedents are proposed: (1) disrespect (Trumbull, 2008); (2) status loss (Torres & Bergner, 2010); and (3)

social exclusion and rejection (Oravecz et al., 2004; Otten & Jonas, 2014; Veldhuis et al., 2014).

### **Disrespect**

“Respect is fundamentally tied to our existence as social beings that live and survive in groups” (Janoff-Bulman & Werther, 2008, p. 147) and therefore all human beings deserve to be respected (Simon & Grabow, 2014). According to Janoff-Bulman and Werther (2008) there are two types of respect which are categorical respect and contingent respect. Categorical respect is based on an individual being a member of a group and this type of respect is equally accorded to all members of one’s group. On the other hand, contingent respect is based on comparisons across group members and it accords status or standing within the group. Contingent respect is earned based on an individual’s efforts (Janoff-Bulman & Werther, 2008). Both categorical disrespect and contingent disrespect can be viewed as appraisals of humiliation.

Disrespecting someone means that people/groups are not accepted by other people/groups for what they are (Frankfurt, 1997). Respect can be treated as a form of recognition in that individuals are all equal and respect is owed to them by virtue of their human status. Hence, if individuals are not recognised or valued, it might lead to humiliation. Simon and Grabow (2014), for instance, found that recognition as an equal is evident when an individual feels respected by members of an outgroup. Accordingly, disrespect is equated to denial of an individual’s status, discounting or ignoring them, thereby leaving them feeling invisible and humiliated (Janoff-Bulman & Werther, 2008; Lindner, 2007; Simon & Grabow, 2014; Torres & Bergner, 2010; Walker and Knauer, 2011). In the case of migrants, they may feel disrespected and neglected due to language barriers in their host country and failure to

get interpreters to assist them (Nawyn, Gjokaj, Agbenyiga, & Grace, 2012). In turn, this undermines their individuality and human status.

### **Status loss**

The feeling that one's status has been lowered is another antecedent of humiliation whereby an individual's status is rejected by other individuals who have the power to do so (Torres & Bergner, 2010). These statuses are positions that are occupied by an individual in his or her social environment. These positions would include, for example, social (e.g., the elderly), occupational (e.g., a medical doctor), and situational positions (e.g., experts). Research has shown that humiliation occurs when individuals realise that their status claim is not recognised by others. In the case of migrants, they may struggle to find employment in their host country due to visa restrictions (Doyle, 2009; Fangen, 2006; Fleay & Hartley, 2016) and this leaves them feeling humiliated due to the fact that their competence is not recognised.

### **Social exclusion and social rejection**

When individuals encounter extreme disapproval from others, they are likely to feel excluded and rejected, which leads to humiliation. Individuals who are rejected or excluded might feel worthless and inferior (Klein, 1991) and these individuals are likely to have problems with belonging, control and self-esteem (Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998). In their research, Veldhuis et al. (2014) found that being rejected leads individuals to feel inferior. Thus, exclusion and rejection may be based on the group to which individuals belong to or on their social class (e.g., migrants) and these feelings are likely to lead individuals to feel humiliated.

Discrimination is also regarded as a form of exclusion and rejection because individuals are denied opportunities, benefits and rights in society (Trbanc, 1996; Fangen,

2006). It has also been noted in the literature that there are extreme forms of social exclusion which are infrahumanization and dehumanisation. Both infrahumanisation and dehumanisation occur when people are perceived as less or not human at all (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014; Wilde, Martin & Goff, 2014). This means that individuals are perceived to lack human attributes which are seen as distinguishing humans from animals in terms of civility, morality and higher cognition (Leyens et al., 2000); this can be regarded as an infringement of their rights.

### **Differences between Humiliation and other Self-conscious Emotions**

Although humiliation as a negative self-conscious emotion is often used interchangeably with other negative self-conscious emotions such as shame, guilt and embarrassment, it is distinct (Beer & Keltner, 2004).

According to Klein (1991) and Lewis (1987), both shame and humiliation are considered to have an impact on the whole self and hence they are often used interchangeably. The differences between these two emotions lie in the attribution given to the devaluating event in that humiliated individuals feel that the devaluation to the self is unjust (Fernandez et al., 2015); whereas individuals who feel ashamed feel that they deserve their shame (Klein;1991). Individuals who have been humiliated blame another person for the humiliating event, while individuals who feel ashamed blame themselves for the shaming event, due to the internal process of negative self-evaluation (Hartling, 1995; Klein, 1991).

Similar to shame, a guilty individual also engages in self-blame, based on the fact that there is an internal attribution of blame (Tracy & Robins, 2007a; Kugler & Jones, 1992). However, guilty individuals may try to repair their transgressions (Lewis, 1993), because guilt is elicited in response to a social norm or standard that has been violated by the individual (Tracy & Robins, 2007a). Furthermore, with guilt, the focus is not on the self as is

the case during the elicitation of shame or humiliation, but rather on the individual's own behaviour (Allpress et al., 2014). The commonality between guilt and humiliation is that individuals may feel guilty over time because they may blame themselves for not being in a position to prevent the humiliating event (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999).

According to Hartling (1995), humiliation and embarrassment are similar because individuals who feel these emotions tend to internalise the devaluation of the self. Embarrassment is often viewed as a minor form of humiliation. However, when a person is humiliated, s/he appraises the event as undeserved (Fernandez et al., 2015). To the contrary, when a person is embarrassed, there is an internal attribution of blame and it is elicited due to the occurrence of social blunders such as falling (Pulham, 2009). In this instance, the individual would not have control over the embarrassing event (Pulham, 2009). The commonality between humiliation and embarrassment is that both emotions heighten intensity at the presence of an audience (Elison & Dansie, 2011).

Due to the above-mentioned differences between humiliation and other negative self-conscious emotions, humiliation is viewed as a distinct emotion. Yet, as mentioned, it shares commonalities with these emotions as well and, therefore, humiliation is often elicited in conjunction with other emotions, such as shame or anger (Fernandez et al., 2015). This relatedness and overlap makes humiliation a blended emotion, that is to say, an emotion accompanied by other emotions.

### **Humiliation as a Blended Emotion**

When an individual experiences two or more emotions in reaction to an event, the emotions are believed to blend with each other (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988). This is because some emotions share similar appraisal patterns (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988). Previous research has shown that humiliation is accompanied by other negative emotions such as shame

(Walker & Knauer, 2011), anger (Fangen, 2006; Silver et al., 1986) and the feeling of powerlessness (Veldhuis et al., 2014). Research has shown that anger is strongly correlated to humiliation (Elison & Harter, 2007; Combs, Campbell, Jackson, & Smith, 2010; Jackson, 2000; Leidner, Sheikh, & Ginges, 2012), because both emotions share the appraisal of injustice (Roseman, 1991) and an external attribution of blame for the belittling event. Yet, in some cases, the individual might internally attribute the devaluing event and then humiliation seems to be accompanied by shame. Interestingly, these emotions that accompany humiliation seem to play a regulatory function in the seemingly contradictory behavioural responses of approach and avoidance (Vorster & Dumont, under review). Research has shown that these contradictory responses correspond with the emotions of anger and shame in that, if humiliation is accompanied by anger, then the behavioural response of approach is likely to occur whereas, when humiliation is accompanied by shame, the behavioural response of avoidance is more likely to occur (Vorster & Dumont, under review). Thus, individuals' tendencies to respond either with approach or avoidance to humiliation actually depend on the emotion(s) that is/are blended into the concrete experience of humiliation (Vorster & Dumont, under review).

When individuals respond with approach, the relationship between the humiliator and the humiliated person is changed. For instance, revenge as tendency to approach, which might be regarded as a form of justice (Muenster & Lotto, 2010; Strelan, Weick, & Vasiljevic, 2014), aims to re-establish a balanced relationship (Fisk, 2008; Torres & Bergner, 2010); thus, restores the individual's esteem and control over the situation (Heider as cited in Strelan et al., 2014). On the other hand, when humiliation is accompanied by shame, people are likely to withdraw from the interactions (Tracey & Robins, 2007b; Richman & Leary, 2009). The latter corresponds with findings of Fangen (2006) who found, in a qualitative

study with Somalian refugees living in Norway, that these refugees reported to withdraw from interactions with the public after facing humiliating encounters. However, the tendency to withdraw may have negative consequences such as the feeling of helplessness (Liedner et al., 2012), which can result in suicide, lack of trust, low self-esteem, increased stress (Torres & Bergner, 2010) and self-blame (Walker & Knauer, 2011).

Another response to humiliation might be forgiveness; this is considered as the opposite behavioural response of approach (Muenster & Lotto, 2010) and avoidance. When individuals forgive, they become less avoiding and less vengeful. However, forgiveness requires the apology by the humiliator consisting of the expression of shame and reparatory intentions (Muenster & Lotto, 2010). According to Zechmeister, Garcia, Romero, and Shona (as cited in Muenster & Lotto, 2010), the apology assists the humiliated person to regain a sense of safety and psychological balance, as well as affirming their sense of justice.

Based on the outlined research on humiliation, the present study proposed the hypothesis that the accompanying emotions of anger and shame regulate the relationship between humiliation and the behavioural responses of approach and avoidance (Hypothesis 1). Moreover, we were interested in exploring the interplay between humiliation, its accompanying emotions and forgiveness as behavioural responses.

Whether people tend to respond to humiliation with avoidance, approach or forgiveness, it can be assumed that these behavioural orientations influence the acculturation strategies which, in turn, determine sociocultural and psychological adaptation.

## **Acculturation Strategies**

Acculturation processes have gained renewed interest on a global scale due to increasing migration patterns. It is important for migrants to acculturate and adapt in their

host country because it minimises the danger of long-term mental disorders (Bhugra, 2004). The acculturation process can either be short-term or long-term and it involves “changes in identities, attitudes, values and beliefs as well as physical, political and economic adjustments” (Greenland & Brown, 2005, p. 375). At a group level, the acculturation processes involve changes in the social structures, institutions and cultural practices while, on an individual level, they involve changes in an individual’s attitudes and behaviours through cultural shedding<sup>1</sup>, cultural learning and cultural conflict (Berry, 2005).

Furthermore, acculturation depends on how an individual perceives and interprets events, based on factors existing before and after migration (Sam & Berry; 2010). In order for individuals to participate in a culturally diverse society such as South Africa, they need to adopt acculturation strategies (Berry, 2005). These acculturation strategies are based on an individual’s ability to maintain their own cultural identity and an individual’s desire to interact with the host society (Berry, 1997). There are four possible acculturation strategies that individuals can adopt: assimilation, separation, integration and marginalisation (Berry, 1997; Esses & Lawson, 2010).

