"I feel more Luxembourgish, but Portuguese too"
Cultural identities in a multicultural society

Stephanie Barros & Isabelle Albert
University of Luxembourg

Corresponding author:

Stephanie Barros
PhD Student - INSIDE

Université du Luxembourg
Campus Belval - MSH
11, Porte des Sciences
L-4366 Esch-sur-Alzette
T. +352 46 66 44 – 9327
Barros.steph@gmail.com
Stephanie.barros.001@student.uni.lu
www.uni.lu

Abstract

The present investigation focused on cultural identity and the dealing with the belonging to different cultural frames as a migrant in a highly culturally diverse context by comparing two generations of Portuguese families living in Luxembourg. Quantitative standardized questionnaires complemented by in-depth qualitative interviews with parent-child dyads were used in order to assess possible (dis)similarities between first generation Portuguese immigrant parents and their adult children (i.e. second generation) concerning their cultural identities. Generational differences were found regarding the dealing with several cultural frames, language competences and attachment to both discussed cultures. Adult children were more prone to find themselves in a "compatible" identity orientation, compared to the parental generation. Yet, when focussing specifically on the second generation, qualitative data highlighted some issues regarding the dealing with the perception of the other regards one's own cultural belonging and a certain sense of cultural identity denial from the other. Our findings contribute to the existing theoretical literature on cultural identity by elucidating some major differences between immigrant parents and their adult children on how they enact the sense of belonging and the dealing with multiple cultural frames on a daily-life basis.

1. Theoretical background – What is already known?

The term of international migrant has in our contemporary societies gained a much broader scope than it did decades ago, the definitions being manifold as the individuals themselves. In 2018, the International Organization for Migration *(IOM)* estimated 244 million international migrants worldwide, defined as "people residing in a country other than their country of birth" (IOM, 2011). The latter definition might not reflect accurately the status and situation of all first-generation immigrants, as for instance age at migration is not considered and it is also possible that a person was born and raised in different countries before migrating to the current country of residence. Also, an interesting point concerns the position of their children – the second generation – who were born and/or raised in this new society. An individual might indeed be born and raised in two or multiple countries, such as the so called 'third culture kids' (Pollock & Van Reken, 2001). At the same time, geographical distances have been reduced in a sense by the generalization and globalization of mass transportation and advances in ICT which have transformed and shaped transnational relations (Arnett, 2002; Foner, 1997; Lemish, 2015; Moore & Barker, 2012)." More specifically, the communication between migrants and left behind family members have been facilitated with a substantial impact on collective as well as individual identities (Barros, Albert, & Ferring, 2017; Burholt, Dobbs, & Victor, 2016).

In many receiving societies, demographic alterations resulting from immigration raises essential questions related to national membership and integration, and thus of cultural identity (Hily & Oriol, 1993). More and more individuals claim to be part of multiple cultures and societies are facing unique challenges regarding the dealing with this multiple belonging (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007; Cheng & Lee, 2009). It becomes thus an essential requirement to further investigate and shed light on how individuals understand, express and live out their multiple cultural identities in order to develop effective programs, policies and

3

institutions for a facilitated adaptation into the receiving society. The issue becomes even more prominent in a country such as Luxembourg, where the proportion of individuals with foreign nationality is currently around 47% of the total resident population (Statec, 2018).

Substantial research and theories have specifically focussed on individuals with a multiple cultural belonging (e.g., immigrants), thus emphasizing at the same time possible multiple cultural identities (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2007; Schwartz, 2001; Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Schwartz and colleagues (2006) extended Erikson's social aspect of identity by taking into account specifically cultural aspects of identity (see also Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001), conceiving therefore identity as a synergistic combination of personal, social, and cultural facets. In the light of cultural psychological perspective, Schachter (2005), similar to previous works (see e.g., Shweder, 1979; Valsiner, 1987; Vygotsky, 1978; etc…), claimed that not only the content but also the basic structure of identity as well as its developmental course may vary across different cultural or similar macrosystemic contexts depending on the constant interaction between the individual and his environment.

1.1. Navigating identities through cultures

Several attempts have been made to assess the very essence of identity in the light of the constantly increasing international migration, without establishing consensus (Schwartz et al., 2006; Sokol, 2009). Identity can be seen indeed as a very complex and continually changing life-long process (Murdock, 2017; Varnum & Grossmann, 2017) in constant movement (Marsico & Tateo, 2017), representing one of the major components of the human being (Galliher, McLean, & Syed, 2017).

In his early work, Erikson (1968) tackled one of the most prominent developmental issues related to the question "How did I become who I am?" (Syed & McLean, 2016, p. 109). His theories revolved around the psychological development of identity as a central task

through early life stages up to adulthood, and his work heretofore has still a significant influence on identity research (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2006). Erikson (1968) referred to the importance of the sociocultural context, in which the individual is embedded, in the identity formation process (Erikson, 1995; Linell, 2009). He conceptualized identity as the result of the influence of a constantly changing dynamic interaction between the individual and its sociocultural context (see also LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). The developmental task associated with identity should, according to Erikson (1968), result in a coherent and consistent sense of the self (Sokol, 2009), in other words, finding "one's place in the world" (Schwartz et al., 2006, p. 5). The identity formation is however not finished with adulthood, but rather a constant process though life and life experiences as suggested by Hermans and Kempen (1998).

Hermans and Kempen (1998) conceived the self in their Dialogical Self Theory *(DST)* as composed of a proliferation of dynamic I-positions in a constant process of (re)negotiations or conflict resolution (Bhatia & Ram, 2001), with the possibility to migrate and reorganize in flexible ways within a same person (Hermans, 2001; Hermans & Kempen, 1998). Also, individuals are not trapped in a single I-position as these are regularly changing on a life-span perspective (e.g., children become parents, parents become grandparents, young people grow old over time; Gillespie & Martin, 2014). Different I-positions can be complementary (i.e., when the I-positions "cohabit" in a certain harmony) or in an opposition/domination relation (i.e., when there are dissonances between the various I-positions) (Hermans, 2001; Valsiner, 2002), reflecting thus the dynamic component of the self.

My culture, my identity, my cultural identity

During the acculturation process, immigrants face a peculiar situation, encountering several cultural demands. They are exposed to a double connectedness to societies with one or multiple languages, double value systems and cultural frames of reference (Bhatia, 2007), and

might seek to position themselves within both cultures. Identity development and the renegotiation of identity are thus essential for individuals with foreign background as they might seek "a sense of self-consistency while considering new possibilities" in the receiving country (Schwartz et al., 2006, p. 6).

Many social scientists conceive cultural identity as a multidimensional construct encompassing emotional, cognitive, behavioural aspects as well as cultural knowledge, all needed for the cultural adaptation and to effectively function in both cultural frames (Birman, 1994; Comănaru, 2009; Erikson, 1968; Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Phinney, 1990; Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). Cultural identity can therefore be defined as the interplay between the individual and his/her cultural context (Bhatia & Ram, 2001), referring to a certain sense of adherence to the ideals, values, beliefs and behaviours of a given cultural group (Schwartz et al., 2006; Jensen, 2003). As suggested by Oyserman and colleagues (Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012) the self is composed, amongst others, by identities (e.g., social identities and thus cultural identities according to Schwartz et al., 2006, cf page 3 paragraph 3) that are dynamically shaped in a given context. As such the self and identity are nested elements that impact how individuals "think and make sense of themselves and others, the actions they take, and their feelings and ability to control or regulate themselves" (Oyserman et al., 2012, p.70; see also Brewer, 1991). Hence, having this in mind, the self, and thus cultural identity, ~~Cultural identity~~ is strongly connected to diverse elements surrounding the individual across time and space, from both past and current situations (Birman, 1994; Hermans & Kempen, 1998), such as personal life goals, cultural and social demands (Noels & Clément, 2015) as well as expectations from family (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Kiang & Fuligni, 2009). As Ellis and Stam stated "the self is fundamentally social, never aware of itself without being aware of the world of others" (2010, p. 426). A person is interdependent and in regular connection *(direct or indirect)* with others' experiences, thoughts, practices as well as others' narrations, which

(in)directly influence and (re)shape at once an individuals' own identity and behaviours. Self and society are closely related as the self is embedded in historical, societal and cultural contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; König, 2009), which points to an even more complex architecture of an individual's cultural identity (Breugelmans & Van de Vijver, 2004).

