

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION ON THE EARLIER AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST JOURNAL

Joaquim Filipe Castro\*

### UMA REVISÃO SOBRE ACULTURAÇÃO NA REVISTA AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

#### Abstract

The research accomplished a literature review about acculturation on the earlier American Anthropologist journal. Acculturation research appeared on the North American Anthropology; later it came to Sociology and Psychology. The main models to approach acculturation followed the historical evolution of the North American cultures, and the earlier research barely considered the main dimensions of the acculturation concept. Assimilation and, in a lesser degree, fusion were the preferred models during colonial and imperial times, and the American Indigenous were the main researched cultural group. Acculturation was approached as one-way of cultural influences, and the Indigenous cultural change was the main concern. Yet, interaction and learning were not main concerns. The multicultural model appeared already in the earlier literature, however it was related to fusion.

Acculturation. Fusion. Multicultural. American Anthropologist.

#### Resumo

A investigação realizou uma revisão da literatura acerca da aculturação na revista American Anthropologist. A investigação acerca da aculturação surgiu nos primórdios da Antropologia norte-americana e, mais tarde, na Sociologia e na Psicologia. Os principais modelos da abordagem da aculturação seguiram a evolução histórica da cultura norte-americana e a investigação inicial quase que não abordou as dimensões fundamentais do conceito da aculturação. Assimilação e, num menor grau, a fusão foram os modelos preferidos durante as épocas coloniais e imperiais, e os indígenas americanos foram o grupo cultural mais investigado. A aculturação foi abordada como tendo apenas uma direção de influências culturais e as mudanças culturais nos indígenas constituíram-se como a problemática maior. Contudo, a interação e a aprendizagem não se constituíram como problemáticas fundamentais. O modelo multicultural já tinha emergido na literatura inicial, porém nos artigos iniciais se relacionava com a fusão.

Aculturação. Fusão. Multicultural. American Anthropologist.

\* Licenciado em Psicologia Social e do Trabalho pela Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal. Doutorado em Ciências Sociais, com especialização em Psicologia Intercultural. Participa de projetos de pesquisa na Universidade Fernando Pessoa e mora em Metz, França. Email: titodecastro@hotmail.com

Licentiate in Social and Work Psychology at Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Oporto, Portugal. Doctoral studies in Social Sciences, expertise in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Participates in research projects at Universidade Fernando Pessoa, and he is living in Metz, France. Email: titodecastro@hotmail.com

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

### **ACCULTURATION DEFINITION**

The current research aimed to do a review about the acculturation concept. It employed the references from the *American Anthropologist* journal. The acculturation phenomenon may be defined by its main dimensions, i.e., intercultural contact, mutual interactions among different cultures (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault & Senécal, 1997; Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936), by learning a second culture (Powell, 1880; Rudmin, 2009), and by cultural changes at individual (Graves, 1967) and collective levels (Malinowski, 1958; Redfield, et al., 1936). On the definition of the acculturation concept, it was important to take into account that cultural changes may drive to reformulate the cultural legacy (Barth, 1969), because acculturation was a dynamic process of cultural creation (Boas, 1982/1940). It was also important to take into account that acculturation was regulated by motivations, and that acculturation was often antagonistic and asymmetric.

#### **The main models to approach the acculturation phenomenon**

The acculturation topic has four models, i.e., assimilation, multicultural, fusion, and intercultural (Castro, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2014a, b, 2015, 2016a, b, c, d, e, f, 2018; Castro & Marques, 2003; Castro & Rudmin, 2016). The intercultural model is supposed to be related to the Francophone cultural legacy (Meer & Modood; Taylor, 2012). According to Castro (2014a, b, 2015, 2016a, b, c), in the assimilation model, the minority culture is expected to disappear. The mutual learning will not be reported on the expected outcome, because the minority will be completely assimilated. The European policies in the 19th century, the Chicago School (Park, 1928) and the work of Gordon (1964) are examples of the assimilation model.

In the multicultural model, the minority culture is expected to get cultural adaptation, maintaining, at the same time, its culture (Berry, 2001). In the multicultural approach, only the minority is described as learning, and both cultures are interacting with the larger society. The WASP culture (White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) and the Berry Model (2001) are examples of the multicultural approach.

In the fusion model there is interaction, mutual learning between different cultures, and there are cultural mixtures (Herskovits, 1938; LaFromboise, Coleman & Gerton, 1998; Simons, 1901). Cultural mixtures are expected to produce a new culture with internal diversity (Bastide, 1973; Castro, 2012, 2014a, b, 2015, 2016a, b, d). The Freyre's (1986/1933; Rudmin, Wang & Castro, 2016), and the Ortiz's (1995/1940) theories, and the policies of Alexander the Great (Simons, 1901) are examples of the fusion model. The assimilation and the fusion models are expected outcomes in the future, and both approaches may entail harmonious and/or antagonistic relationships. In the current article, fusion was approached as dynamic, and not as an expected outcome. Furthermore, acculturation was considered as a way of cultural creation with no particular content and outcome.

In the intercultural model, at private and individual levels the minority may change or maintain its cultural legacy, because of the laissez-faire point of view. However, the minority at the public level is expected to get cultural adaptation regarding the majority, for instance, at labor and educational domains. At the institutional level, the interaction between different cultures is reduced. The universalistic values of the French Republic may be an example of the model, because its institutional values are not expected to change, due to minority agency. According to Meer and Modood (2011) and Taylor (2012), the intercultural model entailed interaction, but the multicultural did not. In the current review, it was still required to contextualize the concept of acculturation.

### **Acculturation is a complex phenomenon**

Acculturation may be conceived as an effect of human migrations, exchanges (McGee, 1898), colonization and wars, due to intercultural contact between different cultures. It may be also conceived as a cause, because it created cultures, which were transmitted over generations. In addition, culture and historical backgrounds shaped reactions (attitudes, behaviors) regarding acculturative changes, in a similar way that national policies (Taft, 2007/1973) shaped reactions regarding immigration (Bourhis, et al., 1997).

Since the Palaeolithic and the Neolithic that cultural interaction among dissimilar cultural groups led to acculturation, and it created cultural and ethnic diversities (Barth,

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

1969; Coppens, 2012; Pääbo, 2013). Anthropology started concerned with the origin of culture. The evolutionism was the first explanation. Later, the concept of cultural diffusion appeared (Eriksen & Nielsen, 2013; Stocking, 1982). Afterward, appeared the concept of acculturation, and it was connected to learn a second culture (Powell, 1880). The concept of acculturation was concerned with intercultural contact, and mainly with reactions regarding cultural changes on unfamiliar cultures. The evolutionist and the diffusion approaches were connected to acculturation as a cause of culture.

Some anthropologists were concerned with the minority cultural maintenance, non-violence (Chamberlin, 1905; Rudmin, 1991) and discrimination. Yet, other researchers did not, and sometimes they were working for colonial administrations (Bateson, 1935). Consequently, the acculturation concept gained an ambiguous meaning connected to Western domination (Rudmin, et al., 2016). In the French literature, for instance, the concept was almost dismissed, because of its colonial foundation (Brégent, Mokoukolo & Pasquier, 2008). According to Westphal-Hellbusch (1959), Germans anthropologists took a similar position. Furthermore, the word contact was employed by British anthropologists (Malinowski, 1958) as synonymous of acculturation, and, in Cuba, Ortiz (1995/1940) preferred the word transculturation.