According to Berry (1997), assimilation is a strategy used when individuals have no intention of maintaining their cultural heritage when interacting with the host culture. This suggests a strong relationship with the host country. However, assimilation may be the least preferred acculturation strategy, especially by migrants who have physical features which set them apart from their host country (for example, Somalians living in South Africa; see also Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). When individuals prefer to maintain their cultural heritage, and avoid interactions with the host culture, they adopt separation as a

---

<sup>1</sup> Cultural shedding is “unlearning of aspects of one’s previous behaviour that are no longer appropriate” (Berry, 1997, p. 13).

strategy (Berry, 1997; Esses & Lawson, 2010). Integration as a strategy is used by individuals who wish to maintain both their cultural heritage and identify with the host culture (Berry, 1997; Sam & Berry, 2010). For integration to be successful, there needs to be a mutual acceptance by both the migrants and the host country to live in a culturally diverse society (Berry, 1997). The marginalisation strategy is used when individuals have no interest in maintaining their cultural heritage or interacting with the host culture but, instead, they choose to live in parallel sub-societies (Berry, 2005; Esses & Lawson, 2010).

Research has shown that migrants prefer in general the acculturation strategy of integration (see Berry, 1999; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013; Ward, 2009; Ward & Kus, 2012). However, whether the integration strategy is considered as appropriate depends on the host country (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013). For instance, if the host country supports multiculturalism, it is likely that the integration strategy would be preferred, as it leads to positive adaptive outcomes (Ward, 2013). Moreover, if migrants make the effort to integrate, they are more likely to be viewed as less of a threat by members of the host society which, in turn, leads to improved attitudes towards migrants (Roblain, Azzi, & Licatta, 2016). Conversely, if migrants do not make the effort to integrate, they are likely to be viewed as a threat and are, therefore, more likely to be exposed to negative attitudes by the host society. This in turn influences their adaptation (Roblain et al., 2016).

Previous research shows that integration as an acculturation strategy is “positively related to both identification with the host country and identification with the country of origin; whereas separation is positively related to identification with the country of origin and negatively to identification with the host country” (Badea, Jetten, Iyer, & Er-Rafiy, 2011, p. 593). Similarly, when migrants feel discriminated against, excluded or feel that their existence as migrants is threatened, they tend to choose either marginalisation or separation

strategies (Berry; 2003). Berry, Phinney, Sam, and Vedder (2006) found that when individuals experience discrimination, they are likely to reject close involvement with the host society and are more oriented to their own ethnic group. According to McBrien (2005) and Torres, Driscoll, and Voell (2012), discrimination or stigmatisation can affect the acculturation process in the form of acculturative stress<sup>2</sup>. Acculturative stress may be due to a range of physical, social and psychological adjustment difficulties (e.g., learning a new language and balancing different cultures) which may result in psychological health problems (Berry, 2005; Greenland & Brown, 2005).

Given that both the feeling of humiliation and acculturation strategies result from the interaction between the migrant and his/her social environment, we would argue that acculturation strategies are influenced by the behavioural implications of migrants' experiences of feeling humiliated by members of the host country. More specifically, we would assume that avoidance is related to the acculturation strategies of separation and marginalisation (Hypothesis 2a); whereas approach and forgiveness are related to the acculturation strategies of integration or assimilation (Hypothesis 2b).

### **Sociocultural and Psychological Adaptation**

Searle and Ward (1990) proposed two acculturation outcomes, namely, sociocultural and psychological adaptation. Sociocultural adaptation refers to how an individual is likely to 'fit in' or belong to their new cultural environment (Searle & Ward, 1990; Sam & Berry, 2010). Positive sociocultural adaptation relies on individuals' ability to engage with the hosts and learn new skills (e.g., language) and behaviours. Dahab (2016) found that participants

---

<sup>2</sup> Acculturative stress is the reaction to intercultural or the cultural adaptive process (Berry, 2006). It may be influenced by individual demographics (e.g., age and gender) and personality variables (e.g., self-esteem, cognitive style and motivation) (Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok, 1987).

who assimilated or integrated showed high levels of sociocultural adaptation, while those who separated and marginalised showed low levels of sociocultural adaptation.

Psychological adaptation, on the other hand, refers to the individual's 'well-being' (i.e., how well they are likely to cope and be happy in their new cultural environment). According to Berry (1997) and Ward and Kennedy (1999), migrants who adopt the integration strategy are likely to have high levels of psychological adaptation. Both assimilation and separation strategies lead to moderate psychological adaptation, while marginalisation is associated negatively with psychological adaptation (Berry, 1997).

Thus, the acculturation strategies that migrants adopt are likely to influence how well they adapt. The present study aimed to explore the influences that the acculturation strategies have on the sociocultural and psychological adaptations of migrants. Based on the above-mentioned research, the present study hypothesised that integration would be the most preferred acculturation strategy, whereas assimilation would be the least preferred acculturation strategy (Hypothesis 3a). Secondly, we predicted that integration and assimilation as acculturation strategies would be positively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation, whereas marginalisation and separation would be negatively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation (Hypothesis 3b).

The relationships among acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation do not exist in a social vacuum (Tajfel, 1981). For instance, host countries' policies, practices and attitudes with regard to migrants might be perceived by migrants as rejection, which does not necessarily lead to the emotion of humiliation (as inter-individual difference variable), but rather to a humiliating climate in society (as situational variable).

## **Perceived Rejection by Host Country**

The perceptions of rejection by the host country due to existing policies, practices and attitudes might create a humiliating climate in a society. For instance, discriminatory practices such as referring to migrants in derogatory names (Crush & Ramachandran, 2010) may be perceived as rejection. A common term used to name foreigners within the South African context is ‘Makwerekwere’ which is supposedly onomatopoeic. As the Greeks named foreigners ‘barbarians’ because, for them, different tongues sounded like ‘bar, bar’ South Africans claim to hear ‘kwere, kwere’ when listening to other languages (Tafira, 2011). Being labelled as a ‘Makwerekwere’ might increase migrants’ perceptions of being rejected. Discriminatory practices might also be found in the workplace in that people might not be employed because of their migrant status irrespective of their qualifications. Similarly, being treated differently in public spheres such as hospitals or Home Affairs departments (for instance, by queuing separately) might also contribute to the perceptions of rejection by the host country.

Based on the above- mentioned, the present study tested the hypothesis that the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation is conditional on people’s perceptions of rejection by the host country (Hypothesis 4).

## **Research Context of the Present Study**

Although South Africa is portrayed and likes to portray itself as a country of immigration, its share of foreign-born nationals is comparably low when compared to other countries (see United Nations Population Division, 2015). South Africa’s 2011 Census results showed that there were about 2.2 million people living in South Africa who were born outside of South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2012). Of those born outside of South Africa, 71% were African from Angola, Botswana, DRC, Lesotho, Zambia and Zimbabwe

(Statistics South Africa, 2012). Furthermore, approximately 1.7 million people living in South Africa did not hold South African citizenship, which represented 3.3% of the country's total population (which stood at 51.770 560 in 2011). The United Nations Populations Division (n.a.) estimates that in 2015 approximately 3.14 million foreign-born people were living in South Africa. A more recent Community Survey conducted by Statistics South Africa (2016) reports that the number of foreign-born persons living in South Africa declined from about 2.2 million in 2011 to 1.6 million in 2016. These rather different estimates might be due to different mathematical models used for the estimations and, as Moultrie (2017) suggests, the "likely answer lies between one and three million".

As different as the official figures are, as different are the speculations about the number of illegal immigrants living in South Africa. For instance, the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) once stated that between four and eight million undocumented foreigners apparently live in South Africa (an estimate that was withdrawn by the Human Science Research Council but which is still used in the public discourse); whereas Statistics South Africa estimates the number of undocumented migrants to be in the 500 000 to one million range (Araoye, 2016). These varying estimates, as well as media reports on police operations resulting in deportations of illegal migrants, using headlines such as 'Flushing out illegal immigrants', probably does not contribute to change in attitudes of the South African public which is rather hostile towards migrants.

Although, research on immigration and migrants in South Africa has increased in the last decade (Crush, 2001; Landau & Jacobsen, 2004; Kabwe-Segatti & Landau, 2006; Landau, 2010; Amit; 2011), studies on migrants' acculturation and adaptation within the South African context are rare.

## **The Present Study**

The first objective of the present study was to test the hypothesis that the accompanying emotions of anger and shame regulate the relationship between humiliation and the behavioural responses of approach and avoidance (Hypothesis 1). Second, the present study aimed to explore the relationships between the behavioural implications of humiliation and acculturation strategies. More specifically, we hypothesised that avoidance is related to the acculturation strategies of separation and marginalisation (Hypothesis 2a); whereas approach and forgiveness are related to the acculturation strategies of integration or assimilation (Hypothesis 2b). The third aim of the present study was to explore the influences of acculturation strategies on the sociocultural and psychological adaptations of participants. First, we hypothesised that integration would be the most preferred whereas assimilation would be the least preferred acculturation strategy (Hypothesis 3a). Furthermore, we hypothesised that integration and assimilation as acculturation strategies would be positively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation, whereas marginalisation and separation would be negatively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation (Hypothesis 3b). Lastly, the present study tested the hypothesis that the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural/psychological adaptation is conditional on individuals' perceptions of rejection by the host country (Hypothesis 4).

## **Participants**

All participants were migrants residing in Johannesburg and surrounding areas with different cultural backgrounds. They were identified and recruited using convenient and snowball sampling. Attempts were made to approach migrants at public spaces such as at the Department of Home Affairs Office (Marabastad), their places of work and social media platforms.

In total, 132 participants took part in the present study. Ninety-nine participants completed the survey manually (i.e., paper and pencil), while 33 participants completed the survey online using *Qualtrics*. Of the 132 participants, 78 were from Zimbabwe, eight were from Zambia and Malawi respectively; seven were from Uganda, five from the Democratic Republic of Congo, four from Tanzania, three from Ethiopia and two from Cameroon. There was one participant from each of the following countries: Angola, Burundi, Kenya, Mozambique and Swaziland (12 participants did not indicate their country of origin). Sixty-nine participants were males and 51 were females (12 participants did not indicate their gender). One hundred and sixteen participants indicated their age which ranged from 23 to 52 years ( $M_{age} = 34.21$ , missing: 16). Only a minority of participants ( $N = 24$ ) were married to a South African.

## **Procedure**

In order to conduct this study, ethical clearance was sought from the Department of Psychology at the University of South Africa (UNISA). Both an online and a paper and pencil questionnaire were set up. Following the ethical clearance, participants were contacted and presented with a brief introduction to the study. This contained information about the study, estimated duration of completing the questionnaire and participants' right to withdraw from participating at any time. For the online questionnaire, participants received a link to the study via email or Facebook. The participants were asked to click on a link as a sign of their consent to taking part in the study.

## **Measurements**

The following measures were presented to the participants in the order reported below.