On being bicultural: The identity forth and back

First empirical evidence for the moving between and interchanging cultural frame systems was given by Hong and colleagues' study, where cultural icons were used as triggers for cultural knowledge (Hong et al., 2000). Benet-Martinez and colleagues (Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002) further developed the cultural frame switching model of Hong et al. (2000) and proposed the Bicultural Identity Integration model *(BII)* for individuals developing in more than one cultural meaning system. According to the BII model, individuals high in BII will supposedly perceive their two cultural orientations as compatible with a certain ease to combine both cultures in their daily lives. However, low BII will see their dual cultural identities as rather in conflict and opposed to one another (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002), creating therefore possible conflicts and ambivalences when having to alternate cultural settings of reference, or maintaining both identities completely separated one from the other (Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997).

Both studies of Hong and colleagues (2000) and Benet-Martinez and colleagues (2002) highlighted the fact that bicultural individuals have access to various cultural meaning systems and might dispose of cultural competences to engage actively in a cultural frame switching, moving from one cultural meaning system to the other according to situational and cultural cues presented to them (LaFromboise et al., 1993). These cultural cues are known to activate an individual's cultural knowledge and value system, which will entail certain behavioural and attitudinal answers adapted to the involved culture. Interestingly, in their interviews Moore and

7

Barker (2012) found that this cultural alternating process according to the cultural context, happens rather intuitively, without specific efforts to intentionally fit in.

However, the experience of biculturalism, how each individual experiences and deals with the multiple belonging to and identification with different cultures, varies strongly across bicultural individuals as it is directly related and dependent on each individual's socio-historical environment (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997; Schachter, 2005). Factors affecting how individuals deal with their cultural identities are manifold, such as the perception of compatibility/opposition of the multiple cultures (Haritatos & Benet-Martinez, 2002; Hermans, 2001) or the generational status (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009; Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000). Clark and colleagues (Clark, Glick, & Bures, 2009) went further claiming that "children of immigrants born into a society different from the one in which their parents were raised will be influenced by their parents' experiences but must also navigate the social norms and expectations of the society in which they are being socialized" (p. 866). Children indeed, when already born in their parents' receiving country or who grew up in it, spending most of their childhood there, possibly face the dual cultural challenge even stronger than their parents. They are simultaneously under their parents' and extended family's influence to preserve components of the culture of origin while being possibly confronted to multiple socialization agents (e.g., school, friends, day-care systems...) in the receiving country compared to their parents.

Regardless of the manifold designations or definitions attributed to individuals developing in several cultural frames, (e.g., third culture kids[1], hybrids[2], cultural chameleons[3], biculturals, etc.), biculturalism per se implies a certain competence for intercultural communication, such as proficiency in several languages, which facilitates, amongst others, cultural interactions (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006; Northover, 1988). Biculturalism likewise requires a shifting capacity between distinct cultural frames with the necessary cultural tools to

navigate from one culture to the other, always changing the perspective and perception from where one stands.

Crossing borders: a human feature?

Noteworthy is the fact that, on top of the globalizing world (Arnett, 2002), the back and forth movement of individuals from their country of origin to their receiving country, psychologically and physically speaking, has led social researchers to re-evaluate and develop several new ways of thinking concepts such as identity or culture. In cross-cultural psychology, most concepts related to the notion of culture, and consequently to cultural identity, seem to some extent impregnated by the idea that "societies and cultures are distinctive entities created by fragmentary, disconnected spaces" (Bhatia, 2007, p. 309). Currently, we are living in a world with rather clear borders between nations and countries, symbolized by specific and distinct cultural value systems and social practices (Bhatia, 2007; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992; Hermans & Kempen, 1998). Acculturation research has thus been expanding on this conception of imaginary cultural borders seemingly overlapping with the geographical and national borders (Berry, 1992; Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997) without taking into consideration that these individuals, through their back and forth movement, "take their culture (or origin) to the new homeland and reinvent and reimagine it" (Bhatia, 2007, p. 309), where they subsequently get influenced by and influence the receiving culture itself (Berry, 2006). From a cultural psychological perspective, according to Nedergaard, Valsiner, and Marsico (2015), human beings are indeed the creators and wardens of borders, that are inherently made to be crossed in time and space.

However, the clear separation between an immigrant's receiving and home culture might in our current societies be rather melting away, often resulting in a more interwoven culture, respectively in more interwoven cultural identities. As a matter of fact, "borders are not as fixed as they appear, neither in practice nor in meaning" (Marsico & Tateo, 2017, p. 3). They

9

are manifold and can either be discrete or "entail fluid transitions" (Valsiner, 2014, p. 44), and demonstrate a capacity of high flexibility with the possibility to be (un)done depending on the socio-cultural development and time (Marsico & Tateo, 2017), as well as on the actions themselves of human beings that influence and (re)shape these borders creating or dismantling openings (Valsiner, 2014). These border zones can thus from a developmental perspective be considered as places of identity formation in the interaction of an individual and his/her socio-cultural and ecological environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Marsico & Tateo, 2017).

For decades, migrants all over the world have been "spanning ties to multiple nations and global spaces and are described as transforming institutions, economic, political structures, and cultural spaces in both the host and the homeland" (Bhatia, 2007, p. 307). It is therefore of paramount importance to understand how these individuals with diverse cultural allegiances deal with their cultural identities, as how they navigate between them might be a reflection of their embeddedness into the larger society. The receiving society can benefit from a deeper knowledge of how these individuals locate themselves in respect to the mainstream structures.

1.2. A small country teeming in migrant flows

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg can be seen as a sample case for a highly culturally diverse society with one of the highest proportions of foreign residents in Europe. From a country of emigration, Luxembourg developed over time becoming a leading country in Europe in terms of immigration, attaining in January 2018 up to 47.9% of foreign inhabitants out of the total Luxembourgish resident population (about 602.000 in total; Statec, 2018a). The Luxembourgish immigration history has indeed known several important immigrant waves, one of them being the Portuguese migrant flow in the late 1960's – early 1970's, currently still ongoing, even if a bit declining. In January 2018, the national institute for statistics in Luxembourg (Statec, 2018b) reported 96.544 inhabitants of Luxembourg with Portuguese migrant background (i.e., Portuguese passport holders) representing thus around 16% of the

total resident population of Luxembourg, some of them having now even the double citizenship (i.e., official passport holder of both countries)[1].

Luxembourg provides thus a very intriguing acculturation context, standing out with its several peculiarities that developed across time, one of them being its demographics as aforementioned making it "superdiverse" (Vertovec, 2007) as well as Luxembourg's singular linguistic diversity with three official languages – Luxembourgish, French and German and manifold cultural specificities colouring even further this culturally diverse landscape of the country. Recently, the term of proculturation context has been proposed (see Gamsukhurdia, 2018) which seems to apply well here as it implies that a culture is being reconstructed at all time through, amongst others, new encounters and interactions, that will "provoke reconsideration of self's existing configuration and the meaning system in general" (Gamsakhurdia, 2018, p. 552).

2. A story of generations - The IRMA project

The current investigation is part of the larger project called IRMA (Intergenerational Relations in the light of Migration and Ageing, 2013-2017). The IRMA-project is a cross-cultural comparison of Luxembourgish native and Portuguese migrant families, all living in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg with a special interest for intergenerational family relations. For the purpose of the present study, a particular focus was put on Portuguese migrant families whose family history and identity were influenced and marked by migration. Both generations -- the first generation that arrived 30-40 years ago, and their adult children, who either grew up or were already born in their parents' receiving country -- spent most of their lives in-between both cultures, the Luxembourgish and the Portuguese cultures. Living a transnational life, in the sense of keeping interactions with family members and friends back in the country of origin

---

[1] The law on the acquisition of the double nationality in Luxembourg was introduced in 2008 and came into effect as of January 2009 (Ministry of State, 2008).

and cultural daily practices from Portugal, means for these individuals that they have to adapt to a certain extent to cultural changes occurring in both countries (Bhatia, 2007). As we are currently witnessing sweeping demographic alterations all around the world, it becomes all the more important to expand our knowledge on identity issues and related matters.