Another consideration about the intercultural relationships was connected to the reaction regarding intercultural contact. In the Western culture, the first written reaction perhaps belonged to Plato (Rudmin, 2003a). Acculturation is a complex (Morin, 1990) phenomenon, and it is a two-way learning process of cultural exchanges and changes. Furthermore, it is not possible to find out a single pattern. The Western European colonialism (Hobsbawm, 1995) praised assimilation or separation regarding ruled cultures, and it rarely praised fusion (Castro, 2015, 2016c, d, e; DeTocqueville, 2002/1835; Freyre, 1986/1933; Myrdal, 1944; Simons, 1901). Afterward, the civil rights movement drove to the preference for the multicultural model, as the conservative Glazer (1997) wrote. The multicultural model praised different cultures living in the same territory (diversity), relative tolerance, and minority integration. It is important to clarify that in psychology integration means that the minority is learning the majority culture and, at the same time, it is maintaining its culture (Berry, 2001). Hence, the multicultural approach

entails a main contradiction, because it presumes cultural maintenance, regardless the minority adaptation (Castro, 2015).

The word acculturation was coined in the 19th century maybe by Powell (1880). However, appraisals about other cultures, about intercultural relationships, and their cultural changes were inner to intercultural contact (Barth, 1969). In the Western culture, Posidonius, and later Strabo wrote about barbarians, e.g., Celts and Jews (Bloch, 2004). The Roman Empire had the military power, although it was under Hellenic influence. This situation was closer to fusion than to assimilation, because cultures shared cultural content. Castro (2014a, b, 2016a) provided also a unusual point of view, because the Portuguese in Japan, during the 16th century, were a minority, however they tried to change the Japanese majority.

The acculturation's complexity can be reported by the American dilemma described by Myrdal (1944). In the WASP culture, assimilation was the main model and, in a lesser degree, fusion (DeTocqueville, 2002/1835). However, Myrdal (1944) reported separation among cultures. Afro-Americans were acculturated to the WASP culture (Herskovits, 1967), regardless that their ethnic identity was not validated by the majority (Du Bois, 1999/1899; Frazier, 1942, 1949; Park, 1914). Therefore, no theoretical model described accurately the social reality, because assimilation did not occur. Furthermore, the multicultural cultural maintenance did not occur as well, because Afro-Americans changed their originals cultural features. The outcome was fusion, because the WASP majority also changed, for example, by jazz music (Merriam, 1955; Castro & Rudmin, 2017). Ideals or attitudes were contradicted and overwhelmed by reality (Navas et al., 2005). For example, in the 19th century, Herbert Spencer suggested that the Japanese intercultural contact would be reduced to trading. He aimed to maintain the Japanese culture, and in consequence to maintain worldwide cultural diversity. However, the Japanese trading and modernization drove to a nationalistic and aggressive reaction (Castro, 2016e).

It is also important to state that the acculturation phenomenon is universal, and that tolerance is not exclusive to the Western liberal thought. For example, the Syrian

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

Umayyad Caliphate in Iberian Peninsula reported the three main monotheistic religions living in the same territory with relative tolerance.

### **Methodological approach**

#### **Goals**

The research aimed to do a review about the concept of acculturation. It employed the references from the journal *American Anthropologist*, which were placed in the website AnthroSource. The latter belonged to the American Anthropological Association, and it is owned by Wiley Online Library.

Acculturation has its roots in the anthropological literature, and those roots are still present on the psychological and sociological approaches. Cross-cultural psychology is under a deadlock on the acculturation research (Bowskill, Lyons & Coyle, 2007; Cresswell, 2009; Ozer, 2013; Rudmin, 2003a, b, 2009; Rudmin, et al., 2016). Thus, the review approached a journal of anthropology, because it aimed to get a clear understanding of main trends, evolution, and historical background of the acculturation concept.

#### **Research technique**

On the Website AnthroSource, the refined search only allowed to single out articles according to their relevance (most relevant) and time (most recent). The search for terms was not refined by title, author, and keywords. In February 1th, 2016, a refined search by the word acculturation gave 3585 outcomes. It was done according to most recent criterion. The *American Anthropologist* journal had the largest database about acculturation, as it was possible to verify; (2162) *American Anthropologist*, (535) *Anthropology News*, (265) *American Ethnologist*, (138) *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, etc. After that, the current review searched by the criterion of relevance, because the free access articles only appeared from 1981 to backward, taken into account time (most recent) criterion.

The review codified 17 codes, which will appear later, and some codes had subdivisions. It is necessary to define concepts, their dimensions, and their indicators in order to formulate measuring instruments (Boudon & Lazarsfeld, 1965). However, often

acculturation research was not approached by its defining dimensions. In the current research, the acculturation definition was important to limit the research scope. Articles were interpreted according to the provided dimensions of acculturation concept and models.

The current research selected ninety articles, which were codified in SPSS, and were accomplished by descriptive statistics. The majority of the works appeared on the current reference list. The research started by downloading the articles. They were separated by pages on different files, as they appeared on the website, until page 8, and the search only took place by the word acculturation. The search only took place in articles with free access, full versions, and it did not include books reviews, obituaries or letters to the editor. Another list of references was done, and it corresponded to the SPSS cases.

## **Empirical outcomes**

### **Publication topic**

The first code wanted to know the topics of the articles. The main defining dimensions of the acculturation construct were included as potential topics, i.e., cultural change (31.1%) and contact (5.6%). In addition, according to Ward (2001), in Psychology, the acculturation research had three main topics. One topic was health, and it got 5.6% (Change, 1965; Graves, 1967; Macwhite, 1956; Press, 1978; Robbins & Pollnac, 1969). The health topic included the Lazarus (1997) coping approach. Another topic was ethnic identity (nativism), and it got 6.7% (Berreman, 1964; Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Freed 1957; Linton 1943; Voget, 1951; Wallage, 1956). Finally, another main topic was learning. Other relevant outcomes were theoretical and conceptual definition with 10% (Ianni, 1958), psychological traits (7.8%), review (5.6%), socioeconomic with 5.6%, and language with 4.4% (Basso, 1967). Other topics had three or fewer cases, e.g., colonialism, attitudes, religion, music, artifacts or material acculturation, sociocultural values, meta-analysis, immigration, urbanization, gender, discrimination, both of them, more than two, and not defined.

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

### **Year of publication**

The year of publication was codified by decade from 1880 to 1980. The first article was published in 1895 by Mason, and the last one was published in 1978 by Press. The goal was to get when were produced more works about acculturation. According to the current outcomes, on the 50s acculturation research reached its maximum, because between 1951 and 1960 it had 42.2% of the outcomes. According to Winthrop (1991), in the 1960s, the anthropological literature replaced the acculturation topic by social movements and cultural change topics. In fact, between 1961 and 1970 the number of works decreased (15.6%), and from 1971 to 1980 were published only 6.7% of articles. Finally, between 1941 and 1950, it had 26.7% of the outcomes.