*Humiliation* was measured using an adapted version of the Humiliation Inventory – Cumulative Humiliation Scale (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999). Participants were asked to think about interactions they had had with South Africans and indicate to what extent they had experienced different states. Participants indicated their experiences on a Likert scale (ranging from 1 ‘never’ to 5 ‘all the time’). The following sixteen statements were provided: ‘I have been put down’, ‘I have been discounted or made to feel unworthy’, ‘I have been made to feel insignificant’, ‘I have been made to feel inadequate’, ‘I have been denied access to opportunities’, ‘I have been referred to in derogatory names’, ‘I have been mistrusted’, ‘I have been discriminated against’, ‘I have been made to feel invisible’, ‘I have been harassed’, ‘I have been laughed at’, ‘I have been ignored’, ‘I have felt rejected’, ‘I have been unfairly treated’, ‘I have encountered disapproval’ and ‘I have been made to feel inferior’ were presented ( $\alpha = .95$ ).

*Accommodating emotions of anger and shame* were measured using an adapted version from Van Driel (2011). Participants were asked to think about interactions they had had with South Africans and to indicate to what extent they had felt the emotions listed, using a Likert answer format ranging from 1 ‘not at all’ to 5 ‘extremely’. The emotions listed were ‘angry’, ‘annoyed’, ‘outraged’ ( $\alpha = .88$ ) and ‘shame’, ‘small’, and ‘ashamed’ ( $\alpha = .79$ ). Three positive emotions were added but not used in the further analysis (‘joy’, ‘happy’, ‘proud’).

*Behavioural responses* were measured using an adapted version of Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory consisting of 18 items (McCullough, Root & Cohen, 2006). Participants were asked to think about the humiliating interactions they had had with South Africans and to indicate to what extent they had responded with certain behaviours, using an answer format ranging from 1 ‘not at all’ to 5 ‘to a great extent’.

*Avoidance* was assessed by the following three items: ‘I felt like keeping my distance

between myself and the individual who humiliated me’, ‘I avoided the individual who humiliated me’ and ‘I felt like ending the relationship I had with the individual who humiliated me’ ( $\alpha = .76$ ). *Revenge* was measured by the items: ‘I made sure that they got what they deserved for humiliating me’, ‘I felt like standing up for myself’, ‘I felt like reporting the individual who humiliated me’, and ‘I felt like getting even with the individual who had humiliated me’ ( $\alpha = .72$ ). Lastly, *forgiveness* was measured by the following two items: ‘I felt like apologising to the individual who humiliated me in order to repair the relationship’ and ‘I felt like forgiving the individual who humiliated me’ ( $r = .50, p < .001$ ).

*Acculturation strategies* were assessed using an adapted version of the 16 items Acculturation Attitudes and Expectations – Non-Dominant Group Version: Acculturation Attitudes scale (Berry et al., 1989). Four dimensions of acculturation were measured: separation, marginalisation, integration and assimilation. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed/disagreed with statements, using an answer format ranging from 1 ‘*strongly disagree*’ to 5 ‘*strongly agree*’. *Separation* was measured by the following items: ‘I feel that I should maintain my own cultural traditions and not adapt to those in South Africa’, ‘I prefer social activities which involve members of my home country’, ‘It is more important to me to be fluent in my own language than in South African languages’ and ‘I prefer to have friends from my home country’ ( $\alpha = .66$ ). *Marginalisation* was measured by the items: ‘It is not important to me to be fluent in a language of my home country or a South African language’, ‘I do not want to attend social activities from either my home country or those of South Africa’, ‘I feel that it is not important to maintain my own cultural traditions or to adopt South African cultural traditions’ and ‘I do not want to have friends from both my home country or from South Africa’ ( $\alpha = .42$ ). The corrected item-total correlations were below .3 in three of the four items, which indicates a very low reliability of this sub-scale. We

therefore excluded this sub-scale from any further analysis. *Integration* was measured by the items: ‘It is important to me to be fluent in both the languages of my home country and South African languages’, ‘I feel that I should maintain my own cultural traditions but also adopt those of South Africa’, ‘I prefer social activities which involve both South Africans and people from my home country’ and ‘I prefer to have friends from both my home country and South Africa’ ( $\alpha = .76$ ); whereas *assimilation* was measured by the items: ‘I prefer social activities which involve South Africans only’, ‘I feel that I should adopt the South African cultural traditions and not maintain those of my own’, ‘I prefer to have only South African friends’ and ‘It is more important to me to be fluent in South African languages than languages from my home country’ ( $\alpha = .68$ ).

*Sociocultural Adaptation* was measured using an adapted version of the Revised Sociocultural Adaptation scale (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). Participants were asked to think about their lives in South Africa and thus living within a different culture and learning new skills and behaviours. Seven items were provided and participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed/disagreed with statements, using an answer format ranging from 1 ‘*strongly disagree*’ to 5 ‘*strongly agree*’: ‘I have managed to build and maintain relationships with South Africans’, ‘I have adapted to the noise level in my neighbourhood’, ‘I have managed to work effectively with South Africans’, ‘I have changed my behaviour to suit the South African social norms, rules, attitudes, beliefs and customs’, ‘I understand and speak South African languages’, ‘I have attended or I have participated in South African community activities’ and ‘I have adapted to the pace of life in South Africa’ ( $\alpha = .79$ ).

*Psychological adaptation* was measured using an adapted version of the Brief Psychological Adaptation Scale (Demers & Geeraert, 2013). Participants were asked to use an answer format ranging from 1 ‘*not at all*’ to 5 ‘*to a great extent*’ to indicate the extent they

agreed/disagreed with the following ten statements: ‘I feel excited about being in South Africa’, ‘I feel out of place like I do not fit in with the South African culture’ (reversed), ‘I feel a sense of freedom being away from my home country’, ‘I feel sad to be away from my home country’ (reversed), ‘I feel nervous about how to behave in certain situations’ (reversed), ‘I feel lonely without my family and friends from my home country around me’ (reversed), ‘I feel curious about things that are different in South Africa’, ‘I feel homesick when I think of my home country’ (reversed), ‘I feel frustrated by difficulties adapting to South Africa’ (reversed) and ‘I feel happy with my day-to-day life in South Africa’ ( $\alpha = .81$ ).

*Perceived rejection by the host country* was measured using the adapted version of Measuring Dimensions of Perceived Discrimination Subscale of Blatant Individual Discrimination (Molero, Recio, Garcia-Ael, Fuster, & Sanjuan, 2013). Participants were provided with 11 items and an answer format ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*): ‘I have felt personally rejected for being a migrant’, ‘I have been treated unfairly for being a migrant’, ‘I have been discriminated against at work for being a migrant’, ‘I have been discriminated against in the health sphere for being a migrant’, ‘I have been discriminated against at government departments (e.g., Department of Home Affairs & Police station) for being a migrant’, ‘I have been rejected in my daily social relations or interactions for being a migrant’, ‘I do not feel accepted in South Africa because of my status as a migrant’, ‘Stereotypes about migrants have not affected me personally’ (reversed), ‘I never worry that my behaviours will be viewed as stereotypically that of a migrant’ (reversed), ‘I often think that South Africans are unfairly accused of being xenophobic’ (reversed) and ‘Most South Africans have a problem viewing migrants as equals’ ( $\alpha = .86$ ).

## Results

### Preliminary Analysis

Table 1 summarises the means, standard deviations, number of participants and the inter-correlations among the assessed variables. The preliminary analysis revealed that humiliation was strongly correlated with both shame and anger, suggesting that humiliation is accommodated by those emotions, which is in line with previous findings (Vorster, 2017). Humiliation was also strongly correlated with avoidance, moderately with revenge and rather weakly with forgiveness. Surprisingly, revenge and avoidance correlated strongly with each other, which contradicts previous findings (Vorster, 2017).

Humiliation correlated positively with separation and negatively with integration as acculturation strategies. The former corresponds with findings of Berry et al. (2006), showing, for instance, that experienced discrimination leads migrants to reject close involvement with the host society, while the latter corresponds with findings of Badea et al. (2011) who showed that experienced rejection (i.e., humiliation) influences migrants' integration negatively. Moreover, humiliation was negatively correlated with sociocultural and psychological adaptation. These results correspond with the findings of Sam and Berry (2010), who showed that high discrimination of migrants predicts low levels of interaction between them and the host society, thereby predicting poor levels of adaptation. Lastly, humiliation correlated positively with perceived rejection from the host country.

The above-mentioned strong correlation between avoidance and revenge needed further consideration. We therefore decided to conduct an explorative factor analysis using maximum likelihood. Although the present sample consisted of only 132 participants, which is smaller than the commonly recommended 300 participants, (Field, 2013, p. 684), the Kaiser-Meyer-Okin (KMO) measures did, however, verify the sampling adequacy for the

analysis. The KMO value for individual variables was larger than .6, which is considered acceptable and supports our confidence that the sample size is adequate (Field, 2013, p. 685). The Bartlett's tests of sphericity were statistically significant, indicating that correlations among the items were sufficiently large for a maximum likelihood test. Two factors with an Eigenvalue larger than 1 were extracted, which explained 46.77% of variance. Factor 1 captured all items measuring either avoidance or revenge, whereas Factor 2 captured the two items measuring forgiveness. Consequently, two new variables were formed to assess behavioural responses: *relationship-challenging* and *relationship-maintaining* responses.

*Relationship-challenging response* consisted of the variables: 'I felt like keeping my distance between myself and the individual who humiliated me', 'I avoided the individual who humiliated me', 'I felt like ending the relationship I had with the individual who humiliated me', 'I made sure that they got what they deserved for humiliating me', 'I felt like standing up for myself', 'I felt like getting even with the individual who had humiliated me' and 'I felt like reporting the individual who humiliated me' ( $\alpha = .86$ ); whereas *relationship-maintaining response* consisted of the variables: 'I felt like apologising to the individual who humiliated me in order to repair the relationship' and 'I felt like forgiving the individual who humiliated me' ( $r = .50, p < .001$ ).