The general aim is thus to explore how individuals deal with their cultural identity(ies) within their own self and how they reflect this into their daily-life and in interaction with others within a highly culturally diverse society, considering both perspectives of first and second generation immigrants. To this end, we will make use of a mixed methods approach, combining both quantitative as well as qualitative methods, by a) drawing on quantitative assessments of dimensions of cultural identity, as well as b) exploring underlying renegotiation processes related to elements of cultural identity. Using the complementarity and strengths of both methods, the mixed methods approach allows a unique opportunity to gain deeper and richer insight into the human functioning, more specifically about cultural identity issues in the present paper.

2.1. Study 1: Numbers to assess cultural identity?

The moving between cultures has required both host nationals as well as immigrants to acculturate to increasingly complex societies (Berry, 1997; König, 2009). As already suggested above, first generation immigrants and their children might be confronted with different developmental tasks regarding acculturation as well as with different socialization agents that might influence their cultural identity development. To that regard, how do adult children from migrant families (second generation) deal with and make sense of these double cultural influences compared to their parents (first generation) in terms of identity?

We expect adult children in comparison to their parents, to be more oriented toward the receiving culture (i.e., a higher attachment towards the LU culture) and therefore show a higher tendency for a compatible bicultural identity as they grew up or were already born in the

receiving society, being therefore more socialized in the "new" country, whereas the parents spent their formative years (see Mannheim, 1928) in the country of origin, leading thus to a potential generational gap.

2.1.1. The Portuguese (PT) population living in Luxembourg (LU)

In total, 209 participants with a PT migrant background were recruited, of which 71 were mothers with a mean age of $M = 54.7$ ($SD = 7.5$) years, while 65 fathers took part in the study aged on average $M = 57.5$ ($SD = 7.9$) years. Both had been living longer in the receiving country than in their country of birth, arriving on average around 30 years ago to LU (cf Table 1 for detailed results).

Seventy-three adult children[2] (61.6% daughters), all of which having Portuguese immigrant parents living in Luxembourg, with an average age of $M = 28.4$ ($SD = 8.0$) years, participated in the study. Interestingly, over half of them (61.6%) were already born in the receiving country. The remainder arrived at an early age of $M = 5.43$ ($SD = 4.7$) years, spending therefore most of their lives in the "new" country, Luxembourg (cf Table 1).

Noteworthy were the participants' auto-evaluations of their own language competencies *(7-point Likert scale; 1 = none, 7 = excellent)*. Regarding Portuguese language skills, no significant difference was highlighted between parents and children, all of them reporting a quite good general knowledge of the PT language. A quite different tendency was seen regarding the proficiency of the LU language, which adult children rated much higher than their parents. Whereas adult children indicated having a very similar knowledge of both languages, being a possible reflection of their bicultural competencies and ease in both cultures, migrant parents mostly had very little to no knowledge of the LU language. While these first generation immigrants have most of times learned rather French, one of the three official languages in

---

[2] Generation 1.5 usually refers to individuals who migrated before adolescence (in our study prior to the age of 12), however scholars suggest different age limits and definitions (Roberge, 2012). Nevertheless, our results show no significant differences between both groups in terms of identity orientation or cultural attachment. For this reason and to facilitate the flow of the text, we decided to integrate into the present article G1.5 and G2 into the general appellation of G2.

Luxembourg, their offspring generally grew up in this multicultural society going through the LU school system and mastering thus all the required languages used in the Grand Duchy (cf Table 1).

--- Insert Table 1 ---

Participants were asked to indicate their single or multiple nationalities (if applicable) in their order of choice. Noteworthy disparities in responses were highlighted as the parents' generation predominantly reported having one single Portuguese nationality, very few declaring the possession of a double nationality ($n = 16$). Adult children were more scattered in their answers, over half of them indicating only having either the PT or the LU citizenship. The remainder were double passports holders having thus a legal bond to both countries (cf Table 2).

--- Insert Table 2 ---

As often documented in research (Berger, 2008; Siahaan, Lee, & Kalist, 2014), adult children were generally higher educated than their immigrant parents, over half of them achieving at least secondary level (56%) and over 30% attaining even a university degree. Both, mothers and fathers barely finished primary school (around 50%), with few of them having achieved a secondary diploma or a professional training (around 24%).

2.1.2   Assessing cultural indicators with questionnaires

Regarding the quantitative part, a standardised questionnaire was developed in three different languages (i.e., French, German and Portuguese) using translation and back-translation techniques in a team of multilingual psychologists.

The attachment to each culture, PT as well as LU, was measured with a newly developed scale (Marinho Ribeiro, 2014) containing altogether 14 symbols or icons (7 per culture) reflecting diverse cultural components such as food, athletes or national flags (*5-point Likert scale; from 1 = not attached at all to 5 = very attached*). Theses icons were used as triggers for our participants' cultural knowledge and emotions, similar to those used by Hong and colleagues in their studies (2000).

To assess **cultural identity**, we used a shortened version of the BIOScale (Bicultural IDentity Orientation; Comănaru, 2009) with 13 items which had to be rated on a 6-point Likert scale (6-point Likert scale; 1 = *agree not at all* to 6 = *totally agree*). The original instrument, based on several earlier scales (e.g., BII; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2002), identifies 5 different dimensions with 4 items each regarding identity orientation: conflict, hybrid, compatibility, monocultural and flexibility (Comănaru, 2009). Several items were selected or modified to better fit to the specific Luxembourgish context. An exploratory principal axis factor analysis with Varimax rotation on the pooled data set (combining data of adult children and their parents) resulted in a three-dimensional structure with a KMO of .75 (see Annex 1). Two items were excluded from the final scale: one had significant cross-loadings on two of the three dimensions, the other loaded on a different dimension on the pooled EFA as theoretically conceptualized, which led us to exclude it for conceptual clarity of the scale, that ended up with 11 items in total. The dimensions were labelled drawing on the BII model developed by Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2002). The first factor was labelled *conflicted identity orientation* and contained 5 items such as "Sometimes I feel I'm really confused about my cultural identity". This dimension referred to a still explorative orientation defined by an ongoing and confusing search of whether or not to belong to several or only one culture. The second factor was labelled *compatible identity orientation* with 3 items exemplified with "I believe that my identity is a mixture of the Portuguese and the Luxembourgish culture". This factor reflected a certain

awareness of and commitment to the double allegiance. The last factor, consisting of 3 items, reflected a rather behavioural dimension where participants navigate from one cultural frame to the other, namely the *frame-switching identity orientation*. A sample item reads "I'm adapting my cultural identity to the respective context". Internal consistencies of the subsamples for the three factors were satisfactory, $.60 < \alpha < .87$ (except the compatible dimension for the mothers: $\alpha = .56$).

2.1.3. The analysis of cultural identity and indicators

The described variables (attachment to culture and cultural identity – conflicted, compatible and frame-switching) were all submitted to one-way ANOVA's for independent measures, where adult children, mothers and fathers were compared to each other. Several expected generational differences emerged between the parental and the adult children's generations.

Regarding attachment to culture, unsurprisingly, adult children reported a significantly higher attachment towards the LU culture compared to both mothers and fathers. As for the attachment to the PT culture, both generations showed a similarly high attachment to the PT culture. Besides the ANOVA analyses, we conducted further T-tests for dependent samples to compare the attachment to each culture (i.e., LU and PT culture) within participants for all separated family subsamples (i.e., adult children, mothers, and fathers). Both mother and father showed, as anticipated, significantly higher affinities with their culture of origin compared to the receiving culture. As a matter of fact, they reported being more attached to the PT culture than being attached to the LU culture. Interestingly, adult children reported similarly a slightly higher attachment to the culture of origin compared to the receiving Luxembourgish culture. (cf Table 3 for all specific test results discussed in the present section)

-- Insert Table 3 –

Regarding the revised bicultural identity orientation scale, the first dimension, labelled the *conflicted orientation*, showed no relevant generational differences as both generations reported a similar low tendency to feel conflicted between both cultures. The *frame-switching orientation* likewise did not show any significant difference in ratings between family members of both generations. This identity tendency highlights a more behavioural and externalized aspect of cultural identity, reflecting a relatively facilitated ability to adapt to double cultural contexts depending on situation, interaction and addressee.