### **Original language**

The code options were English, Spanish, French, Portuguese, German, and Japanese. Most articles were written originally in English (96.7%). The only exceptions were Anderson (1958) and Westphal-Hellbusch (1959). The former worked in France, and the latter wrote originally in German. Outsiders to North American cultures often wrote employing English, for example, the German Willems (1944), who lived in Brazil, and the Austrian Thurnwald (1932), who taught at the Yale University.

### **Who wrote the article?**

One code associated with language was who wrote the article. The code options were North-American, South-American, European, non-European, and Asian. It was fulfilled employing university or institution, and not by the origin and by the name. It is important to notice that foreign researchers working in North American institutions were under acculturation, socialization and enculturation. The code option North-American encompassed (Canada and the USA). The outcomes reported a scarce internationalization regarding outside institutions and researchers. The exceptions were Baal (1960) at the Royal Institute for the Tropus, Amsterdam, Anderson (1958) from the French Centre National La Recherche Scientifique, and Westphal-Hellbusch from Berlin. Weingrod (1962) from The Hebrew University had a fellowship from the Ford Foundation.

### **Author gender**

The gender of the author was associated with the previous code. The options were male, female or both (two or more authors with both genders). Males were largely dominants; 90%. Females were only 8.9% (Benedict, 1943; Friedl, 1956; Hawley, 1948; Mead, 1943; Meggers, 1946; Spindler, L., 1952; Thompson, 1948; Westphal-Hellbusch, 1959). There was also a married couple, so both genders (Spindler & Spindler, 1958). Most articles were written by only one researcher. It may be explained, because a main feature of the anthropological fieldwork is to live alone into a strange cultural environment (Bernard, 2006).

### **Country where the research took place**

The country where the research took place was another code. The options were codified when the reviewer inserted data. Most articles or produced in the USA or Canada (65.6%). Therefore, researchers were concerned about North American minorities and cultures, mainly with Indigenous. Few works were produced about European countries, the exceptions were Netherlands (Baal, 1960), Denmark (Anderson, 1958) and Germany (Thurnwald, 1932; Westphal-Hellbusch, 1959).

In Central America, there were Adams (1956), Beals, Redfield and Tax (1943), Service (1955), and Tax (1941). In Mexico, there were Barker, (1958), Johnson, (1943) and Spicer (1954). There were works also about South America (Steward, 1943), and in particular Brazil (Watson, 1952; Willems, 1944). In Trinidad and Tobago was Crowley (1957). In Asia, researches focused on Indonesia (Kennedy, 1943; Maher, 1960), India (Mandelbaum, 1941; Sebrinc, 1972), and Philippines (Eggan, 1941). In Israel was Weingrod (1962), and in Africa were Goldschmidt (1965), Kilbride, Robbins (1969), and Robbins and Pollnac (1969). There were several works with more than two countries, and other works approached the entire planet. The article of Lange (1957) deserved attention, because he compared Austrians to American Indigenous, and it was rare.

### **Research field**

The code research field included the options Anthropology, Sociology (2.2%), Psychology (17.8%), Demography, Economics (1.1%), Archaeology (1.1%), History,

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

Education (1.1%), more than one field, and not defined. Anthropology was without surprise the main field (76.7%), followed by Psychology (17.8%), because it was 'The oldest of our recent trends, and the most important in terms of membership and number of publications, is Psychology' (Meggers, 1946, p. 178). Barnett, Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson (1953) also reported the influence of Psychology. In return, The American Journal of Psychology had an anthropological session.

Psychology was connected to projective tests, measuring devices and with topics as attitudes (Thompson, 1948), health, and personality (James, 1961). The use of projective tests required training in Psychology, as Meggers reported (1946), regardless that most authors were anthropologists (Boggs, 1958; Change 1965; Henry, 1955; Kilbride & Robbins, 1969). Spindler L. (1952) employed a projective test, even because of her husband, i.e., Spindler G., who was psychologist. Other anthropologists were connected to the health topic, e.g., Edgerton (1965) on a Neuropsychiatric Institute. Caudill (1949) was an expert on medical anthropologist, and Parker (1964) on behavioral anthropology. Other authors employed measuring devices (Kemnitzer, 1973), approached the health topic, and mixed both social sciences (Graves, 1967; Robbins & Pollnac, 1969). Finally, the sociologist Gillin (1942) approached acculturation as learning.

### **Direction**

A defining dimension of the acculturation concept is the direction, and mainly the two-way direction (Redfield, et al., 1936; Rudmin, 2009). The code options were one-way (66.7), two-way (28.9), and not defined (4.4). Often, only the minority was approached, and the majority agency was neglected. The outcomes reported a clear limitation and problem on the acculturation research, which was claimed by key authors (Bourhis, et al, 1997; Rudmin, 2009). However, the problem persists on cross-cultural psychology.

The code direction was subdivided. This code aimed to check out whether the minority was active (92.2%) or not active (1.1%), and it also included the not defined option (6.7%). The minority is active on all models. Thus, the review outcome may fit on all acculturation models, and not only on the multicultural, and on the assimilation models.

The majority is reported as active on 23.3% of the cases, and it is no active in 47.8% of the articles. The not defined option got 28.9% of cases. This code corresponded to the fusion model. Minority and majority cultural groups were described as active on 22.2% of the articles, yet they were not active on 47.8% of cases, and 30.0% of cases were not defined.

### **What produced the cultural changes?**

Another defining dimension of the acculturation concept is the cultural change, due to intercultural contact. Cultural diffusion does not need contact in order to produce cultural changes. Innovation occurs inside a certain culture. Contact, diffusion, and innovation are ways to produce culture, but only contact is a cause of acculturation. Besides contact (7.8%), the options were diffusion (1.1%), two of them (91.1%), and not defined. The outcomes reported that most works encompassed contact and diffusion, even because often it was hard to distinguish them.

The next code aimed to know whether the cultural groups were living for long in the same territory (yes, 94.4%) or not (1.1%), and it also included the not defined option (4.4%). On the code, 'for long' meant more than two generations. Hence, this option appeared, because on the pervasive Anglo-Saxon literature the Afro-Americans and the Indigenous were sometimes approached like the first generation of immigrants (Berry, Phinney, Sam & Vedder, 2006). It drove the researchers to confound socialization, enculturation and acculturation, because, for instance, the two mentioned minorities were previously acculturated (Frazier, 1942, 1949). Besides, the confusion among the three ways to learn, there are different legal systems, which are often neglected. For example, the Jus sanguinis and Jus soli should be taken into account, because second generations of immigrants may be national citizens. The problem is on sampling, because cross-cultural psychology devises comparisons among dissimilar cultural groups.

The interaction was a defining dimension of the acculturation concept. This code was asking whether different cultures were interacting (yes 86.7%) or not (7.8%), and it also included the not defined (5.6%) option. This code appeared, because there were few descriptions of interaction, and often only the minorities were described as learning the majority cultures. It happens often on the assimilation and on the multicultural models.

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

The next code was connected to the previous code. The main feature of the fusion model is to report a shared culture. The code was asking 'Are cultural groups sharing cultural traits?', and the outcomes were yes (26.7%), no (52.2%), and not defined (21.1%).