Results of the inter-correlations (see lower part of Table 1) showed that the relationship between humiliation and the relationship-challenging response was statistically significant, but the relationship between humiliation and the relationship-maintaining response was not statistically significant. There was a strong significant correlation between anger and the relationship-challenging response, but there was no significant relationship between anger and the relationship-maintaining response. Shame, on the other hand, was

moderately correlated with both the relationship-challenging and the relationship-maintaining responses.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Inter-correlations of Variables

|                                  | 1    | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8       | 9      | 10      | 11      | 12      | 13 | 14 |
|----------------------------------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|----|----|
| <i>Means</i>                     | 2.95 | 2.85   | 2.65   | 3.06   | 2.62   | 2.83   | 3.10   | 3.85    | 2.02   | 3.56    | 3.07    | 3.48    |    |    |
| <i>SD</i>                        | 0.87 | 1.11   | 1.06   | 1.17   | 1.04   | 1.04   | 0.91   | 0.83    | 0.82   | 0.82    | 0.80    | 0.81    |    |    |
| <i>N</i>                         | 132  | 130    | 130    | 126    | 126    | 126    | 122    | 122     | 122    | 124     | 123     | 122     |    |    |
| 1. Humiliation                   | ---  | .64*** | .66*** | .54*** | .44*** | .22*   | .41*** | -.28**  | -.16   | -.35*** | -.48*** | .70***  |    |    |
| 2. Anger                         | ---  |        | .58*** | .53*** | .44*** | .03    | .27**  | -.22*   | -.14   | -.41*** | -.39*** | .65***  |    |    |
| 3. Shame                         |      | ---    |        | .41*** | .27*** | .36*** | .42*** | -.07    | -.07   | -.40*** | .53***  | .53***  |    |    |
| 4. Avoidance                     |      |        | ---    |        | .56*** | .17    | .30**  | -.14    | .20*   | -.22*   | -.31*** | .49***  |    |    |
| 5. Revenge                       |      |        |        | ---    |        | .17    | .33*** | -.39*** | -.11   | -.26**  | -.27**  | .44***  |    |    |
| 6. Forgiveness                   |      |        |        |        | ---    |        | -.00   | -.21*   | -.13   | -.00    | -.36*** | .30**   |    |    |
| 7. Acculturation<br>Separation   |      |        |        |        |        | ---    |        | -.39*** | -.05   | -.33*** | .35***  | .33***  |    |    |
| 8. Acculturation<br>Integration  |      |        |        |        |        |        | ---    |         | -.26** | .30**   | -.06    | -.12    |    |    |
| 9. Acculturation<br>Assimilation |      |        |        |        |        |        |        | ---     | -.20*  | .29**   | .32***  |         |    |    |
| 10. Sociocultural<br>Adaptation  |      |        |        |        |        |        |        |         | ----   |         | .60***  | -.61*** |    |    |
| 11. Psychological<br>Adaptation  |      |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |        | ----    |         | -.43*** |    |    |

|  |        |        |        |  |        |        |      |        |         |        |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|------|--------|---------|--------|
| 12. Perceived rejection<br>from the host country |        |        |        |  |        |        |      |        |         | ---    |
| 13 Relationship-<br>Challenging                  | .55*** | .54*** | .38*** |  | .36*** | -.31** | -.17 | -.27** | -.33*** | .52*** |
| 14 Relationship-<br>Maintaining                  | .10    | -.09   | .32*** |  | -.07   | .27**  | -.03 | .08    | -.28**  | .14    |

Note: \*\*\* p < .001, \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05

## Hypothesis Testing

### *The regulating role of anger and shame in the relationship between humiliation and behavioural responses*

Firstly, we proposed that the accompanying emotions of anger and shame regulate the relationship between humiliation and the behavioural responses of approach and avoidance, in that humiliation accommodated by shame will result in avoidance, whereas humiliation accommodated by anger will result in revenge (Hypothesis 1). Given that participants did seemingly not discriminate between avoidance and revenge but rather between relationship-challenging and relationship-maintaining responses, we abstained from testing the more specific hypothesis that humiliation accommodated by shame would result in avoidance, whereas humiliation accommodated by anger would result in revenge. Alternatively, we tested the more general hypothesis that the accommodating emotions of humiliation regulate the behavioural responses (Hypothesis 1).

To test the rather general hypothesis statistically, we estimated two models with two intervening variables, namely, anger and shame, humiliation as an independent variable and the behavioural responses of relationship-challenging and -maintaining as dependent variables, respectively (see Table 2). The two models were estimated using *Process* (# Model 4, Hayes, 2013; Hayes, 2009) through the analysis of specific indirect effects using the bootstrapping method with 10 000 iterations.

The model for the *relationship-challenging response* was statistically significant,  $R^2 = .3646$ ,  $F(3, 122) = 23.3398$ ,  $p < .001$ . The estimates of the specific indirect effects, using a 95% bias corrected confidence interval, suggest that the relationship-challenging response was both directly predicted by humiliation and indirectly predicted by humiliation through anger (see Table 2). The indirect effect of humiliation on the relationship-challenging

response through anger was qualified by the Normal Theory Test for specific indirect effects in that anger,  $Effect = 0.2409$ ,  $SE = 0.074$ ,  $Z = 3.254$ ,  $p = .0011$ , but not shame, reached statistical significance,  $Effect = -0.046$ ,  $SE = 0.074$ ,  $Z = -0.603$ ,  $p = .5468$ . The comparison of the specific indirect effects using the contrast definition of the difference between anger and shame,  $b = 0.2855$ ,  $SE = .1271$ , 95% CI [0217, .5240], shows that the indirect effect of humiliation through anger,  $b = 0.2409$ ,  $SE = .0854$ , 95% CI [.0814, .4213], is significantly larger than through shame,  $b = -0.0446$ ,  $SE = .0784$ , 95% CI [-.1862, .1193] (see Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Table 2. Model for Relationship-Challenging Responses

| <u>Outcome: Anger</u>                    |       |       |        |       |        |        |
|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
|  | Beta  | SE    | T      | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | .4352 | .2779 | 1.5660 | .1199 | -.1148 | .9852  |
| Humiliation                              | .8169 | .0895 | 9.1302 | .0000 | .6398  | .9940  |
| <u>Outcome: Shame</u>                    |       |       |        |       |        |        |
|  | Beta  | SE    | T      | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | .2957 | .2541 | 1.1638 | .2467 | -.2072 | .7987  |
| Humiliation                              | .7989 | .0818 | 9.7646 | .0000 | .6370  | .9609  |
| <u>Outcome: Relationship-challenging</u> |       |       |        |       |        |        |
|  | Beta  | SE    | T      | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | .8617 | .2546 | 3.3843 | .0010 | .3576  | 1.3657 |

|             |        |       |        |       |        |       |
|-------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| Anger       | .2949  | .0842 | 3.5032 | .0006 | .1282  | .4615 |
| Shame       | -.0559 | .0920 | -.6069 | .5451 | -.2381 | .1264 |
| Humiliation | .4186  | .1186 | 3.5296 | .0006 | .1838  | .6534 |

Total, direct and indirect effects

| <u>Total effect x on y</u>     | Effect | SE      | T         | P         | LLCI  | ULCI  |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|
|                                | .6149  | .0843   | 7.2938    | .0000     | .4480 | .7818 |
| <u>Direct effects x on y</u>   | Effect | SE      | T         | P         | LLCI  | ULCI  |
|                                | .4186  | .1186   | 3.5296    | .0006     | .1838 | .6534 |
| <u>Indirect effects x on y</u> | Effect | Boot SE | Boot LLCI | Boot ULCI |       |       |
| Anger                          | .2409  | .0854   | .0814     | .4213     |       |       |
| Shame                          | .0446  | .0784   | -.1862    | .1193     |       |       |

The model for *relationship-maintaining response* was also statistically significant,  $R^2 = .2036$ ,  $F(3, 122) = 10.39$ ,  $p < .001$ . Different from the previous model, the estimates of the specific indirect effects suggest that the relationship-maintaining response was indirectly predicted by humiliation through both anger and shame (see Table 3). These results were qualified by the Normal Theory Test for specific indirect effects because anger, *Effect* = -0.348, *SE* = 0.1045, *Z* = -3.329, *p* = .0009, and shame reached statistical significance, *Effect* = 0.504, *SE* = 0.1161, *Z* = 4.34, *p* = .0000. The comparison of the specific indirect effects using the contrast definition of the difference between anger and shame, *b* = -0.8519, *SE* = 0.1331,

95% CI [-1.1212, -.5986], revealed that the indirect effect of humiliation on the relationship-maintaining response through shame,  $b = 0.504$   $SE = 0.099$ , 95% CI [.3175, .7065], is significantly stronger than the indirect negative effect through anger,  $b = -0.3480$ ,  $SE = 0.098$ , 95% CI [-.5561, -.1688] (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Table 3. Mediation Model for Relationship-Maintaining Responses

| <u>Outcome: Anger</u>                    |        |       |         |       |        |        |
|--|--------|-------|---------|-------|--------|--------|
|  | Beta   | SE    | T       | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | .4352  | .2779 | 1.5660  | .1199 | -.1148 | .9852  |
| Humiliation                              | .8169  | .0895 | 9.1302  | .0000 | .6398  | .9940  |
| <u>Outcome: Shame</u>                    |        |       |         |       |        |        |
|  | Beta   | SE    | T       | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | .2957  | .2541 | 1.1638  | .2467 | -.2072 | .7987  |
| Humiliation                              | .7989  | .0818 | 9.7646  | .0000 | .6370  | .9609  |
| <u>Outcome: Relationship-Maintaining</u> |        |       |         |       |        |        |
|  | Beta   | SE    | T       | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant                                 | 2.0256 | .3583 | 5.6536  | .0000 | 1.3163 | 2.7348 |
| Anger                                    | -.4260 | .1184 | -3.5968 | .0005 | -.6605 | -.1915 |
| Shame                                    | .6307  | .1295 | 4.8690  | .0000 | .3742  | .8871  |
| Humiliation                              | -.0092 | .1669 | -.0551  | .9562 | -.3396 | .3212  |

| <u>Total, direct and indirect effects</u> |        |         |        |        |        |       |
|---|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| <u>Total effect x</u>                     | Effect | SE      | T      | P      | LLCI   | ULCI  |
| <u>on y</u>                               |        | .1260   | 1.1640 | .2467  | -.1027 | .3960 |
| <u>Direct effects</u>                     | Effect | SE      | T      | P      | LLCI   | ULCI  |
| <u>x on y</u>                             |        | .1669   | .0551  | .9562  | -.3396 | .3212 |
| <u>Indirect</u>                           | Effect | Boot SE | Boot   | Boot   | LLCI   | ULCI  |
| <u>effects x on y</u>                     |        |         |        |        |        |       |
| Anger                                     |        | .0981   | -.5561 | -.1688 |        |       |
| Shame                                     |        | .0993   | .3175  | .7065  |        |       |

The first aim of the study was to test the hypothesis that the accompanying emotions of anger and shame regulate the relationship between humiliation and relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses (Hypothesis 1). Results of the first model partially supported the hypothesis, because humiliation predicted the relationship-challenging response, not only indirectly through anger, but also directly. This suggests that participants are likely to react with relationship-challenging behaviour to the feeling of being humiliated, regardless of whether they feel angry or not. Shame, on the other hand, did not influence the relationship between humiliation and relationship-challenging responses. Results of the second model supported the proposed hypothesis in that the relationship-maintaining

response was predicted by humiliation, through shame positively and through anger negatively.

As the present study assessed humiliation as result of continuous interactions between the participants and members of their host country, we assumed that the relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses represent not just action tendencies towards a concrete experience of humiliation, but might characterise the relationship between participants and members of the host country. Consequently, we would assume that these relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses influence migrants' acculturation strategies.