Finally, most of our participants had high scores on the *compatible identity orientation*, however with an interesting significant difference between family members. The compatible identity implies a more internalized awareness of the double membership to both considered cultural systems. Individuals scoring high on this dimension seem to have a higher sense of identity commitment in terms of cultural loyalties and devotion. PT migrants from the first generation as well as their adult children were both scoring highly on the compatible identity configuration. However, adult children scored significantly higher on this orientation, where both cultures are more easily reconciled with each other or even overlapping.

2.2.   Study 2: Going deeper into the narratives

In order to investigate further the question about the cultural identity feeling of our participants, an in-depth investigation was needed. Previous results showed that both generations had rather low conflicts and used frame switching without significant differences, however, they differed with regard to the perception of the compatibility of cultural identities. These quantitative results point to different processes of identity construction. As

17

aforementioned, while the first generation has spent its formative years in the culture of origin (Mannheim, 1928), migrating afterwards and having to deal with several new emerging cultural identities (Hermans & Kempen, 1998; Schwartz et al., 2006), the second generation already grew up in a multicultural context, being confronted from the start to two cultural frames, resulting thus in a different developmental task from the beginning. In the light of these results we were specifically interested in looking deeper into what it means to deal and how they deal with various cultural frames and thus cultural identities in their daily lives and in interactions with the others. Indeed, a quantitative approach allows us to have a more general view over global tendencies and patterns of individuals at a fixed moment in time similar to a static 'snapshot'. However, (cultural) identity is, amongst others, defined by memories of past experiences, facts, stories, persons, encounters embedded in a certain socio-cultural context that will be narrated in a specific way allowing a meaning-making process of these recalled memories (Bruner, 1990; Carless & Douglass, 2013; Fivush, Booker, & Graci, 2017). Through our participants' individual narratives, we therefore try to go beyond the numbers into the deeper assessment, understanding and unravelling of living within two different cultural frames from their own vantage point to further interpret and explain the quantitative findings.

2.2.1. The interviewees and their stories

For the qualitative study, we carried out dyadic semi-structured face-to-face interviews with 10 Portuguese migrant families, in a dyadic parent-child dialogue, influenced by a migration experience from their own perspective. The interviews were conducted in 2015-16 in PT languages by the first author. Interviews audio- and video-recorded and lasted between 1 and 2 hours. Each participant had to sign a written statement allowing researchers affiliated to

the project to use the collected data while ensuring confidentiality. Various means were employed for the recruitment such as advertisements, open radio calls, social and professional networks as well as snowball sampling. Portuguese parents were all born in Portugal (7 mothers and 3 fathers), 48-66 years old, and had been living in Luxembourg for an average of over 27 years. Adult children were aged between 22 and 45 years (9 daughters and 1 son), 6 of them being already born in Luxembourg while the remainder was born in Portugal. Different topics were addressed during these interviews by use of an interview guideline, the main subject discussed in the present article being our participants' perspective regarding their possible double cultural identity(ies) and how, from their standpoint, that has affected them in their daily lives (see Annex 2).

For the analysis, we were guided by the following question: How do both cultures from "here and there" shape and influence the meaning making process of an individual's cultural identity, considering perspectives of first and second generation? "Do you have one or more nationalities?" was a simple trigger question used in order to explore the narratives and to fathom how participants understood their multiple identities and how they (un)consciously deal with these cultural identifications. The latter lead our participants to construct narratives as experts of their own lives in a constructive dialogical interaction (Carless & Douglas, 2017). Interviews were analysed by applying the narrative approach (Bruner, 1986) as well as thematic analysis (TA) method (Braun & Clark, 2006) allowing an identification and interpretation of meaning from a deductive (theory-driven) and inductive (data-driven) perspectives to "capture both manifest (explicit) and latent (underlying) meaning" (Clark & Braun, 2017, p. 298).

2.2.2. Narratives to assess identity?

Based on a close reading of the data, we observed generational differences between parents and adult children as well as variations in our participants' narratives regarding different aspects of their cultural identity. Two major themes could be highlighted for both generations:

19

(1) the sense of belonging to the receiving country vs country of origin from *(a)* the adult children's perspective born in Luxembourg, *(b)* the adult children's perspective born in Portugal, and from *(c)* the parents' perspective, as well as **(2)** the importance of language. Two further themes were observed specifically regarding the daily juggling of cultural identities from the second generation's perspective: **(3)** the coherence in a multicultural context and the dynamic aspect of cultural identity, and **(4)** the perception of the other and the cultural identity denial. In the following, the identified themes and subthemes will be further discussed with a focus on meanings and interpretations of the dealing with two cultural identities in daily life.

The sense of belonging to the receiving country vs country of origin

(a) **Adult children already born in their parents' receiving country** seem to have a more detached sense of belonging specifically to the country of their parents' roots. Although they feel a special bond to the culture of their parents -- they all master the PT language and still have family back in Portugal -- the country itself seems more distant in terms of belonging as they often never really lived there. The place they call "home" is Luxembourg, (i.e., their parents' receiving country) which is their actual country of birth. They are aware that their parents' country of origin is ultimately the place where they have their family roots and history, but with no other than the official connection through their passport.

> *Mariana*: It's good to go on holidays, but it's always good to come back home. I was born here […], for me I'm from here [Luxembourg]. Me, nothing connects me to Portugal but the nationality, well my parents are right and myself too, nothing else holds me there […] I feel a bit more LU… I'm also PT but I feel more at home in this country [Luxembourg] than when I'm in Portugal
> [Fernanda, 51 – Mariana, 24]

> *Diogo*: I feel more LU than PT, but I don't leave out my roots. […] we went once a year to Portugal, we stayed a month like almost all PTs […] At home, we spoke PT, it's not that I don't feel PT, but I feel more LU because of living my whole life here...
> [Marta, 49 – Diogo, 25]

These adult children somehow seem to feel close to the country of origin amongst others through the nationality, without feeling close to the geographical territory itself as they never lived there but only knew the country as a place to go on holidays. It seems as if on an emotional

level, boundaries are rather blurred and that a strong link to the culture itself is prevalent. Filipa, for example, clearly says that she abdicated from the PT nationality[3] to get the LU nationality but "I don't regret [to have abdicated from the PT nationality] because we are PT anyway" (Paulo, 58 – Filipa, 35). Her statement using "we" might imply that despite abdicating from a nationality, an individual will somehow always be emotionally related to the concerned culture as the origins are deeply rooted into the culture of origin, being in this case the PT culture. However, when it comes to the actual country, with a physical act of living in the specific territory with fixed national boundaries, Luxembourg becomes rather the place called "home", the place they have always been living in and to which they feel a connection to.

(b) For some **adult children born in Portugal** but grown up in Luxembourg, a certain feeling of attachment to Luxembourg is also tangible. They often talk about the practical advantages of being a Luxembourgish passport holder, in particular for work issues or administrative reasons *(as do those born in Luxembourg)*. However, for some of them, having the LU nationality is a sign of the total integration process into the receiving country, one should indeed aspire to become LU in order to be fully integrated in the country and culture.

> *Daniela*: Practical and not just that […] Because I live here, and I think that it is part of the total integration […] the part of the integration until the end.
> [Célia, 57 – Daniela, born in PT, 24]

> *Patricia*: Because I'm here completely integrated. My childhood, well a part of it, I spent it here in this country. […] I never felt different from a LU. Never felt and never had something that made me feel like a foreigner here with people.
> [Francisca, 66 – Patricia, born in PT, 45]

The fact of having spent the whole childhood in Luxembourg or at least an important part of it, makes some of our participants feel that they belong to the Luxembourgish culture, recognizing Luxembourg even fully as their own country now. They are mostly grateful and recognize the possibilities Luxembourg offered to them (work, economic, education), opportunities and a life that would not have been possible back in their parents' country of origin. One daughter

---

[3] Before the law on double nationality came into effect in 2009

specifically uses the words "well integrated" and as many of our participants, born in Luxembourg or foreign born, she never felt different from the natives, despite of not sharing the same socio-cultural background and migration experience. Yet, some of those children born in PT showed still a very vigorous sense of belonging to the country of origin.