### **Are changes occurring at individual or collective level?**

This code asked whether cultural changes were working at individual (1.1%) or collective (94.4%) levels, both (3.3%), and not defined (1.1%). Anthropology and sociology had collective concerns and approaches. The definition of Redfield et al. (1936) highlighted the collective level. Psychologists are adapting the definition, and they are not aware that it may exclude individual acculturation (Rudmin, 2009). The individual changes may introduce greater variability, and it is adapted to the current individualized ethnic identities. Yet, it is also important to avoid the unproductive dichotomy between individual versus society (Elias & Scotson, 1994/1965; Vygotsky, 1978/1930), even because it is the stage of an ideological fight.

Changes are a defining dimension of the acculturation concept. However, the multicultural model is emphasizing the minority cultural maintenance, and at the same time cultural contact and adaptation. It reveals a contradiction, because adaptation also triggers changes. The code was asking; 'Is there mainly cultural change (4.4%) or maintenance (5.6%)'. Other options were both of them (86.7), none (2.2%), and not defined (1.1%). The current outcomes displayed that often cultural changes and maintenance were occurring at the same time, and it reported the limits of the assimilation and of the multicultural models, because '... absolute multiculturalist hypothesis is as absurd as that of the cultural homogeneity of a city or country.' (Touraine, 2007, p. 153).

### **Harmonious, problematic and conflictive relationship ...**

This code was checked out taking into account the description of the relationship. The code asked 'Is the relationship harmonious (6.7%), problematic (55.6%) or conflictual' (20.0%). It also included the option not defined (17.8%), and the code was taking into account the work of Bourhis, et al. (1997). The outcomes confirmed that acculturation was often motivated and problematic.

The next code was related to the previous one. The code was also approached by the description of the relationship. It asked, 'Is there any asymmetric power relationship approached?' The code outcomes were yes (50.0%), no (4.4%) and not defined (45.6%). Asymmetric relationships can be considered as ordinary in a world under Western industrial, military and colonial domination, and still under social evolutionist ideas.

The next code asked, 'Is discrimination approached?' Unlike the previous two codes, it was not approached by the mere description of the relationship, because discrimination should be reported as a research concern. The outcomes were yes (11.1%), no (11.1%) and not defined (77.8%). It is interesting to notice that the outcomes were too short, taking into account that relationships were often asymmetric. Hence, discrimination was not a main topic of the earlier anthropological research.

### **Minority and majority labels**

The minority and majority labels were also codes. The minority code options were Afro-American (2.2%), Latino (1.1%), Hispanic, Indigenous (45.6%), Asian (2.2%), Japanese, Eskimo (4.4%), European (2.2%), African (4.4%), Jew (1.1%), Arab, Indian (2.2%), Australian Indigenous, two of them (1.1%), more than two (11.1%), another (2.2%), and not defined (16.7%). The statistical outcomes revealed the historical evolution of the acculturation concept, and of the North American Anglo-Saxon culture, because the West was still under colonization. Hence, Indigenous was the most frequent minority label. Bascom (1941) and Merriam (1955) were the exceptions, because they approached Afro-Americans. Europeans were under acculturation by Anderson, (1958), who focused on Dutch settlements in Denmark, and Willems (1944), because the latter approached Germans immigrants in Brazil.

The majority labels were Anglo-American (27.8%), White (17.8%), Brazilian (1.1%), Anglo-Saxon, French, British (1.1%), Spanish (6.7%), Portuguese, Japanese, Russian, two of them, more than two (7.8%), another (30.0%), and not defined (30.0%). The outcome on the not defined option (30%) reported that majorities were not under acculturation, and that majorities were not a concern, because often they were not expected to change.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

### Acculturation models

The review wanted to know which acculturation model was pervasive. The code options and outcomes were assimilation (31.1%), fusion (18.9%), multicultural (5.6%), intercultural, both of them, none, and not defined (25.6%). Consequently, the assimilation model was pervasive, and it was followed by fusion. The fusion and the multicultural models deserved further considerations.

The code options were codified taking into account the acculturation models as expected outcomes, and not as dynamic. As a dynamic process, the outcomes on the fusion model would be higher, as it will be possible to check out later. It can explain why the outcomes of the code shared culture (26.7%), and of the code one-way versus two-way (28.9%) are higher than the percentage of articles belonging to the fusion model (18.9%).

In the fusion articles, some of the works were theoretical, for instance, Mason O. T. (1895), Herskovits (1941), and Baal (1960). The latter, who was European wrote, ' . . . just as it is probable that other peoples possess qualities, rare among us, which could be an asset to modern social and cultural life.' (1960, p. 117). Some works were literature reviews, e.g., Linton (1943), who approached the ethnic identity movements. Hallowell (1957) also did a review, complaining about the pervasive one-way, 'Despite the fact that in the well-known memorandum of Redfield, Linton and Herskovits (1936), acculturation was conceived as potentially a two-way process, in practice, American anthropologists have investigated it as a one-way process.' (Hallowell, 1957, p. 204).

Hallowell (1957) provided other examples of fusionist works, i.e., Chamberlin (1905), Foster (1951), Beals (1953), and Gillin (1955). Other studies were fieldworks, e.g., Spicer (1954), who in Mexico studied the Spanish-Indian culture. Crowley (1957) was in Trinidad. Reed (1941) reported the Navajo cultural maintenance and, at the same time, changes done by syncretism. Spicer (1958) approached the Yaqui Indians of Northwestern Mexico, where maintenance, changes, and mixtures occurred at the same time in Spanish (Jesuit) and Indigenous cultures. Barker (1958) did a similar work about

the Catholic processions. In Central America Adams (1956) reported how Spaniards became the Ladino culture. Siegel (1941) also worked in Guatemala. It is interesting to notice that the Spanish culture was the dominant culture, however it changed. In Israel, Weingrod (1962) reported reciprocal changes. In the USA, Schwartz (1959) reported fusion among Indigenous, but not among Europeans.

The North-American Anglo-Saxon culture was rarely reported to learn second cultures and to produce mixed cultures, the exception was Merriam (1955), because he reported mixtures among different cultures, producing, for example, the jazz music. Another exception was Barnett (1940), '... the frontiersmen learning from the Indians . . . their social norms. The earliest white men, for example, bought their Indian wives . . . the most propitious circumstances for cultural transfers and fusions were created.' (Barnett, 1940, p. 24).

The research did a search for the words plural and multicultural on the American Anthropologist database. The search took place for the most recent criterion. The word multicultural got 798 results, and the word pluralism got 919 results. The researcher downloaded the articles from the last pages of both searches in order to get the earlier articles. Most of the results were not connected to the multicultural model. The works of Vogt (1955) and Polgar (1960) were found during the search. Polgar (1960) provided more examples of multicultural works. He mentioned mainly Bateson (1935), Tax (1941), the SSRC of Barnett et al. (1953), Bruner (1956), and Crowley (1957). Yet, the work of Crowley (1957) was considered, by the current review, as fusionist, because he reported mixtures and shared cultures. Furthermore, fusion also worked by cultural maintenance, as Freyre (1986/1933), Herskovits (1967) and Frazier (1942) reported about the Brazilian culture.