### ***The relationships between behavioural responses of humiliation and acculturation strategies***

The second aim of the study was to explore the implications of the behavioural responses to humiliation for the acculturation strategies. We regressed the acculturation strategy of separation on the relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses using bootstrapping with 10 000 iterations. The model was significant,  $F(2, 119) = 9.344, p < .001$ , explaining 12.1% of variance. Separation was predicted by the relationship-challenging response,  $B = .339, SE = .080, 95\% CI [.177, .494]$ , but not by the relationship-maintaining response,  $B = -.061, SE = .069, 95\% CI [-.194, .078]$ . These results suggest that the relationship-challenging responses to humiliation are likely to result in separation as acculturation strategy.

Further, we regressed integration as an acculturation strategy on the relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses, using again bootstrapping with 10 000 iterations. The model was significant,  $F(2, 119) = 12.287, p < .001$ , explaining 15.7% of variance.

Integration was predicted by both the relationship-challenging response,  $B = -.268$ ,  $SE = .087$ , 95% CI [-.433, -.092], and by the relationship-maintaining response,  $B = .189$ ,  $SE = .055$ , 95% CI [.071, .289]. These results suggest that relationship-challenging responses are likely to prevent integration, whereas relationship-maintaining responses are likely to increase integration as acculturation strategy.

Lastly, we regressed assimilation as acculturation strategy on the relationship-challenging and -maintaining responses, using bootstrapping with 10 000 iterations. The model was, however, not significant,  $F(2, 119) = 1.738$ ,  $p = .180$ , which suggests that neither the relationship-challenging nor -maintaining responses influence assimilation as acculturation strategy.

The results suggest that the acculturation strategies of separation and integration are indeed related to the behavioural implications of humiliation, in that relationship-challenging responses lead participants to rather separate and less to integrate, whereas the relationship-maintaining responses lead participants to integrate.

### ***Relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation***

The third aim of the present study was to explore the influences of acculturation strategies on the sociocultural and psychological adaptations of participants. First, we hypothesised that integration would be the most preferred acculturation strategy, whereas assimilation would be the least preferred acculturation strategy (Hypothesis 3a). Secondly, we hypothesised that integration and assimilation as acculturation strategies would be positively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation, whereas marginalisation and

separation would be negatively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation (Hypothesis 3b).

To test Hypothesis 3a, we conducted a General Linear Model with repeated measures, comparing the scores of integration ( $M = 3.84$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ ) with separation ( $M = 3.09$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ) and assimilation ( $M = 2.02$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ) and testing for within-subject effects. The latter was significant (assuming Sphericity),  $F(2, 242) = 114.38$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\text{Partial Eta}^2 = .49$ . The *post hoc* test using Bonferroni revealed that integration was significantly higher than separation ( $p < .001$ ) and assimilation ( $p < .001$ ). Moreover, separation was significantly higher than assimilation ( $p < .001$ ). These results support previous research that integration is the most preferred acculturation strategy, whereas assimilation is the least preferred acculturation strategy.

The hypothesis that integration and assimilation as acculturation strategies would be positively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation, whereas marginalisation and separation would be negatively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation (Hypothesis 3b) was tested by estimating two multiple regression models using sociocultural and psychological adaptation as dependent variables, respectively, and using the bootstrapping method with 10 000 iterations.

The model predicting sociocultural adaptation was statistically significant,  $F(3, 118) = 10.401$ ,  $p < .001$ , and explained 18.9% of variance. Sociocultural adaptation was negatively explained by separation,  $B = -.188$ ,  $SE = .091$ ,  $p < .05$ , 95% CI [-.367, -.010], positively by assimilation,  $B = .264$ ,  $SE = .087$ ,  $p < .05$ , 95% CI [.094, .433], and positively by integration,  $B = .290$ ,  $SE = .116$ ,  $p < .05$ , 95% CI [.072, .527].

The model predicting psychological adaptation was also statistically significant,  $F(3, 118) = 9.33, p < .001$ , and explained 17.1% of variance. Psychological adaptation was negatively explained by separation,  $B = -.228, SE = .079, p < .001$ , 95% CI [-.443, -.132], and positively by assimilation,  $B = .258, SE = .100, p < .05$ , 95% CI [.057, .446]. Integration did not influence psychological adaptation in the present study,  $B = .000, SE = .086 p = .998$ , 95% CI [-.173, .162].

These results suggest that the more participants separate, the less they adapt, both socioculturally and psychologically; that is to say, the less they are able to establish meaningful relationships in this environment, the less they feel personally satisfied in their new environment. Yet the more participants assimilate, the more they adapt both socioculturally and psychologically. This means that those migrants who give up their cultural heritage in order to become part of the host culture experience personal satisfaction and meaningful relationships in their new environment. The results further suggest that maintaining one's cultural heritage and identifying with the host culture leads to meaningful relationships with members of the host country on the one hand, but not necessarily to personal satisfaction on the other.

As we argued that the acculturation strategies are influenced by the behavioural implications of humiliation, we would argue that the relationships between acculturation strategies and the sociocultural and psychological adaptations are influenced by the humiliating climate in society.

***Perceived rejection from the host country as moderator of the effect of acculturation strategies on sociocultural and psychological adaptation***

The final aim of the present study was therefore to test whether the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation is conditional on individuals' perceptions of rejection by the host country. We tested the proposed hypothesis that the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural/psychological adaptation is conditional on the perceived rejection by the host country by estimating six moderation models using *Process* (# Model 1, Hayes, 2013) and the bootstrapping method with 10 000 iterations.

***Sociocultural adaptation model***

In the first model, integration was entered as an independent variable, sociocultural adaptation was entered as a dependent variable, and perceived rejection from the host country was entered as a moderator. Separation and assimilation were controlled for. Results showed that the model was statistically significant,  $F(5, 116) = 13.429, p < .001$ , and explained 36.66% of variance. Table 2 reports the main and interaction effects. As expected, integration,  $B = .370, SE = .088, 95\% CI [.1943, .5466]$ , as well as assimilation,  $B = .278, SE = .088, 95\% CI [.1030, .4531]$  had a significant main effect on sociocultural adaptation. Perceived rejection from the host country had a significant, negative main effect on sociocultural adaptation,  $B = -.268, SE = .085, 95\% CI [-.4386, -.0987]$ . Separation did not have a main effect on sociocultural adaptation (see Table 4). The interaction term between integration and perceived rejection from the host country was significant,  $B = -.369, SE = .095, 95\% CI [-.5582, -.1808]$ , and increased significantly the explained variance in the dependent variable,  $\Delta R^2 = .0821, F(1, 116) = 15.036, p < .001$ . The simple slopes analysis, as reported in Table 4 (lower part), shows that the relationship between integration and

sociocultural adaptation is strongest if perceived rejection from the host country is low (1 SD below mean) and moderate if it is at mean value. However, the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation becomes non-significant if perceived rejection from the host country is strong (1 SD above mean).

Table 4. Conditional effect of perceived rejection from the host country on the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation with assimilation and separation entered as covariates

| <u>Outcome: Sociocultural Adaptation</u>  |        |       |         |       |        |        |
|---|--------|-------|---------|-------|--------|--------|
|   | Beta   | SE    | T       | P     | LLCI   | ULCI   |
| Constant  | 3.329  | .3128 | 10.6559 | .0000 | 2.7134 | 3.9523 |
| Assimilation  | .2780  | .0884 | 3.1454  | .0021 | .1030  | .4531  |
| Integration   | .3705  | .0889 | 4.1655  | .0001 | .1943  | .5466  |
| Separation  | -.1188 | .0768 | -1.5472 | .1245 | -.2708 | .0333  |
| Perceived<br>rejection from the<br>host country   | -.2686 | .0858 | -3.1311 | .0022 | -.4386 | -.0987 |
| Assimilation x<br>Perceived<br>rejection from the<br>host country   | -.3695 | .0953 | -3.8776 | .0002 | -.5582 | -1.808 |
| Conditional effect of integration on sociocultural adaptation at the values of perceived<br>rejection from the host country |        |       |         |       |        |        |
| 1 SD below mean   | .6692  | .1352 | 4.9486  | .0000 | .4014  | .9371  |
| At mean   | .3705  | .0889 | 4.1655  | .0001 | .1943  | .5466  |
| 1 SD above mean   | .0717  | .0970 | 0.7397  | .4609 | -.1203 | .2638  |

In the second model, assimilation was entered as an independent variable, sociocultural adaptation was entered as a dependent variable, and perceived rejection by the host country was entered as a moderator. Integration and separation were controlled for. The model was significant,  $F(5, 116) = 10.005, p < .001$ , and explained 30.12% of variance. As expected, assimilation,  $B = .192, SE = .090, 95\% CI [.0149, .3682]$ , integration,  $B = .239, SE = .090, 95\% CI [.0623, .4155]$ , and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = -.333, SE = .090, 95\% CI [-.5111, -.1553]$ , had a significant main effect on sociocultural adaptation. Separation did not have a significant main effect on sociocultural adaptation,  $B = -.099, SE = .081, 95\% CI [-.2601, .0608]$ . The interaction term between assimilation and perceived rejection from the host country was not significant either,  $B = .158, SE = .095, 95\% CI [-.0301, .3465]$ .

In the third model, separation was entered as an independent variable, sociocultural adaptation as a dependent variable, and perceived rejection from the host country as a moderator, while assimilation and integration were controlled for. The model was significant,  $F(5, 116) = 9.2262, p < .001$ , and explained 28.45% of variance. Separation,  $B = -.113, SE = .082, 95\% CI [-.2751, .0491]$ , and assimilation,  $B = .160, SE = .090, 95\% CI [-.0167, .3373]$ , did not have a significant main effect on sociocultural adaptation. Integration,  $B = .259, SE = .090, 95\% CI [.0802, .4376]$ , and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = -.315, SE = .090, 95\% CI [-.4952, -.1357]$ , had a significant main effect on sociocultural adaptation. However, the interaction term between separation and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = -.002, SE = .084, 95\% CI [-.1641, .1671]$ , was not significant.

These results suggest that only the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation was found to be conditional on perceived rejection from the host country, or, to put it differently, the acculturation strategy of integration leads to sociocultural adaptation

under the conditions that participants perceive no rejection by members of the host country. The results that perceived rejection from the host country did not moderate the relationships between assimilation and sociocultural adaptation as well as separation and sociocultural adaptation might not be surprising. First, migrants' meaningful relationships with members of the host country due to assimilation might not be influenced by perceived rejection from the host country, because they share these sentiments as members of the host country or, because, as new members of the host country, they realise that these sentiments were actually never shared amongst members of the host country.

### ***Psychological adaptation model***

Because previous analysis showed that integration did not predict psychological adaptation, we abstained from testing whether perceived rejection from the host country would moderate this relationship.