> *Sofia*: I was born in Portugal, I am PT, I'm proud of being PT […] I feel completely PT, despite everything that Luxembourg transmitted me. I will, I was born PT and God willing I will die PT
>
> [Maria, 59 – Sofia, born in PT, 36]

Sofia in particular, clearly says that she will always be PT and will even die as a PT. She deeply expresses a high sense and deep subjective feeling of belonging to the PT culture without denying or rejecting what the receiving country transmitted and offered in terms of life conditions and traditions.

(c) For **parents**, a strong bond and feeling of belonging is also still vividly present and vigorous.

> *Francisca*: No, no, no, no, I'm PT until I die. […] I will not bother to change now. […] No, no. […] I don't like to be Luxembourger.
>
> [Francisca, 66 – Patricia, born in PT, 45]

> *Antonio*: I don't see why we need a nationality to be linked to our country […] but I know I am PT […] I think there are many PT of my age that have the LU nationality, or only the LU nationality but in their mind, they are always PT, I think […] I know that I am PT but if I can choose where to life it is here [in Luxembourg]
>
> [Antonio, 49 – Karina, 23]

Similarly to their children, almost all of our participants of the first generation showed a high sense and deep subjective feeling of belonging to the PT culture. They recognize feeling well in their country of origin and acknowledge clearly the opportunities and better life their receiving country offered to them and their children. Yet the bond to the culture of origin, seems almost to be a feeling of patriotism through the felt pride of their cultural belonging and the expressed positive emotions related to it. Antonio goes that far to claim that being PT and having a bond with Portugal as a country is not a question of nationality *(similarly to Filipa)*, but rather a felt emotion. One will always be PT in one's mind, with or without an official

paper. However, this feeling of proudness of the PT culture was also tangible in a majority of the adult children's narratives, born or not in Portugal.

Despite the strong bond with the culture of origin and not expressing the desire to become officially a Luxembourgish citizen, most parents express though feeling well in their receiving country, not wanting to go establish themselves definitely back in the country of origin, such as Francisca:

> *Francisca*: No, no one will catch me there [Portugal] […] I stay here [Luxembourg] I won't go […] because I like this here […] I like all of it with the years
> [Francisca, 66 – Patricia, born in PT, 45]

Francisca clearly expresses her desire to stay permanently in Luxembourg with some forth and back to Portugal. A previous study conducted by Albert and colleagues (Albert, Barros, & Ferring, 2016) showed indeed that the longer PT immigrants were living in their receiving culture, the more attached they felt to the Luxembourgish culture with a declined desire to go back to the country of origin.

The importance of language

One common element between **both generations of parents and their adult children** was the importance accorded to the language, be it the LU language to be seen as a LU citizen or the PT language as a mark and symbol of preserving the roots and traditions to the Portuguese culture of origin.

> *Filipa*: My father always required us to talk PT at home, he always made a point of talking PT. *Paulo*: the language, it's the link to Portugal, to our country […] and now comes the little child [the granddaughter], she goes to PT and she will have to talk PT otherwise she won't eat *(laughs)*
> [Paulo, 58 – Filipa, 35]

> *Diogo*: At home, we spoke PT, it's not that I don't feel PT, but I feel more LU because of living my whole life here and I even speak better LU than PT.
> [Marta, 49 – Diogo, 25]

> *Fernanda*: No, change for the LU nationality no, because I think that everyone that doesn't talk LU shouldn't get the LU nationality, really. I don't speak LU, do you think that it is a good thing to get the nationality?
> [Fernanda, 51 – Mariana, 24]

23

The first generation emigrated from Portugal to Luxembourg, and to some extent also from the PT culture and language. The latter in particular represents therefore very often, as specifically mentioned by one father, the only bond to the homeland, similar to a sanctuary to which they always can flee from the foreign-speaking context. The transmission of the language is sometimes even seen as a further asset, an advantage in the Luxembourgish daily life, especially later on in the Luxembourgish professional area. Parents as well as adult children, do not seem to perceive the maintaining of the mother tongue additionally to the alongside learning to new languages as a restraining element to their children's and grandchildren's well integration process into the "new" country, but rather the opposite. It has, as additional language, a very practical use for future life and career (Feliciano, 2001). At the same time, language fulfils the role of transmission of values and culture from one generation to the other, from parents to children and grandchildren, as mentioned by the father. It will serve later on to still be able to communicate in the country of origin of the (grand)parents in a more practical manner, like ordering food, but it also implies an emotional connection as it will allow the next generations to still communicate with the family left in Portugal.

The coherence in a mixed cultural context & dynamic aspect of cultural identity

Some participants *(mainly adult children)* are more in a coherent perception of their double cultural identities, perceiving both of their cultures rather as a compatible mixture. Several adult children indeed narrate having found a certain balance between both, the LU and PT cultures and ways of living. They indeed spent their (mostly) infant and (early) adult years in their parents' receiving country, having thus gone through the Luxembourgish school system, mastering all the required languages of the country, and being more socialised and integrated than their parents. Yet, the extent to which an individual might feel as belonging to both cultures seems to vary much from one individual to another.

> *Joana*: I think that in the Luxembourgish society, to be like me, it's completely normal. Not to be only PT, but be LU and something else, I don't know, it's a mixture.
>
> [Raul, 57 – Joana, 28]

These new identity patterns of PT immigrants and their offspring in Luxembourg, as well as possibly further immigrant groups, appear to clearly affect normative standards in the Luxembourgish society. What was rare a few decades ago, is now seen as "normal" in the mainstream society, becoming over time "part of the standard repertoire" of the mainstream country (Foner, 1997, p. 972). As our participant claimed, being part of several cultures has become something normal in a multicultural society, reshaping the whole structure of the larger Luxembourgish society.

> *Diogo*: I have both nationalities. […] I grew up with both cultures, from the family the PT culture and the rest was everything LU, school, friends… […] I feel more LU than PT but I don't leave my roots out, I have PT family […] I know that I have PT roots, I don't forget that.
>
> [Marta, 49 – Diogo, 25]

Interestingly, Diogo here precisely *(as several other participants did, explicitly or implicitly)* tells that his PT cultural belonging and knowledge was all transmitted by his family, while the "rest" of his cultural knowledge, namely the Luxembourgish culture, came all from school and friends teaching him competences (language, traditions…) to manage in the Luxembourgish society, showing a domain specific cultural transmission.

As aforementioned, bicultural identity is not something identical for each individual as the belonging to two distant cultures differs strongly from one person to the other *(inter-individual)*. However, high variations can also be detected even among a single same individual *(intra-individual)* as Joana further explained:

> *Joana*: I feel both things, it's a mixture of both things […] Pfff I don't know what I am after all […] I'm not connected to the PT culture, but I'm not connected to the LU culture either, it's both […] It depends on the situation […] it depends where I am with whom I am…
>
> [Raul, 57 – Joana, 28]

Joana indeed at first seemed to say that her identity was a clear combination of both cultures resulting in a rather compatible identity orientation. Nevertheless, later in her narrative she explains that it is actually more complicated and sometimes even conflictual (i.e., conflicted identity orientation). Joana mentions her "disconnection" to one and the other culture, as if she would perceive them as separate. Yet, she connects to both cultures, which might reflect to some extent the ambivalent feeling one might have towards the double cultural systems and countries one is confronted with. She then ends her statement by highlighting that it depends on the situation and the people she is dealing with, as did some other participants, bringing therefore a rather frame-switching orientation as aforementioned in Study 1.

The perception of the other and cultural identity denial

Regarding specifically the **second generation**, we could highlight some interesting inductive perspectives regarding their identity feeling and orientation. Indeed, several adult children of the second generation, independently of their country of birth, seem to be struggling more with issues related to their double cultural belonging than does the generation of their parents.