Besides the Polgar references about the multicultural model, the current review found out Bigart (1972), and McFee (1968). The latter described multiculturalism in comparison to forced assimilation, and mainly regarding the work of Park (1928), 'Many of the men we have considered to be "lost between two cultures" may not be lost. . . ' (McFee, 1968, p. 1102). Bateson (1935) did not write the word multicultural, but he provided clues about what was considered the plural society, ' . . . the persistence of both

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

groups in dynamic equilibrium within one major community.' (Bateson, 1935, p. 74). In *The American Journal of Sociology*, Park (1914) also pointed out to the multicultural model as an outcome, because 'In the South, similarly, the races seem to be tending in the direction of a bi-racial organization of society, in which the Negro is gradually gaining a limited autonomy . . .' (p. 623).

The common element among the descriptions of Tax (1941), Vogt (1955) and Polgar (1960) was that fusion was previous to the multicultural outcome. The three authors described, in fact, processes of fusion. However, they ascribed it to the multicultural model, because there were cultural maintenance, and the final outcomes were different (autonomous) cultures living in the same territories. Another common feature was that violence and asymmetric relationships occurred only during fusion. The multicultural outcome was described as peaceful by Tax (1941), Vogt (1955), and Polgar (1960). Multiculturalism was called stable pluralism, because cultures were expected to be in permanent contact with relative tolerance (mutual recognition), and with no further cultural changes, which was not realistic. It was close to the Kallen (1915, Feb 25) solution for the USA society, mainly for the European immigrants.

Tax (1941) described the Spaniards and the Indigenous peoples in Guatemala. The Spaniards, who were the dominant cultural group. However, they changed, and they became Ladinos, because they mixed with the Indigenous. According to Tax (1941), the Indigenous culture achieved cultural maintenance, and they were described as an autonomous culture, regardless contact, and intercultural relationship. In the follow quote there were different cultures living in the same territory, after cultural changes, there was also relative tolerance, and no further cultural changes were expected, 'The Guatemalan communities may, however, be more fruitfully treated as separate local societies, and it may be said that as such they merely recognize in each other groups which appropriately have different cultures.' (Tax, 1941, p. 33). Tolerance was ascribed implicitly by mutual recognition. However, mutual recognition of cultural differences is not enough to produce tolerance, even because the larger society may be the majority culture. It is interesting to notice that Tax explained cultural maintenance, and continuous intercultural contact with no change by Lamarck evolutionist thought, '... The case of Ladinos (and of course

foreigners) makes significant another trait of Indian culture that has been mentioned above, the belief that culture is local, and even tied to the biology of different peoples.' (Tax, 1941, p. 36). Thus, the description of Tax was closer to Herbert Spencer's (1855, 1873) social evolutionism than to the cultural relativism of Boas (1928/1940). Furthermore, the Tax (1941) description of the Indigenous culture was alike the descriptions of Clastres (1974) or Scott (2009), and they were not multiculturalists authors.

Vogt (1955) described Indigenous, Spanish-Americans and Anglo-Americans gathered together during Laguna Fiesta, New Mexico. Their relationships were characterized by economic motivations. Social roles were established, and the different ethnic groups were interacting, but they were not described as changing. Similar to Tax's article (1941), fusion and changes were previous to plural, tolerant and unchangeable cultures. Fusion occurred between the Spanish and the Indigenous cultures, and it rendered to the Spanish-Americans ethnic group.

The description of Polgar (1960) occurred in the USA, his subjects were the Mesquakie teenage boys. Polgar and Tax belonged to the Department of Anthropology at the Chicago University. The article was written regarding the Park (1928) marginal man. Hence, it was written in reference to the sociological department of the same university. It is important to notice that Park (1928) frequently studied immigrants under urbanization, and rarely the Indigenous minorities. Park (1928) described the marginal man as a bicultural person (Jew), who did not belong to any culture, and was not recognized by any culture. Furthermore, the bicultural situation could endanger his mental health. This point of view is still present on the psychological literature, and it has its contradiction on the immigrant paradox (Markides & Coreil, 1986). In short, on Tax (1941), Vogt (1955) and Polgar (1960) the acculturation processes had only one-way, regardless that at least one culture was under fusion. Yet, the Anglo-Saxon culture was not described as learning any second culture.

### **Is the research employing measuring devices and projective tests?**

The last two codes were connected to Psychology, because measuring devices and projective tests were often employed. On the current review, measuring devices were

## **A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION**

employed to 13.3% of the articles (Bloom, 1939; Change, 1965; Graves, 1967; Kemnitzer, 1973; Kilbride & Robbins, 1969; Maher, 1960; McFee, 1968; Polgar, 1960; Reboussin & Golstein, 1966; Robbins & Pollnac, 1969; Sasaki & Olmsted, 1953; Thompson, 1948). Projective tests were employed on 10% of the works (Caudill, 1949; Edgerton, 1965; Goldschmidt & Edgerton, 1961; Henry, 1955; Kilbride & Robbins, 1969; Parker, 1964; Spindler & Spindler, 1958). Furthermore, some projective works were using statistical work (Reboussin & Golstein 1966; Thompson, 1948).

## **CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

The current conclusion will be outlined according to the defining dimensions of the acculturation concept, as they were provided at the outset, and taking into account culture as a dynamic process of acculturative fusion. The review's outcomes reported that acculturation research came from the anthropological literature to the sociological, and later to the psychological literatures. In Anthropology acculturation research was a main topic from its earlier works until the 60s. However, acculturation research appeared on colonial and imperial times. Europeans and Westerns were dominating the world, because of their industrial, and technological powers. Furthermore, eugenics, racism, the idea of progress, and social evolutionist ideas appeared in order to vindicate European and Western domination, and in some cases to vindicate genocides. Hence, most works were reporting a problematic and asymmetric relationship, and the discrimination topic only gained strength after the 60s, maybe because of the civil rights movement.

Cultural changes were the main topic in the anthropological literature, but the mere contact with intercultural interaction with two-ways of cultural influences was not a major concern. The outcomes reinforced the colonial and the imperial backgrounds of the acculturation concept. Hence, acculturation was approached more as an effect than as a cause of culture. Intercultural contact occurred among Westerns and American Indians, who were the main researched minority, and Westerns were rarely reported as learning a second culture.

As was stated previously, acculturation was approached by the dimension of changes, because Westerns were concerned about the effects of acculturation in the Indigenous cultures or were concerned about Indigenous reactions regarding the Western

culture. The colonial and imperial background may explain why the collective concern was dominant in comparison to the individualistic approach. The reactions regarding the Western domination confirmed that acculturation was a motivated phenomenon, and it was often asymmetric and antagonistic, and because social dominance narratives were current, even when the minority cultural maintenance was a concern. The main question was not the anthropological description of the Indigenous cultures, and of the intercultural contact, but how to deal the asymmetric relationships, and how to regulate the Western domination, violence, and exploitation.

The Western dominance was so powerful that acculturation was often only approached as one-way of cultural influences. Under those conditions, most of the authors were writing in English, and most of them were males working in North America. Later, the anthropological research was extended to South America, to Caribbean Islands, and in a lesser degree to Africa and Asia. Psychology was a main field of the earlier anthropological literature, and it encompassed to apply projective tests and measuring devices. Regardless the review outcomes, different cultures were reported to live for long in the same territory. Hence, cultures interacted, and it encompassed that they shared cultural features, and that cultural change or maintenance worked often at the same time.