In the next model, assimilation was entered as an independent variable, psychological adaptation as a dependent variable, perceived rejection from the host country as a moderator, and integration and separation as covariates. The model was significant,  $F(5, 116) = 16.466$ ,  $p < .001$ , and explained 41.51% of variance. Only separation,  $B = -.176$ ,  $SE = .071$ , 95% CI [-.3147, -.0355], and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = -.499$ ,  $SE = .078$ , 95% CI [-.6536, -.3429], but not assimilation,  $B = .070$ ,  $SE = .080$ , 95% CI [-.0844, .2241], and integration,  $B = -.038$ ,  $SE = .080$ , 95% CI [-.1925, .1160] had a main effect on psychological adaptation. However, the interaction term between assimilation and perceived rejection from the host country was not significant,  $B = -.102$ ,  $SE = .083$ , 95% CI [-.2668, .0620].

The results were similar for the model which tested whether the relationship between separation and psychological adaptation is conditional on perceived rejection from the host country. Separation was entered as an independent variable, psychological adaptation as a

dependent variable, perceived rejection from the host country as a moderator, and integration and assimilation as covariates. The model,  $F(5, 116) = 9.226, p < .001$ , explained 28.45% of variance. In this model, integration,  $B = .259, SE = .090, 95\% CI [.0802, .4376]$ , and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = -.315, SE = .090, 95\% CI [-.4952, -.1357]$ , had a significant main effect. Neither separation,  $B = -.113, SE = .082, 95\% CI [-.2751, .0491]$ , assimilation,  $B = .160, SE = .090, 95\% CI [-.0167, .3373]$ , nor the interaction term between separation and perceived rejection from the host country,  $B = .002, SE = .084, 95\% CI [-.1641, .1671]$ , had a significant effect.

These results suggest that perceived rejection from the host country does not influence the relationships between acculturation strategies and psychological adaptation, that is to say, whether assimilation is positively, or separation is negatively, related to psychological adaptation, is not dependent on how migrants perceive being rejected by the host country.

## **General Discussion**

The overall aim of this study was to extend our understanding of whether humiliation influences the acculturation and adaptation processes of migrants. We first tested the more general hypothesis that the accompanying emotions of humiliation regulate the behavioural responses towards this emotion (Hypothesis 1). The preliminary analysis suggested to distinguishing between relationship-challenging and relationship-maintaining responses, rather than between the commonly distinguished responses of approach and avoidance. The results showed that humiliation predicted the relationship-challenging response not only indirectly through anger, but also directly. On the other hand, shame did not influence the relationship between humiliation and relationship-challenging responses. Results further showed that the relationship-maintaining response was predicted by humiliation through shame positively and through anger negatively. These results provide further evidence for the regulatory role of the accompanying emotions of anger and shame in the relationship between humiliation and the behavioural responses.

Secondly, we tested the hypothesis that the behavioural implications of humiliation are related to the acculturation strategies. The results suggest that the acculturation strategies of separation and integration were indeed related to the behavioural implications of humiliation in that relationship-challenging responses were likely to lead participants to separate and integrate less; whereas the relationship-maintaining responses were likely to lead participants to integrate.

Thirdly, we explored the influences of acculturation strategies on the sociocultural and psychological adaptations. First, we hypothesised that integration would be the most preferred, whereas assimilation would be the least preferred acculturation strategy (Hypothesis 3a). The results of the present study confirmed this assumption and thus

replicated previous findings (Berry, 1999; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013; Ward, 2009; Ward & Kus, 2012). Furthermore, we hypothesised that integration and assimilation as acculturation strategies would be positively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation, whereas marginalisation and separation would be negatively related to sociocultural and psychological adaptation (Hypothesis 3b). The results showed that the more participants assimilate, the more they adapt both socioculturally and psychologically; whereas the more participants separate, the less they adapt socioculturally and psychologically. The results also showed that although integration, that is to say, maintaining one's cultural heritage and identifying with the host culture, leads to meaningful relationships with members of the host country (sociocultural adaptation), it does not necessarily lead to personal satisfaction (psychological adaptation).

Lastly, the present study tested whether the relationship between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptation is conditional on individuals' perceptions of rejection by the host country. The relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation was the only relationship which was found to be conditional on perceived rejection from the host country, in that the acculturation strategy of integration was significantly related to sociocultural adaptation under the conditions that participants perceive no rejection by members of the host country. The results further showed that perceived rejection from the host country did not moderate the relationships between assimilation and sociocultural adaptation, as well as between separation and sociocultural adaptation.

Moreover, the results imply that perceived rejection from the host country does not influence the relationships between acculturation strategies and psychological adaptation.

Various contributions have been made by the present research. The first contribution refers to research addressing explanations for the seemingly contradicting responses to

humiliation. Vorster and Dumont (under review) proposed that humiliation as a blended emotion occurs in conjunction with other emotions such as anger and shame (Fernandez et al., 2015, Van Driel, 2011) and that these accompanying emotions play a regulatory role in responding to humiliation. They showed, for instance, that when humiliation was accompanied by anger, it led to the tendency to approach, while humiliation accompanied by shame led to the tendency to avoid (Vorster & Dumont, under review). The present research supports these findings in a different intergroup context (previous studies used, for instance, gender and nationality, see Vorster & Dumont, under review) and thus provides further evidence that the seemingly contradicting behavioural implications of humiliation as a blended emotion are contingent upon the emotions that accompany humiliation. Different from previous studies, however, was that the present study did not replicate the distinction between avoidance and approach responses. As outlined elsewhere, the responses in the present study referred to relationship-challenging (which included the measures of avoidance and approach) and relationship-maintaining responses (which included the measure of forgiveness). We would argue that participants in the present study did not distinguish between avoidance and approach as responses to humiliation might have to do with the particular social context. Behavioural responses to emotions such as humiliation serve not only to get rid of this negative emotion, but more so to regulate the relationship between the humiliator and the humiliated. Avoidance means that the humiliated withdraws from the relationship, whereas approach means that the humiliated aims to re-establish the relationship. In both cases, the current relationship between the humiliator and the humiliated is challenged. Given the situation of migrants in a country such as South Africa, the relevant question might not be *how* they challenge the relationship between themselves as the humiliated and members of the host country as humiliators, but rather the question of *that* they challenge this relationship. Or, to put it differently, in a context in which our participants

find themselves, it might be that appropriate responses to humiliation are not construed as ends on a continuum (ranging from approach to avoidance), but rather as true contradicting behaviours. The results of the present study showed that the accompanying emotions of anger and shame also regulate the relationship between humiliation and relationship-challenging and relationship-maintaining responses. Thus, these results should be seen as further evidence that these accompanying emotions play a regulatory role in responding to humiliation.

A second contribution of the present study is to extend our understanding about how acculturation strategies, which are largely a result of daily and continuous interactions between the migrant and his/her social environment (Horenczyk, 1997), are influenced by the interruption of these daily and continuous interactions due to the experiences of humiliation. The results showed that relationship-challenging responses are positively associated to separation and negatively to integration acculturation strategies, whereas relationship-maintaining responses are positively related to integration acculturation strategies. The former means that individuals who respond to humiliating interactions with relationship-challenging responses are more likely to reject close involvement with the host society and are more oriented to their own ethnic group (Berry et al., 2006). The latter means that participants who forgive their humiliator are more likely to integrate, as forgiveness makes individuals less avoiding and less vengeful (Muenster & Lotto, 2010). Another interesting result was that assimilation was not influenced by either relationship-challenging responses or relationship-maintaining responses. Assimilation not only means that migrants have a strong relationship with the host society, but also that they view themselves psychologically as members of the host country. It might be that participants who assimilate to the host country are less likely to be or to feel humiliated by others, because of their migrant status.

They may simply consider themselves not as migrants. However, future research needs to systematically test this proposal.

The third contribution refers to research addressing the relationship between acculturation strategies and adaptation. First, the present study replicated findings of previous research in that integration was the most preferred (Berry, 1999; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013; Ward, 2009; Ward & Kus, 2012), whereas assimilation would be the least preferred acculturation strategy (Berry et al., 1989). Secondly, the present study not only replicated previous findings addressing the interplay between acculturation strategies and sociocultural and psychological adaptations, but also explored the role of the social context in influencing this interplay. Previous research has shown that migrants who adopt the integration strategy are likely to have high levels of sociocultural adaption (Dahab; 2016) and psychological adaptation (Berry, 1997; Ward & Kennedy; 1999). The present study found only a relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation. This suggests that individuals who maintain their cultural heritage and identify with the host culture are more likely to ‘fit in’ to their new but do not ‘cope well’ or feel satisfied with their new cultural environment (Searle & Ward, 1990; Sam & Berry, 2010). However, the results also showed that the relationship between integration and sociocultural adaptation is contingent upon the absence of perceived rejection from the host country.

As with any research, the present study has its limitations. The first limitation refers to the methodological problem to conclude causal relationships based on cross-sectional data. Although, the present study which used a cross-sectional research design assessed the measures in the logical order as theoretically assumed, any conclusion assuming causality needs to be treated with caution. To overcome this problem, it would be more appropriate to

apply a longitudinal research design in future research which could examine cause and effect relationships and changes over time (Caruana, Roman, Hernández-Sánchez, & Solli; 2015).

The second limitation is related to the measurements which were used in the present study. As outlined, participants did not distinguish between avoidance and approach responses, as the results of the explorative factor analysis revealed. We argued that this might be due to the particular context of migrants in South Africa. One could also argue that the inability of participants to distinguish between avoidance and approach responses might be due to measurements issues. However, the latter is rather unlikely because these measures were found reliable and valid in previous studies conducted in South Africa (Vorster, 2017). Moreover, the present study could not test the influences of marginalisation on both sociocultural and psychological adaptation, because this sub-scale showed too low reliability. Previous studies that measured marginalisation encountered similar problems, as their marginalisation scale had poor reliability and validity (Unger et al., 2002).

The third limitation refers to the different sampling strategies which were used to recruit participants in the present study. For the paper and pencil questionnaire, convenient sampling was used, while the online survey used snowball sampling. The use of both paper/pencil and internet-based questionnaire and the use of these two different sampling strategies might have led to other limitations such as the non-randomisation of items within the respective measures, as well as skewed composition of the sample which predominantly consisted of migrants from Zimbabwe.

Lastly, the study was faced with language barriers. The questionnaire which was set up in English required that participants had knowledge of this language in order to participate in the survey. Although English is commonly used in South Africa as the official language, it cannot be assumed that the majority of migrants are proficient in this language. Hence, future

studies should be cognisant about that, in order to allow participants to participate under equal conditions of language proficiency.