> *Karina*: Bah, it's a bit complicated… For PT we are the immigrants that left and for here we are strangers, but I was born here [Luxembourg], I've always been here, I just know this, Portugal I just know it for holidays
>
> [Antonio, 49 – Karina, 23]

In some ways, it seems as if some would feel that the legitimacy of belonging to one or the other culture is denied to these participants by natives of both countries due to their migrant background. Karina for once specifies that she was born in LU, her parents' receiving country, and never knew something else but is still perceived by others as a stranger to her native country, a reflection shared by some of the interviewed adult children.

> *Daniela*: I look like an alien there, right? Because here [Luxembourg] I'm PT and there [Portugal] I'm LU. I still don't have a country
>
> [Célia, 57 – Daniela, born in PT, 24]

Daniela, who was born outside of Luxembourg but grown up there, even goes as far as to call herself an "alien" without a country because no one seems indeed to give her this legitimacy of belonging to one or the other or even both countries. Independently of their country of birth, they seem not to be recognised as an integral part of one or the other nation, either because they were born somewhere else, or due to their familial cultural background (Noels & Clément, 2015).

> *Filipa*: I am from that generation where there was me and maybe two other PT children in the classroom. Today it's maybe 22 students of which two are LU and 20 are PT. I didn't know that, I knew the other way around (…) it was not easy
>
> [Paulo, 58 – Filipa, 35]

As explained by Filipa, at that time there were few children they could actually identify with (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), as they were mainly confronted to children of one single cultural belonging, thus not being part of a same social category. Interestingly, a majority of the parental generation admits that even if they feel like at home in their receiving country, they know "their place" in society. They are immigrants that feel mostly well integrated and adapted in their receiving country, but their "status" appears clearer for them, a PT immigrant in the receiving country Luxembourg. As for their children, the situation seems to reflect a higher ambivalence towards their place in the world.

2.3. Combining quantitative and qualitative data

Our data structure allowed for a more in-depth inspection of answer patterns in the quantitative questionnaires and the excerpts from the qualitative interviews. Table 5 in the appendix shows the responses to the question "can one belong to one single or rather to multiple cultures simultaneously?" in the quantitative questionnaire regarding the items of the three dimensions conflicted orientation, compatible orientation and frame-switching orientation. These data illustrate very well how the responses in the quantitative and in the qualitative interviews validate but also complement each other.

Microanalyses of some selected cases to exemplify and bolster the complementary of both methods should be outlined here (see Annex 3):

First, Diogo's answer pattern regarding the quantitative measurement of bicultural identity dimensions is very clear: he scores high on items regarding a compatible orientation as well as on frame-switching, whereas he scores low on conflicted orientation items. This is well in line with his utterances in the qualitative interview where he states identifying strongly with the Luxembourgish culture whereas knowing his roots and being culturally competent (e.g. regarding language competences) in both cultures, hence his ability to switch between cultural frames. He seems to know exactly where he belongs to in line with his low scores on the conflicted scale.

Second, a closer look at Karina's answer profile shows that she is rather high scoring on the items regarding a conflicted orientation as well as on compatibility whereas somewhat lower on frame-switching. In her utterances it becomes clear that the view of others might play a role also influencing self-perception "For PT we are the immigrants that left and for here we are strangers", which could be related also to her lower scores on frame-switching, although she for herself seems to be clear regarding her identification with Luxembourg "but I was born here [Luxembourg], I've always been here, I just know this, Portugal I just know it for holidays".

Third, Daniela has an interesting answer pattern where she seems not to be conflicted, having a high compatible orientation and a medium level of frame-switching. In her qualitative interview, she states the practical aspects of having the Luxembourgish nationality and her wish to being highly integrated ("I think that it is part of the total integration […] the part of the integration until the end"), however she also notes that "I look like an alien there, right? Because here [Luxembourg] I'm PT and there [Portugal] I'm LU. I still don't have a country", which could be related to her relatively low levels of alternating—and which could even indicate an

opposite reaction as described by some experiments by Benet-Martinez and colleagues (2002): when being in one cultural context she might act more strongly in line with cultural elements of the other culture. Thus, although not stating to have an inner conflict about her cultural identity, she seems to be aware of the others' view on herself as being different.

This closer view on quantitative in comparison to qualitative results points to the necessity of analysing answer patterns and not just single dimensions and also to take further variables, such as labelling processes and the perceived view of others, into account when analysing patterns of bicultural identity integration, as these might further inform results regarding specific answer patterns

3. Discussion - Cultural identity: A toggle switch?

The present study investigated the cultural identity and thus the dealing with the belonging to different cultural frames, namely the Portuguese and the Luxembourgish, by comparing two generations, parents and adult children. Possible discrepancies or similarities were sought in terms of cultural identity between first generation Portuguese immigrants and their adult children (i.e., second generation), all living in Luxembourg. Our findings contribute to a better understanding of the experience of belonging to culturally diverse societies from the perspective of families with an immigrant background. We added to the already existing literature on cultural identity by further elucidating the dealing with cultural identities and associated essential themes such as language or the perception of the other regarding one's own cultural identity. We further shed light on generational differences in the handling with two cultural identities by comparing two generations, parents and adult children, adding thus further to the knowledge to intergenerational family relations.

The quantitative data, allowed us to identify specific generational gaps between parents and their adult children regarding cultural identity dimensions, more specifically as regards the compatible identity orientation. Our findings from statistical testing were complemented by in-

depth qualitative narratives that further highlighted some generational differences while emphasizing variability within the adult children's generation itself, reflecting the high range among bicultural individuals (Hong et al, 2000) that grew up in a similar socio-cultural environment. By using a mixed method approach, combining numbers and narratives, we get a unique opportunity to gain deeper and richer insight into identity processes and human functioning (Clark, 2017; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007).

The role of language and attachment to culture

Interestingly, results showed that the attachment to the PT culture of origin seems quite intact and similar for both generations. This outcome might to some extent reflect and be part of a family transmission process of culture that emerges from generation to generation. As part of a culture and the attachment to this specific culture, language plays obviously a major role for our participants within the family dynamics, as does its transmission over generations, going from parents to children and grandchildren. The mastering of the language of origin (PT) seems to work as a precious and necessary identity resource (Herold, 2018; Hily & Oriol, 1993), an indication of loyalty and symbol of preserving the bond to the roots and traditions to the culture of origin. It is, as many family dyads highlighted, the link to the culture and country, as well as a way to still be understood by and understand the family back in the country of origin. For first generation immigrants, preserving their home language and continuing the transmission onto the next generation might also have served as a certain escape from the foreign culture they were upon arrival not familiar with and the foreign-spoken languages that were at the beginning difficult to identify with. The receiving language (LU) is specifically relevant for the integration into and the feeling of belonging to the receiving culture from both generations' perspective but particularly for second generation adult children. Their competences in the LU language allowed them obviously to develop a strong bond to the LU culture on an emotional level, as

well as on a more practical level (for example for job search). Thus, being an allophone[4] in a multicultural society (such as our Portuguese participants in Luxembourg) might be considered as a highly desirable advantage, as speaking an additional language (i.e., PT in the present case) is often seen as an added value.

Cultural identity(ies) and variability

An interesting intergenerational gap could be highlighted regarding identity feeling and orientation between foreign-born first-generation parents that immigrated to Luxembourg at a later age, and the second-generation, already born in or grown up in Luxembourg.
Adult children scored higher on the compatible identity orientation. As expected, the adult children's generation seems to be more prone to identify themselves simultaneously with both cultures (i.e., the compatible orientation; Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997), thus apparently not in a mutual conflict one with the other, but rather in complementarity (Hermans & Kempen, 1998) or overlap (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). These results point to the higher salience of negotiation processes in order to reconcile or integrate both cultural identities.