On further researches, the acculturation concept still needs to be contextualized, and the historical evolution of the concept matches on that aim. It is necessary to add additional social sciences to psychology, and the current review should be enlarged to the sociological and psychological literatures.

The current review reported that Western majorities were not a concern, because often they were not expected to change. However, today, in the USA the White majority will be a minority, and the White middle-class has often worse health (Case & Deaton, 2015) than the first generation of immigrants, reinforcing the immigrant paradox (Markides & Coreil, 1986; Rudmin, 2003b). Furthermore, recent Western demographic changes (Case & Deaton, 2015) are maybe leading to racism, and to intercultural violence (Richeson & Sommers, 2016). For this reason, it is necessary to approach Westerns and Europeans learning other cultures.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

### REFERENCES

ADAMS, Richard. Cultural components of Central America. **American Anthropologist**, 58, 881-907, 1956.

ANDERSON, Robert. The Danish and Dutch settlements on Amager island: Four hundred years of socio-cultural interaction. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 683-701, 1958.

BAAL, Van. Erring acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 62, 108-121, 1960.

BARKER, George. Some functions of Catholic processions in Pueblo and Yaqui culture change. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 449-455, 1958.

BARNETT, Homer. Culture processes. **American Anthropologist**, 42, 21-48, 1940.

BARNETT, Homer., Broom, Leonard., Siegel, Bernard., Vogt, Evon., & Watson, James. Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. **American Anthropologist**, 56, 973-1000, 1954.

BARTH, Fredrik. **Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference**. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969.

BASCOM, William. Acculturation among the Gullah Negroes. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 43-50, 1941.

BASSO, Keith. Semantic aspects of linguistic acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 69, 471-477, 1967.

BASTIDE, Roger. Les relations raciales en Amérique anglo-saxonne et en Amérique latine. **Académie des Sciences d'Outre-Mer**, 33, 215-229, 1973.

BATESON, Gregory. Culture contact and schizogenesis. In: **Steps to an ecology of mind; Collected essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology** (pp. 71-82). London: Jason Aronson, 1935.

BEALS, R. Acculturation. In: A. L. Kroeber et al., (Eds.), **Anthropology today**. Chicago, 1953.

BEALS, Ralph., Redfield, Robert., & Tax, Sol. Anthropological research problems with reference to the contemporary peoples of Mexico and Guatemala. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 1-21, 1943.

BENEDICT, Ruth. Two patterns of Indian acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 207-212, 1943.

BERNARD, Russell. **Research methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches**. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

BERREMAN, Gerald. Aleut reference group alienation, mobility, and acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 66, 231-250, 1964.

BERRY, John. W. A psychology of immigration. **Journal of Social Issues**, 57, 615-631, 2001.

BERRY, John. W., Phinney, Jean., Sam, David., & Vedder, Paul. Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. **Applied Psychology: An International Review**, 55, 303-332, 2006.

BIGART, Robert. Indian culture and industrialization. **American Anthropologist**, 74, 1180-1188, 1972.

BLOCH, René. Posidonian thoughts ancient and modern. **Journal for the Study of Judaism**, 35, 284-294, 2004.

BLOOM, Leonard. The Cherokee clan: A study in acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 41, 266-268, 1939.

BOAS, Franz. **Race, language, and culture**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Originally Published in 1940, 1982.

BOGGS, Stephen. Culture change and the personality of Ojibwa children. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 47-58, 1958.

BOUDON, Raymond., & Lazarsfeld, Paul. **Le vocabulaire des sciences sociales, concepts et indices**. Paris: La Haye, Mouton, 1965.

BOURHIS, Richard., Moise, Lena., Perreault, Stephane., & Senécal, Sacha. Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. **International Journal of Psychology**, 32, 369-386, 1997.

BOWSKILL, Matt., Lyons, Evanthia., & Coyle, Adrian. The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. **British Journal of Social Psychology**, 46, 793-813, 2007.

BRÉGENT, Martine., Mokoukolo, René., & Pasquier, Daniel. Recherche et classification d'indicateurs d'acculturation à partir du contexte francophone. **Psychologie Française**, 53, 51-69, 2008.

BROOM, Leonard., & Kitsuse, John. The validation of acculturation: A condition to ethnic assimilation. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 44-48, 1955.

BRUNER, Edward. Primary group experience and the processes of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 58, 605-623, 1956.

CAUDILL, William. Psychological characteristics of acculturated Wisconsin Ojibwa Children. **American Anthropologist**, 51, 409-427, 1949.

CASE, Anne., & Deaton, Angus. Rising morbidity and mortality in midlife among white non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st century. **PNAS**, 112, 15078-15083, 2015)

CASTRO, Joaquim **Os efeitos da aculturação no vaivém da emigração continental: Um estudo de caso em Melgaço**. Dissertação de mestrado não publicada, Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. Os efeitos da aculturação no vaivém da emigração continental: Um estudo de caso em Melgaço. **Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Regionais**, 25/26, 67-76, 2011.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

\_\_\_\_\_. The Portuguese tile in the Rudmin Acculturation Learning Model: A fusion case. In L. Gaiser., & D. Čurčić (Eds.), **EMUNI, bridging gaps in the Mediterranean research space. Conference proceedings of the 4th EMUNI Research Souk**, 17-18 April (pp. 618-625). El. Knjiga/Portorož: EMUNI University, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. **O contexto da aculturação português através do modelo de Rudmin: Do encontro intercultural com o Japão até ao Luso-Tropicalismo**. Dissertação de doutoramento não publicada, Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal, 2014a.

\_\_\_\_\_. **O contexto da aculturação português através do modelo de Rudmin: Do encontro intercultural com o Japão até ao Luso-Tropicalismo**. Actas dos Dias da Investigação na Universidade Fernando Pessoa. Porto: GADI, 2014b.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Towards a Psychology of fusion in the acculturation phenomenon**. Actas dos Dias da Investigação na Universidade Fernando Pessoa. Porto: GADI, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_. Acculturation in the Portuguese overseas experience with Japan: A Rudmin Model application. **Daxiyanguo: Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Asiáticos**, 20, 89-120, 2016a.

\_\_\_\_\_. A aprendizagem duma segunda cultura e a identidade étnica dos indígenas brasileiros através duma rede social: Estudo exploratório. **Religacion, Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades**, 2, 75-94, 2016b.

\_\_\_\_\_. **A literature review on the Portuguese emigration literature and acculturation**. Actas dos Dias da Investigação na Universidade Fernando Pessoa. Porto: GADI, 2016c.

\_\_\_\_\_. The contributions of Gilberto Freyre for the acculturation research. **The Portuguese Studies Review**, 24, 247-257, 2016d.

\_\_\_\_\_. Wenceslau de Morães: Acculturation between ideals and life experiences. **Religacion, Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades**, 5, 207-235, 2016e.

\_\_\_\_\_. Acculturation on the Portuguese historical narrative: Gilberto Freyre contributions and limitations. **Religacion, Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades**, 3, 76-102, 2016f.

\_\_\_\_\_. Lifelong education on Portuguese emigrants and their acculturation. **Sisyphus – Journal of Education**, 6, 97-119, 2018.