Overall, the present research showed the implications of the experience of humiliation and perceived rejection of the host country for the acculturation and adaptation processes of migrants. We would argue that two general strategies should be applied in order to reduce the South Africans' rejection of migrants (Crush, 2001; Everatt, 2011; Hall, 2015; Mattes et al., 1999; Misago et al., 2010; SAMP, 2008), as well as migrants' perception of being rejected by South Africans. The first strategy refers to a change in the public narratives and discourses about migration and migrants by construing it as a global phenomenon that is “[...] essential, unavoidable and potentially a beneficial component of the economic and social life of countries and regions” (Kalitanyi, 2010, p. 377). Particularly, public figures such as politicians are very influential in changing these public narratives and discourses, because they define the country's migration policies which are not only “responsible for the type of migrants a country receives, [but also for, *added by author*] their economic performance, the functioning of the economy and the locals' perceptions towards migrants” (Constant et al., 2009, p. 2). The second strategy refers to the change in the interactions between members of the host country and migrants. The extensive research on intergroup contact has shown that positive and quality contact between members of different groups decreases negative stereotypes and increases trust (Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009). Thus, communities should provide opportunities and spaces for members of the host country to meet and engage with migrants and vice versa, for instance, by organising cultural events.

Any country that receives migrants should be interested in providing appropriate conditions that support integration into the society. Integration as acculturation strategy not

only reduces the likely costs of mal-adaption on an individual level (e.g., costs related to treatment of depression, etc.) but also increases social peace.

## References

- Afrobarometer (2010). *Tolerance in South Africa: Exploring popular attitudes toward foreigners* (Afrobarometer Briefing No. 82). Retrieved from <http://afrobarometer.org/sites/default/files/publications/Briefing%20paper/AfrobriefN082.pdf>
- Allpress, J., Brown, R., Giner-Sorolla, R., Deonna, J., & Teroni, F. (2014). Two faces of group-based shame: moral shame and image shame differentially predict positive and negative orientations to ingroup wrongdoing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(10), 1270 – 1284. doi: 10.1177/0146167214540724
- Amit, R. (2011). No Refuge: Flawed Status Determination and the Failures of South Africa's Refugee System to Provide Protection. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 23(3), 458-488. doi:10.1093/ijrl/eer015
- Araoye, A. (2016, September 9). *South Africa, the global immigration crisis and the challenge of African solidarity*. Retrieved from <https://www.joburgpost.co.za/2016/09/09/south-africa-the-global-immigration-crisis-and-the-challenge-of-african-solidarity/>
- Arnstein, A., Mazure, C., & Sinha, R. (2012). This is your brain in meltdown. *Journal of Scientific American*, 4, 48-53. doi: 10.1038/scientificamerican0412-48.
- Badea, C., Jetten, J., Iyer, A., & Er-Rafiy, A. (2011). Negotiating dual identities: The impact of group-based rejection on identification and acculturation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41(5), 586-595. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.786
- Beer, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2004). What is unique about self-conscious emotions? *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 126-170.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaption. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 5-34. doi:10.1080/02699497378467
- Berry, J. W. (1999). Intercultural relations in plural societies. *Canadian Psychology*, 40(1), 12–21. doi:10.1037/h0086823
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.). *Acculturation, advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 697-712. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.013
- Berry, J. W. (2006). Acculturative stress. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. S. Wong (Eds.). *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 287-298). Langley: Springer.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21, 491-511.

- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38, 185-206. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1989.tb01208.x
- Berry, J.W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant Youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaption. *Applied Psychology*, 55(3), 303-332. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00256.x
- Bhugra, D. (2004). Migration, distress and cultural identity. *British Medical Bulletin*, 69, 129-141. doi: 10.1093/bmb/ldh007
- Caruana, E. J., Roman, M., Hernández-Sánchez, J., & Solli, P. (2015). Longitudinal Studies. *Journal of Thoracic Disease*, 7(11), E537-E540. doi:/10.3978/j.issn.2072-1439.2015.10.63
- Claassen, C. (2017). Explaining South African Xenophobia. *Africa Portal Roundup Newspaper*, Retrieved from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2974065>
- Combs, D. J. Y., Campbell, G., Jackson, M., & Smith, R. H. (2010). Exploring the consequences of humiliating a moral transgressor. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(2), 128–143. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01973531003738379>
- Constant, M., Kahanec, M., & Zimmermann, K. (2009). Attitudes towards immigrants, other integration barriers, and their veracity. *International Journal of Manpower*, 30(1), 5-14. doi: 10.1108/01437720910948357
- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social Stigma. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 504-553). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Crush, J., (2001). The dark side of democracy: Migration, xenophobia and human rights in South Africa. *International Migration*, 38(6), 103-133.
- Crush, J., & Ramachandran, S. (2010). Xenophobia, international migration and development. *Journal of Human Development Capabilities*, 11(2), 209-228. doi: 10.1080/1945282100367732.
- Dahab, D. (2016). *Acculturation strategies and outcomes of international retired migrants in Portugal* (Masters dissertation). Lisbon University Institute. Retrieved from: <http://www.rcaap.pt/detail.jsp?id=oai:repositorio.iscte-iul.pt:10071/11493>
- Demes, A. K., & Geeraert, N. (2013). Measures Matter: Scales for adaptation, cultural distance, and acculturation orientation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(1), 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0022022113487590
- Doyle, L. (2009, July 9). “I hate being idle”. *Wasted skills and enforced dependence among Zimbabwean asylum seekers in the UK*. Retrieved from [https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/latest/blogs/3693\\_i\\_hate\\_being\\_idle](https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/latest/blogs/3693_i_hate_being_idle)
- Elison, J., & Dansie, E.J. (2011). Humiliation. In R. J. Levesque (Ed.). *Encyclopaedia of Adolescence* (pp. 1342-1351). New York: NY: Springer.

- Elison, J., & Harter, S. (2007). Humiliation: Causes, correlates, and consequences. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 310–329). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ellsworth, P. E. (2013). Appraisal theory: Old and new questions. *Journal of Emotion Review*, 5(2), 125- 131. doi: 10.1177/175407391246361.
- Ellsworth, P. E., & Smith, C.A. (1988). From appraisal to emotion: differences among unpleasant feelings. *Motivation and emotions* 12(3), 271-301.
- Essex, V. M., & Lawson, A. (2010). Immigration. In J. M. Levine & M. A. Hogg (Eds.). *Encyclopaedia of group processes and intergroup relations* (pp. 427-431). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Everatt, D. (2011). Xenophobia, State and Society in South Africa, 2008–2010, *Politikon*, 38(1), 7-36. doi: 10.1080/02589346.2011.548662
- Fangen, K. (2006). Humiliation experienced by Somali refugees in Norway. *Journal of Refugee studies*, 19(1), 69-93. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fej001
- Fernandez, S., Saguy, T., & Halperin, E. (2015). The paradox of humiliation: the acceptance of an unjust devaluation of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(7), 976-988. doi: 10.1177/0146167215586195
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering using statistics IBM SPSS statistics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fischer, K. W., & Tangney, J. P. (1995). Self-conscious emotions and the affect revolution: Framework and overview. In J. P. Tangney & K. W Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Fisk, C. (2008). Humiliation at work. *William and Mary Journal of Women and the Law*, 8(1), 73-95.
- Fleay, C., & Hartley, L. (2016). ‘I feel like a beggar’: Asylum seekers living in the Australian community without the right to work. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 17(4), 1031-1048. doi: 10.1007/s12134-015-0453-x
- Frankfurt, B. Y. H. (1997). Equality and respect. *Social Research*, 64(1), 3-16.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions: Studies in emotion and social interaction*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenland, K., & Brown, R. (2005). Acculturation contact in Japanese students studying in the United Kingdom. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, 373-389. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.145.4.373-390
- Hall, J. (2015). Anti-foreigner violence exposes festering conflict in South Africa. *Africa Conflict Monitor*, 5, 71-77. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC171567>

- Hartling, L. M. (1995). *Humiliation: Assessing the specter of derision, degradation, and debasement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Union Institute Graduate School, Cincinnati.
- Hartling, L., & Luchetta, T. (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the impact of derision, degradation and debasement. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 19(4), 259–278. doi: 10.1023/a:1022622422521
- Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and Infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 399-423. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115045
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs*, 76(4), 408–420. doi:10.1080/03637750903310360
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and process analysis. A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Horenczyk, G. (1997). Immigrants' perceptions of host attitudes and their reconstruction of cultural groups. A response to John W. Berry [Peer commentary on the journal article "Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation"]. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 5-68.
- Izard, C. E. (2007). Basic emotions, natural kinds, emotional schemas, and a new paradigm. *Perspectives of Psychological Science*, 2(3), 260-280. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00044.x.
- Jackson, M. A. (2000). Distinguishing shame and humiliation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(4), 2272. (UMI No. 9968089).
- Jacobson, A. D. (2013). The role of humiliation in international conflict. *Northern Plains Ethics Journal*, 65-74.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Werther, A. (2008). The social psychology of respect: Implications for delegitimization and reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation*, (pp. 145-165). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195300314.003.0008
- Kabwe-Segatti, A., & Landau, L. (2006). *Migration in post-apartheid South Africa: Challenges and questions to policy makers* (pp. 1-178). French Institute of South Africa and Forced Migration Studies Programme.
- Kalitanyi, V. (2010). African immigrants in South Africa: Job takers or job creators? *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 13(4), 376-390.
- Kemeny, M. E., Gruenewald, T. L., & Dickerson, S. (2004). Shame as the emotional response to threat to the social-self. Implications for behavior, physiology and health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 153-160.
- Klein, D. C. (1991). The humiliation dynamic: An overview. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 12(2), 93–121. doi: 10.1007/BF02015214

- Kugler, K., & Jones, W. H. (1992). On conceptualizing and assessing guilt. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(2), 318-327. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.2.318.
- Landau, B. L. (2010). Loving the alien? Citizenship, Law and the future in South Africa's demonic society. *African Affairs*, 109(435), 213-230. doi: 10.1093/afraf/adq002
- Landau, B. L., Ramjathan-Keogh, K., & Singh, G. (2005). *Xenophobia in South Africa and problems related to it*. Forced Migration Working Paper no.13. Johannesburg: Forced Migration Studies Programme. Available from:<http://migration.wits.ac.za>
- Landau, B. L., & Jacobsen, K. (2004). Refugees in the new Johannesburg. *Forced Migration Review*, 19, 44-56.
- Lazare, A., & Levy, R. S. (2011). Apologizing for humiliations in medical practice. *Chest*, 139(4), 746-751. doi: 10.1378/chest.10-3334
- Leidner, B., Sheikh, H., & Ginges, J. (2012). Affective dimensions of intergroup humiliation. *PloS One Journal*. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0046375
- Lewis, H. B. (1987). *The role of shame in symptom formation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lewis, M. (1993). Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. In M. Lewis, & J. M. Haviland (Eds). *Handbook of emotions*, (pp. 563-573). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Leyens, J., Paladino, P. M., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice: The attribution of secondary emotions to ingroups and outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 186-197. doi: 10.1080/00224540903348253
- Lindner, E. (2007). In times of globalization and human rights: Does humiliation become the most disruptive force? *Journal of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies*, 1(1), 1-30. Retrieved from <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/evelin/HumiliationandFearinGlobalizingWorldHumanDHSJournal.pdf>
- MacDonald, G., & Leary, M. R. (2005). Why does social exclusion hurt? The relationship between social and physical pain. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(2), 202–223. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.131.2.202
- Mackie, D. M., Smith, E. R., & Ray, D. G. (2008). Intergroup emotions and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, 2(5), 1866-1880. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00130.x
- Margalit, A. (1996). *The Decent Society*. (N. Goldblum, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mason, W. A., & Capitanio, J. P. (2012). Basic emotions: A reconstruction. *Emotional Review*, 4(3), 238-244. doi: 10.1177/1754073912439763