However, the quantitative results do not necessarily seem to go along with higher identity conflict which was on average rated as similarly low in both groups. Yet narratives revealed some substantial nuances. Some adult children reported certain issues, struggling more with their double cultural belonging, compared to their parents. The parental generation, as aforementioned, perceives itself as immigrants living in their receiving country with a specific place within it and probably have no or less conflict in terms of identity orientation as reported by Antonio (cf Study 2). In contrast, some adult children revealed a tendency to sometimes feeling somehow lost in their identities, mostly due to the perception of the other. Sometimes,

---

[4] Allophones are residents in multicultural societies, whose mother tongue is different from the country's official languages (Statec, 2016)

in Portugal they are not seen as Portuguese and in Luxembourg not really as Luxembourgish natives, leading to a certain cultural identity denial, where the position within the society is presumably denied to them by others. On top of that, while being socialized in a different environment than their parents were, they are also still under the strong influence of their parents' culture of origin, therefore faced with a double system of values (Benet-Martinez et al, 2002; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997) and potentially contradictory messages coming from different sources (Clark et al., 2009; Rudmin, 2003). They are thus more prone to find themselves in a rather conflictual position in terms of identity compared to their parents, showing possibly a higher level of ambivalent feelings regarding double incongruent messages they receive from family, mainstreamers and society in general.

However, being in a conflicted orientation does not necessarily imply that participants feel as belonging to one single culture, which might be the case for the first immigrant generation as aforementioned and reported by Antonio's narrative. Feeling conflicted regarding one's cultural identities might also mean that despite wanting to belong to two cultural systems, the monocultural concept may be experienced as less conflictual and ambivalent, thus easier to deal with in terms of felt emotions and loyalties from the participants' theoretical perspective. The feeling of a certain conflictual orientation towards one's own identity is in fact not incompatible with the belonging to other identity orientations as identity is flexible and considered to fluctuate in time and space (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Erikson, 1968). Some participants specified it by moving in their discourse from a conflictual orientation to a rather compatible and even frame-switching identity orientation, proving the dynamic process of identity not only on a life-span perspective but even on a daily-basis. Individuals are therefore not trapped in a single cultural identity orientation as the latter is dynamic and oscillates in time and space (Hermans & Kempen, 1998). Additionally, some adult children of the second generation were in their youth less confronted to a cultural diversity within for example

classrooms. They were mainly facing children who had only one cultural belonging, be it LU native children in the receiving country Luxembourg or PT native children back in the homeland Portugal during holidays. These were mostly children with whom those from the second-generation immigration could not always readily identify with as stated by one of our participants as they did not "share a common definition of themselves" (i.e., social identity theory; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 40). For these "first" second generation children, no real identification group existed then, leaving them to build their identity for themselves. However, the multicultural aspect of Luxembourg has developed such as in numerous other societies. Nowadays, children grow up with other children from several different cultures with whom they might easier relate and identify to. The social categorization and identification process (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) might be facilitated, so they might feel less "alienated" by the perception of others as in the current Luxembourgish society *"To be like me it's completely normal (…) be LU and something else" (Joana, 28, p. 22)*.

In that sense, both generations seem to face the frame switching situation, trying both to adapt to the normative societal expectations and to those of their interlocutors as well as they can according to the different situations (Hong et al, 2000; LaFromboise et al, 1993). Quantitative results showed indeed no generational differences in the frame-switching dimension, thus parents and adult children might make use of cultural frame-switching to similar extents. Both generations alternate between different cultural frames while assessing the various cultural cues in their multicultural society even if parents assumingly seem less socialized into the receiving society compared to their offspring. In today's multicultural societies, it seems indeed highly unlikely that one can avoid any cultural contact, not requiring any sense of cultural frame switching, be it for allochthones or even autochthones. Still, the extent of the development of intercultural competences might strongly be related to quantity and frequency of intercultural contact (Islam & Hewstone, 1993) as well as quality of contact,

33

and therefore of available socialization agents (Arnett, 1995). Immigrants' children going through the school system in today's multicultural settings meet therefore children from different cultural contexts, and therefore have a higher opportunity to be on a daily-basis and multiple times in a cultural frame switching process (languages, cultural traditions, values, food…). On the contrary, first generation immigrants were usually rather involved as salaried-workers (mostly construction and cleaning activities) in the late 70-80's, and thus more prone to find themselves rather with people of a similar immigrant background (Nienaber, Dionisio, & Sommarribas, 2015). Yet cultural contact happened even for them, be it at work with other immigrant groups or through their children.

Despite generational differences in relating to both cultures, there is nevertheless, a "constant weaving in and out from one culture to another" (Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2006, p. 192) in both generations. These individuals can indeed be defined by their "double belonging" to societies, languages, norms and practices (Bhatia, 2007), with networks transcending both national boundaries (receiving and home countries). The physical and emotional process of continuously moving back and forth (e.g., for holidays, phone calls, media, sports, etc.…) is mirrored by the regular process of reconceiving and reshaping their respective identities (Bhatia, 2007). A person with migrant background is therefore in regular (re)negotiation of his/her migrant identity facing at the same time renegotiation within family dynamics (see for example children as language brokers; Glick, 2010).

Transcending concepts of fixed borders

Overall, we are currently living in a fragmented world with rather clear borders between nations and countries, symbolized by specific and distinct cultural value systems and social practices (Bhatia, 2007), where each country is supposedly embodying a distinct culture of its own (Gupta & Fergusson, 1992). While visiting The Netherlands or Italy for example, assumingly one will be confronted with Dutch, respectively Italian culture in all its possible

forms such as language, food, behaviours or even clothes. Nevertheless, what happens in multicultural societies such as Luxembourg? Is it still possible to find a "pure" native Luxembourgish culture or rather bi- or even multicultural individuals who influence and reshape the Luxembourgish society? As Joana related *"to be like me, it's completely normal. Not to be only PT, but be LU and something else [...] it's a mixture"*. "Geographical cultural borders" are physically and politically still present in our culturally expanding cultures. However, the back and forth movement is becoming a lesser obstacle, as moving between countries has been facilitated by globalization, mass transportation, technological devices and communication developments (Arnett, 2002; Moore & Baker, 2012), almost wiping out geographical borders and the actual distance that separate migrants from their country of origin. Immigrants are constantly crossing these borders inherently made to be crossed (Nedergaard et al., 2015), going multiple times back to their homeland to "kill" their longing of family and country (i.e., *"matar saudades"*; Barros & Marinho Ribeiro, 2018).

The border zones between both cultural frame systems are therefore flexible, depending on socio-cultural development, such as laws regarding geographical borders (e.g., the Schengen agreement; Marsico & Tateo, 2017). These psychological borders, more specifically cultural identity border zones become thus also from a psychological point of view rather blurred, being places of identity development where an individual, in interaction with the other as well as the socio-cultural environment, can remodel his/her manifold cultural memberships and therefore his/her cultural identities at desideratum. Borders are as a matter of fact not fixed (Marsico & Tateo, 2017) neither is cultural identity and its borders. Cultural identity may therefore be conceived as a permeable membrane, where an individual's actions (Valsiner, 2014) as well as external actions (e.g., laws, societal structural changes…) can either create or close openings, allowing for cultural exchange and alterations.

The migration and socio-cultural context

35

As already suggested by Erikson (1968), the analysis of identity development should not and cannot be done isolated from the socio-cultural and historical context in which the individual is embedded (Linell, 2009) for the benefit of a global understanding of the human mind (Varnum & Grossmann, 2017). In our contemporary culturally diverse societies, individuals often find themselves caught up between several cultures (Murdock, 2017). Immigration leads, amongst others, to a cultural diversity, where new immigrants possibly not only accommodate to the mainstream culture (Berry, 1997) but possibly also get influenced by other minority cultures they get in contact with (Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2006). On top of that, the globalization process might even create a more globalized identity (Arnett, 2002), which adds to the already complex architecture of identity formation.

Migrants compared to non-migrants deal therefore potentially with a higher variety of bi- or even multiple cultural identities which are not always ready-made combinations provided by society (Hermans & Kempen, 1998). These bi- or multicultural identities are in that sense created by the narratives and experiences of each individual, whereby society and people evolve and influence one another (e.g., mother and successful worker; LU-PT double nationalities). These new varieties of cultural identities of immigrant groups change the traditional carved monocultural concept of identity within our current societies.