CASTRO, Joaquim; MARQUES, Abel. **Emigração e contrabando**. Melgaço: Centro Desportivo e Cultural de São Paio, 2003.

CASTRO, Joaquim; RUDMIN, Floyd. **What can contemporary USA learn from the history of Portuguese imperial power in Japan and in Brazil?** Paper presented at 39th Annual Conference of the International Psychohistorical Association, New York University, 2016.

CASTRO, Joaquim; RUDMIN, Floyd. Acculturation, acculturative change, and assimilation: A Research Bibliography With URL Links. **Online Readings in Psychology and Culture**, 8(1), 2017.

CHAMBERLIN, Alexander. The contributions of the American Indian to civilization. **Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society**, 16, 91-126, 1905.

CHANGE, Norman. Acculturation, self identification, and personality adjustment. **American Anthropologist**, 67, 372-393, 1965.

CLASTRES, Pierre. **La société contre l'état**. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1974.

COPPENS, Yves. **Le présent du passé au carré: La fabrication de la préhistoire**. Paris: Odile Jacob, 2012.

CRESSWELL, James. Towards a post-critical praxis: Intentional states and recommendations for change in acculturation psychology. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, 33, 162-172, 2009.

CROWLEY, Daniel. Plural and differential acculturation in Trinidad. **American Anthropologist**, 59, 817-824, 1957.

DETOCQUEVILLE, Alexis. **Democracy in America, Vol I**. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University. Originally published in 1835, 2002.

Du BOIS, William. **The Philadelphia Negro: A social study**. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Originally published in 1899, 1999.

EDGERTON, Robert. "Cultural" vs. "ecological" factors in the expression of values, attitudes, and personality characteristics. **American Anthropologist**, 67, 442-447, 1965.

EGGAN, Fred. Some aspects of culture change in the northern Philippines. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 11-18, 1941.

ELIAS, Norbert., & Scotson, John. **The established and the outsiders: A sociological inquiry into community problems**. London: Sage Publications. Originally published in 1965, 1994.

ERIKSEN, Thomas., & Nielsen, Finn. **A history of Anthropology: Second edition**. New York: Plutopress, 2013.

FOSTER, George. Report on an ethnological reconnaissance of Spain. **American Anthropologist**, 53, 1-25, 1951.

FRAZIER, Edward. The Negro family in Bahia, Brazil. **American Sociological Review**, 7, 465-478, 1942.

\_\_\_\_\_. Race contacts and the social structure. **American Sociological Review**, 14, 1-11, 1949.

FREED, Staley. Suggested type societies in acculturation studies. **American Anthropologist**, 59, 55-68, 1957.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

FREYRE, Gilberto. **The masters and the slaves: A study in the development of Brazilian civilization.** Berkeley: University of California Press. Originally Published in 1933, 1986.

FRIEDL, Ernestine. Persistence in Chippewa culture and personality. **American Anthropologist**, 58, 814-825, 1956.

GILLIN, John. Acquired drives in culture contact. **American Anthropologist**, 44, 545-554, 1942.

\_\_\_\_\_. Ethos components in modern Latin American culture. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 488-500, 1955.

GLAZER, Nathan. **We are all multiculturalists now.** Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

GOLDSCHMIDT, Walter. Theory and strategy in the study of cultural adaptability. **American Anthropologist**, 67, 402-408, 1965.

GOLDSCHMIDT, Walter; Edgerton, Robert. A picture technique for the study of values. **American Anthropologist**, 63, 26-47, 1961.

GORDON, Milton. **Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion and national origins.** New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

GRAVES, Theodore. Acculturation, access, and alcohol in a tri-ethnic community. **American Anthropologist**, 69, 306-321, 1967.

HALLOWELL, Alfred. The impact of the American Indian on American culture. **American Anthropologist**, 59, 201-217, 1957.

HAWLEY, Florence. An examination of problems basic to acculturation in the Rio Grande Pueblos. **American Anthropologist**, 50, 612-624, 1948.

HENRY, Jules. Projective testing in Ethnography. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 245-270, 1955.

HERSKOVITS, Melville. The significance of the study of acculturation for Anthropology. **American Anthropologist**, 30, 259-264, 1937.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Acculturation: The study of culture contact.** New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher, 1938.

\_\_\_\_\_. Some comments on the study of cultural contact. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 1-10, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. Pesquisas etnológicas na Bahia. **Afroásia**, 4/5, 89-106, 1967.

HOBBSAWM, Eric. **The age of extremes: The short twentieth century, 1914-1991.** London: Abacus, 1995.

IANNI, Francis. Time and place as variables in acculturation research. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 39-46, 1958.

JAMES, Bernard. Social-Psychological dimensions of Ojibwa acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 63, 721-746, 1961.

JOHNSON, Jean. A clear case of linguistic acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 427-434, 1943.

KALLEN, Horace. Democracy versus the melting-Pot: A study of American nationality II. **The Nation**, 100, 217-220, 1915.

KEMNITZER, Luis. Adjustment and value conflict in urbanizing Dakota Indians measured by Q-Sort technique. **American Anthropologist**, 75, 687-707, 1973.

KENNEDY, Raymond. Acculturation and administration in Indonesia. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 185-192, 1943.

KILBRIDE, Philip., & Robbins, Michael. Pictorial perception and acculturation among the Baganda. **American Anthropologist**, 71, 293-301, 1969.

LAFROMBOISE, Teresa., Coleman, Hardin., & Gerton, Jennifer. Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. In: P. B. Organista., K. M. Chun & G. Marín (Eds), **Readings in ethnic psychology** (pp. 117-155). New York: Routledge, 1998.

LANGE, C. H. Acculturation in the context of selected new and old world peasant cultures. **American Anthropologist**, 59, 1067-1074, 1957.

LAZARUS, Richard. Acculturation isn't everything. **Applied Psychology**, 46, 39-43, 1997.

LINTON, Ralph. (1943). Nativistic movements. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 230-240,

MACWHITE, Eoin. On the interpretation of archeological evidence in historical and sociological terms. **American Anthropologist**, 58, 3-25, 1956.

MAHER, Robert. Social structure and cultural change in Papua. **American Anthropologist**, 62, 593-602, 1960.

MALINOWSKI, Bronislaw. **The dynamics of cultural change: An inquiry into race relations in Africa**. New Haven: Yale University Press. Originally published in 1945, 1958.

MANDELBAUM, David. Culture change among the Nilgiri tribes. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 19-29, 1941.

MARKIDES, Kyriakos., & Coreil, Jeannine. The health of Hispanics in the Southwestern United States: An epidemiologic paradox. **Public Health Reports**, 101, 253-265, 1986.

MASON, Leonard. The characterization of American culture in studies of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 1264-1279, 1955.

MASON, Otis. Similarities in culture. **American Anthropologist**, 8, 101-117, 1895.

MCFEE, Malcom. The 150% man, a product of Blackfeet acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 70, 1096-1107, 1968.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

MCGEE, William. Piratical acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 11, 243-249, 1898.

MCKENZIE, Fayette. The assimilation of the American Indian. **The American Journal of Sociology**, 19, 761-772, 1914.