- Mattes, R., Taylor, D., McDonald, D., Poore, A., & Richmond, W. (1999). *Still waiting for the barbarians: SA attitudes to immigrants and immigration*. Migration Policy No. 14. Cape Town: The Southern African Migration Project.
- McBrien, J. L. (2005). Educational needs and barriers for refugee students in the United States: A review of literature. *Review of Education Research*, 75(3), 329–364. doi:10.3102/00346543075003329
- McCullough, M. E., Root, M. L., & Cohen, A. D. (2006). *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(5), 887-897. doi: 101037/0022-006X.74.5.887
- Misago, J., Monson, T., Polzer, T., & Landau, L. (2010). *May 2008 Violence against foreign nationals in South Africa: Understanding causes and evaluating responses*. ACMS Report, Wits University, 2010.
- Molero, F., Recio, P., Garcia-Ael, C., Fuster, M. J., & Sanjuan, P. (2013). Measuring dimensions of perceived discrimination in five stigmatised groups. *Social Indicators Research*, 114, 901–914. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0179-5
- Moultrie, T. (2017, January 8). Analysis: what do we really know about international migration to and from SA? *Africa Check*. Retrieved from <https://africacheck.org/2017/01/08/analysis-really-know-international-migration-sa/>
- Muenster, B., & Lotto, D. (2010). The social psychology of humiliation and revenge: The origins of the fundamentalist mindset. In C. B. Strozier, D. M. Terman, J. W. Jones, & K. A. Boyd (Eds.), *The fundamentalist mindset*, (pp. 71-79). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nawyn, S., Gjokaj, L., Agbenyiga, D. L., & Grace, B. (2012). Linguistic isolation, social capital, and immigration belonging. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41(3), 255-282. doi: 10.1177/0891241611433623
- Neuhauser, C. (2011). Humiliation: The collective dimension. In P. Kaufmann, H. Kuch, C. Neuhauser, & E. Webster (Eds.), *Humiliation, degradation, dehumanization: Human dignity violated*, (pp. 21-36). New York, NY: Springer.
- Nguyen, A. M. D., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2013). Biculturalism is linked to adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 44, 122-159. doi: 10.1177/0022022111435097
- Oravec, R., Hardi, L., & Lajtai, L. (2004). Social transition, exclusion, shame and humiliation. *Torture*, 14(1).
- Otten, M., & Jonas, K. J. (2014). Humiliation as an intense emotional experience: Evidence from the electro-enccephalogram. *Social Neuroscience*, 9(1), 23-35. doi: 10.1080/17470919.2013.855660
- Peberdy, S; Crush, J. & Msibi, N. (2004). *Migrants in the City of Johannesburg: A Report for the City of Johannesburg*. Johannesburg: City of Johannesburg.

- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- Pulham, D. J. (2009). *Humiliation and its relationship to embarrassment and shame*. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 905. Retrieved from [https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/905?utm\\_source=digitalcommons.du.edu%2Fetd%2F905&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/905?utm_source=digitalcommons.du.edu%2Fetd%2F905&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)
- Richman, L. S., & Leary, M. R. (2009). Reactions to discrimination, stigmatization, ostracism, and other forms of interpersonal rejection: A multimotive model. *Psychological Review*, 116(2), 365-383. doi:10.1037/a0015250
- Roblain, A., Azzi, A., & Licata, L. (2016). Why do majority members prefer immigrants who adopt the host culture? The role of perceived identification with the host nation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 55, 44-54. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.08.001
- Roseman, I. (1984). Cognitive determinants of emotion: A structural theory. In P. Shaver (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Emotions, relationships and health* (pp. 11- 36). Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
- Roseman, I. J. (1991). Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions. *Journal of Cognition and Emotion*, 5(3), 161-200. doi: 10.1080/02699939108411034
- Roseman, I. J., & Smith, C. A. (2001). Appraisal theory: Overview, assumptions, varieties and controversies. In K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr, & T. Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal, process in emotion: theory, methods, research*, (pp.3-19). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sam, D., & Berry, J. (2010). Acculturation: When individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds meet. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(4), 472-481. doi: 10.1177/1745691610373075
- Scherer, K. R. (1982). Emotion as a process: function, origin and regulation. *Journal of Social Science Information*, 21(4-5), 555-570. doi: 10.1177/053901882021004004
- Scherer, K. R. (1984). On the nature and function of emotion: A component process approach. In K. R Scherer, P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to Emotion* (pp. 293-318), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Scherer, K. R. (2001). Appraisal considered as a process of multi-level sequential checking. In K. R. Scherer, A. Schoor, T. Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, methods, research* (pp. 92-120). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, K. R., Mortillaro, M., & Mehu, M. (2013). Understanding the mechanisms underlying the production of facial expression of emotion: A componential perspective. *Journal of Emotion Review*, 5(1), 47-53. doi: 10.1177/1754073912451504
- Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychology and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transition. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 449-464. doi: 10.1016/0147-1767(90)90030-Z

- Shultziner, D., & Rabinovici, I. (2012). Human dignity, self-worth, and humiliation: A comparative legal-psychological approach. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 18(1), 105-143. doi: 10.1037/a0024585
- Siemer, M., Mauss, I., & Gross, J.J. (2007). Same situation – different emotions: How appraisals shape our emotions. *Emotion*, 7(3), 592-600. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.7.3.592
- Silver, M., Conte, R., Miceli, M., & Poggi, I. (1986). Humiliation: Feeling, social control and the construction of identity. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 16(3), 269-283. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.1986.tb00080.x
- Simon, B., & Grabow, H. (2014). To be respected and to respect: The challenge of mutual respect in intergroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 53, 39-53. doi:10.1111/bjso.12019
- Southern African Migration Project (2008). *The perfect storm: The realities of xenophobia in contemporary South Africa*. Retrieved <http://samponline.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Acrobat50>
- Statistics South Africa (2012). *Census 2011: Census in brief*. Retrieved from [http://www.statssa.gov.za/census/census\\_2011/census\\_products/Census\\_2011\\_Census\\_in\\_brief](http://www.statssa.gov.za/census/census_2011/census_products/Census_2011_Census_in_brief).
- Statistics South Africa (2016). *Statistical Release: Community survey 2016*. Retrieved from [http://cs2016.statssa.gov.za/?portfolio\\_page=census-2011-fact-sheet](http://cs2016.statssa.gov.za/?portfolio_page=census-2011-fact-sheet)
- Strelan, P., Weick, M., & Vasiljevic, M. (2014). Power and revenge. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 53, 521-540. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12044
- Tafira, E. (2011). Is xenophobia racism? *Anthropology Southern African*, 34(3), 114-121. doi: 10.1080/23323256.2011.11500015
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 45-59. doi: 10.1177/0146167208325004
- Timotijevic, L., & Breakwell, G. M. (2000). Migration and threat to identity. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(1), 355-372. doi: 10.1002/1099-1298
- Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Voell, M. (2012). Discrimination, acculturation, accumulative stress, and Latino psychological distress: A moderated meditational model. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(1), 17-25. doi: 10.1037/a002671010.1037/a0026710
- Torres, W. J., & Bergner, R. M. (2010). Humiliation: Its nature and consequences. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law Online*. 38(2), 195 -204.

- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007a). Self-conscious emotions: Where self and emotion meet. In C. Sedikides & S. Spence (Eds.), *The self in social psychology. Frontiers of Social Psychology* (pp. 187-209). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007b). The self in self-conscious emotions: A cognitive appraisal approach. In J. L. Tracy, R.W. Robins, & J. P Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and Research* (pp. 3-20). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Trbanc, M. (1996). *Social exclusion: The concept and data indicating exclusion in Slovenia*. Retrieved from <http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/dr/dr22-23Trbanc.PDF>
- Trumbull, D. (2008). Humiliation: The trauma of disrespect. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry*, 36(4), 643- 660. doi: 10.1521/jaap.2008.36.4.643
- Unger, J. B., Gallaher, P., Shakib, S., Ritt-Olson, A., Palmer, P. H., & Johnson, C. (2002). The AHIMSA Acculturation Scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22, 225-251. doi: 10.1177/02731602022003001
- United Nations Population Division (n.a.). International Migrant Stock 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml>
- Van Driel, E. (2011). *What humiliation feels like in different contexts*. University of Amsterdam. Retrieved from <http://www.scriptiesonline.uba.uva.nl/en/scriptie/408113>
- Veldhuis, T. M., Gordijn, E. H., Veenstra, R., & Lindenberg, S. (2014). Vicarious group-based rejection: creating a potentially dangerous mix of humiliation, powerlessness, and anger. *PloS One Journal*, 9(4). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0095421
- Vorster, A. (2017). *Group-based Humiliation: Does it exist and what are the consequences?* (Masters Dissertation). University of South Africa. Retrieved from <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/21947/Final%20Masters%20Dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>
- Vorster, A. & Dumont, K. B. (under review). The regulatory role of anger and shame in responding to group-based humiliation. *Journal of Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.
- Walker, J., & Knaeuer, V. (2011). Humiliation, self-esteem, and violence. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 22(5), 724-741. doi:10.1080/14789949.2011.617542
- Ward, C. (2009). Acculturation and social cohesion: Emerging issues for Asian immigrants in New Zealand. In C. H. Leong, & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Intercultural relations in Asia: Migration and work effectiveness* (pp. 3–24). Singapore: World Scientific.
- Ward, C. (2013). Probing identity, integration and adaptation: Big questions, little answers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37(4), 391-404. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.04.001

- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(4), 659-677. doi: 10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00014-0
- Ward, C., & Kus, L. (2012). Back to and beyond Berry's basics: The conceptualization, operationalization and classification of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36, 472–485. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.02.002
- Wilde, V. K., Martin, K.D., & Goff, P.A. (2014). Dehumanization as a distinct form of prejudice. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 3, 301-307. doi: 10.4473/TPM21.3.5