MEAD, Margaret. The role of small South Sea cultures in the Post-War World. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 193-196, 1943.

MEER, Nasar., & Modood, Tariq. How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? **Journal of Intercultural Studies**, 33, 1-22, 2011.

MEGGERS, Betty. Recent trends in American Ethnology. **American Anthropologist**, 48, 176-214, 1946.

MERRIAM, Alan. The use of music in the study of a problem of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 28-34, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. Music in American culture. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 1173-1181.4, 1955.

MORIN, Edgar. **Introduction à la pensée complexe**. Paris: ESF, 1990.

MYRDAL, Gunnar. **An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy**. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1944.

NAVAS, Marisol., García, Maria., Sánchez, Juan., Rojas, Antonio., Pumares, Pablo., & Fernández, Juan. Relative acculturation extended model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, 29, 21-37, 2005.

ORTIZ, Fernando. **Cuban counterpoint: Tobacco and sugar**. Durham and London: Duke University Press. Originally published in 1940, 1995.

OZER, Simon. Theories and methodologies in acculturation Psychology: The emergence of a scientific revolution? **Psychological Studies**, 58, 339-348, 2013.

PAABO, Svante. Human origins from a genomic perspective. **Scripta Varia**, 121, 1-5, 2013.

PARK, Robert. Racial assimilation in secondary groups. **The American Journal of Sociology**, 19, 606-623, 1914.

\_\_\_\_\_. Human migration and the marginal man. **The American Journal of Sociology**, 33, 881-893, 1928.

PARKER, Seymour. Ethnic identity and acculturation in two Eskimo villages. **American Anthropologist**, 66, 325-340, 1964.

POLGAR, Steven. Biculturation of Mesquakie teenage boys. **American Anthropologist**, 62, 217-235, 1960.

POWELL, John. **Introduction to the study of Indian languages: With words phrases and sentences to be collected.** Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.

PRESS, Irwin. Urban folk medicine: A functional overview. **American Anthropologist**, 80, 71-84, 1978.

REED, Erik. Navajo independence and acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 681-682, 1941.

REBOUSSIN, Roland., & Golstein, Joel. Achievement motivation in Navaho and white students. **American Anthropologist**, 68, 740-745, 1966.

REDFIELD, Robert., Linton, Ralph., & Herskovits, Melville. Memorandum for the study of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 38, 149-152, 1936.

RICHESON, Jennifer., & Sommers, Samuel. Toward a social psychology of race and race relations for the twenty-first century. **Annual Review of Psychology**, 67, 439-463, 2016.

ROBBINS, Michael., & Pollnac, Richard. Drinking pattern and acculturation in rural Buganda. **American Anthropologist**, 71, 276-285, 1969.

RUDMIN, Floyd. Seventeen early peace psychologists. **Journal of Humanistic Psychology**, 31, 12-43, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. Catalogue of acculturation constructs: Descriptions of 126 taxonomies, 1918-2003. In: W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, S. A. Hayes., & D. N. Sattler (Eds.), **Online Readings in Psychology and Culture** (Unit 8, Chapter 8), (<http://www.wvu.edu/~culture>), Center for Cross-Cultural Research, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington USA, 2003a.

\_\_\_\_\_. Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. **Review of General Psychology**, 7, 3-37, 2003b.

\_\_\_\_\_. Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, 33, 106-123, 2009.

RUDMIN, Floyd., Wang, Bo., & Castro, Joaquim. Acculturation research critiques and alternative research designs. In: S. J. Schwartz, & J. B. Unger, (Ed.), **Handbook of acculturation and health** (pp. 75-95). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

SASAKI, Tom, & Olmsted, David. Navaho acculturation and English-language skills. **American Anthropologist**, 55, 89-99, 1953.

SCHWARTZ, Douglas Culture area and time depth: The four worlds of the Havasupa? **American Anthropologist**, 161, 1060-1070, 1959.

SEBRINC, Jesam. The formation of new castes: A probable case from North India. **American Anthropologist**, 74, 587-600, 1972.

SERVICE, Elman, R. Indian-European relations in colonial Latin America. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 411-425, 1955.

## A REVIEW ABOUT ACCULTURATION

SIEGEL, Morris. Religion in western Guatemala: A product of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 62-76, 1941.

SIMONS, Sarah Social assimilation, I. **American Journal of Sociology**, 6, 790-822, 1901.

SPENCER, Herbert. **The study of sociology**. London: Henry S. King, 1873.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Principles of Psychology**. London: Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, 1855.

SPICER, Edward. Linguistic aspects of Yaqui acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 410-426, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. Spanish-Indian acculturation in the Southwest. **American Anthropologist**, 56, 663-678, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. Social structure and cultural process in Yaqui religious acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 433-441, 1958.

SPINDLER, Louise. Witchcraft in Menomini acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 54, 593-602, 1952.

SPINDLER, Louise, & Spindler, George. Male and female adaptations in culture change. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 217-233, 1958.

STEWARD, Julian. Acculturation studies in Latin America: Some needs and problems. **American Anthropologist**, 45, 198-206, 1943.

SCOTT, James. **The art of not being governed: An anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia**. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.

STOCKING, George. **Race, culture, and evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

TAFT, Ronald. Migration: Problems of adjustment and assimilation in immigrants. In: P. Watson (Ed.), **Psychology and race** (pp. 223-239). *New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction. Originally published in 1973, 2007.*

TAX, Sol. World view and social relations in Guatemala. **American Anthropologist**, 43, 27-42, 1941.

TAYLOR, Charles. Interculturalism or multiculturalism? **Philosophy & Social Criticism**, 38, 413-423, 2012.

THOMPSON, Laura. Attitudes and acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 50, 200-215, 1948.

THURNWALD, Richard. The Psychology of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 34, 557-569, 1932.

TOURAINE, Alain. **A new paradigm for understanding today's world**. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2007.

VOGET, Fred. Acculturation at Caughnawaga: A note on the native modified group. **American Anthropologist**, 53, 220-231, 1951.

VOGT, Evon. A study of the southwestern fiesta system as exemplified by the Laguna Fiesta. **American Anthropologist**, 57, 820-839, 1955.

VYGOTSKY, Lev. **Mind in society**. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Originally published in 1930, 1978.

WALLAGE, Anthony. Revitalization movements. **American Anthropologist**, 58, 264-281, 1956.

WARD, Colleen. The A, B, Cs of acculturation. In: D. Matsumoto (Ed.), **Handbook of culture and psychology** (pp. 411-446). New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

WATSON, James. Cayuá culture change. **American Anthropologist**, 73, 93-123, 1952.

WEINGROD, Alex. Reciprocal change: A case study of a Moroccan immigrant village in Israel. **American Anthropologist**, 64, 115-131, 1962.

WESTPHAL-HELLBUSCH, Sigrid. Trends in Anthropology: The present situation of ethnological research in Germany. **American Anthropologist**, 61, 848-874, 1959.

WILLEMS, Emilio. Acculturation and horse complex among German-Brazilians. **American Anthropologist**, 46, 153-161, 1944.

WINTHROP, Robert. **Dictionary of concepts in cultural Anthropology**. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Recebido em 05/11/2017

Aprovado em 11/06/2018