Luxembourg as such is a unique laboratory for cultural studies, and can thus act as a role model regarding cultural identity, where our findings can be used and further extended for future research within multicultural societies following similar patterns of cultural identity and the belonging to several cultural frames. In a constantly boundary-crossing world (Hermans et al., 2017; Marsico & Tateo, 2017) with over 244mio of international migrants worldwide (IOM, 2011), issues of cultural identity and belonging are an integral part of our current societal realities and need thus to further be discussed as they might be strongly related to how immigrants and their children will relate to the receiving society.

Conclusions – Why cultural identity matters for our societies

A main goal of the present paper was to tackle the question of the dealing with cultural identities from individuals with a migrant background perspective. A mixed-method approach was necessary to allow the highlighting of dissimilarities between first generation Portuguese immigrants and adult children (i.e., second generation) about their cultural identity(ies). Our data support the concept of single or multiple porous fluctuating cultural identity(ies) on a daily- and life-span basis according to context, addressee and cultural cues, with old elements being potentially left behind and new elements emerging (Hermans & Kempen, 1998) by penetrating borders of existing cultural identities (Marsico & Tateo, 2017). Additionally, generational differences were found. ~~regarding the compatible identity orientation where adult children scored higher compared to the parents. Qualitative results complemented the latter where~~ Interestingly, amongst others, adult children reported a higher salience of questions revolving around ambivalent feelings regarding the juggling with cultural identities and their self-definition through the perception of the other. These results point to different processes of negotiation in order to reconcile or integrate both cultural identities between first and second generations. Further, our findings emphasize the variability among adult children's generation itself and in general among bicultural individuals and shed light thus on the prominent issue of dealing with bi- or possible multiple cultural identities in constantly growing multicultural societies. The latter are to some extent clearly affecting and reshaping normative standards of the cultural identity concept and of what it means to be a part of a culture and nation. The so far consensus of a nation is being challenged and turned upside down, amongst others, by migrating flows, individual experiences and intra-subjective feeling of being part of a nation. Further, alongside the role of the other's perception, what impact will the new emerging media and technology have for future generations on how they will bring back together their various cultural identities? The discussed issues regarding the handling of cultural identities should

further be addressed by research from a cross-cultural as well as social and cultural psychology perspective, in particular for the developing of guidelines and directions for future immigration interventions and policies. Investigating the intricated and multifaceted cultural identity process has advanced our understanding of the complexity of the continuous dynamic of negotiating cultural identities. However, as already mentioned, many questions regarding the multiple ways of being bicultural still remain unanswered and will need to be tackled and further explored.

Bibliography

Albert, I, Barros Coimbra, S., & Ferring, D. (2016). Future plans and the regulation of well-being of older Portuguese immigrants in Luxembourg. *Social Inquiry into Well-Being, 2*(1), 70-78.

Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2007). Acculturation Attitudes: A Comparison of Measurement Methods. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(7), 1462–1488.

Arnett, J.J. (1995). Broad and narrow socialization: The family in the context of a cultural theory. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *57*, 617-628.

Arnett, J.J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, *57*(10), 774-783.

Barros, S., Albert, I., & Ferring, D. (2017). Migrating identities: Affective dialogues across generations. In O.V. Lehmann, & J. Valsiner (Eds.). *Deep experiencing: Dialogues within the self* (pp. 51–64). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing AG.

Barros, S., & Marinho Ribeiro, G. (2018). Saudade: A unique feeling in the lusitanian soul. In I. Albert, E. Abbey, & J. Valsiner (Eds.). *Trans-generational family relations: Investigating ambivalences* (pp.217-245). Charlotte, NC, US: IAP.

Benet-Martinez, V., Leu, F., Lee, J., & Morris, M.W. (2002). Negotiating Biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 492-516.

Benet-Martínez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J., (2006). Biculturalism and Cognitive Complexity: Expertise in Cultural Representations. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 37* (4), 386-407.

Berger, F. (2008). Zoom sur les primo-arrivants portugais et leurs descendants [Zoom on Portuguese newcomers and their offspring]. Vivre au Luxembourg : Chroniques de l'enquête PSELL, *49,* 1–2.

Berry, J.W. (1992). Acculturation and Adaptation in a New Society. International Migration, *30*(1), 69-85.

Berry, J.W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*(1), 5-34.

Berry, J.W. (2006). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethnocultural groups in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30*(6)*, 719-734.

Bhatia, S. (2007). Rethinking culture and identity in psychology: Towards a transnational cultural psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *27*(2), 301-321.

Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Locating the dialogical self in the age of transnational migrations, border crossings and diasporas. *Culture & Psychology*, *7*(3), 297-309.

Birman, D. (1994). Rethinking acculturation in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human development*, *44*, 1-18.

Bolognani, M. (2007). The myth of return: Dismissal, survival or revival? A Bradford example of transnationalism as a political instrument. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *33*, 59-76.

Bourhis, R.Y., Moise, L.C., Perreault, S., & Sénécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, *32*(6), 369-386.

Braun, V., & Clark, R.L. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Breugelmans, S.M., & Van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2004). Antecedents and components of majority attitudes toward multiculturalism in the Netherlands. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *53*(3), 400-422.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(6), 723-742.

41

Bruneau, T.J., & Ishii, S. (1988). Communicative silences: East and West. *World Communication*, *17*(1), 1-33.

Burholt, V., Dobbs, C., & Victor, C. (2016). Transnational relations and cultural identity of older migrants. *The Journal of Geropsychology*, *29*(2), 57-69.

Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Castro, J.F.P. (2016). A aprendizagem duma segunda cultura e a identidade étnica dos indígenas brasileiros através duma rede social: estudo exploratório [Learning a second culture and the ethnic identity of the Brazilians indigenous through a social network: An exploratory study]. *Religacion: Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades* [Religion: Journal in Social Sciences and Humanities], *2*, 75-94.

Carless, D., & Douglas, K. (2017). Narrative research. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 307-308.

Carling, J. (2015). Myth of Return. In J. Stone, R.M. Dennis, P.S. Rizova, A.D. Smith, & X. Hou (Eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism* (pp. 1507–1508). Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell.

Cheng, C.-Y., & Lee, F. (2009). Multiracial identity integration: Perceptions of conflict and distance among multiracial individuals. *Journal of Social Issues*, *65*(1), 51-68.

Christmas, C.N., & Barker, G.G. (2014). The immigrant experience: Differences in acculturation, intercultural sensitivity, and cognitive flexibility between the first and second generation of Latino immigrants. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *7*(3), 238-257.

Clark, R.L. (2017). Mixed methods research. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 305-306.

Clark, R.L., Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 297-298.

Clark, R.L., Glick, J.E., & Bures, R.M. (2009). Immigrant families over the life course: Research directions and needs. *Journal of Family Issues*, *30*(6), 852–872.

Crites, S. (1986). Storytime: Recollecting the past and projecting the future. In T.R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct* (pp. 152-173). New York: Praeger.

Comănaru, R.-S. (2009). *Dimensions of biculturalism. The development of the bicultural identity orientation scale.* (Doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta). Retrieved from http://www.psych.ualberta.ca/~knoels/personal/Kim%27s%20publications/Ruxandra %20Comanaru.pdf

Cunha, C. (2007). Constructing organization through multiplicity: A microgenetic analysis of self-organization in the dialogical self. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, *2*, 287–316.

Cunha, C., Salgado, J. & Goncalves, M. (2012). The dialogical self in movement: Reflecting on methodological tools for the study of the dynamics of change and stability in the self. In: E. Abbey & S. Surgan (Eds.), *Emerging methods in psychology* (pp. 65-100). New Brunswick (USA): Transaction Publishers.

Denzin, N.K. (Ed.). (1989). Interpretive biography *(Qualitative research methods: Vol 1).* Newbury Park, California (USA): SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dewaele, J.-M., & van Oudenhoven, J.P. (2009). The effect of multilingualism/multiculturalism on personality: No gain without pain for third culture kids? *International Journal on Multilingualism*, *6*(4), 443-459.

Ellis, B.D., & Stam, H.J. (2010). Addressing the other in dialogue: Ricoeur and the ethical dimensions of the dialogical self. *Theory & Psychology*, *20*(3), 420–435.

Erikson, E.H. (1995). Childhood and Society. London, UK: Vintage Books.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identity, youth, and crisis. New York: Norton.

Eurostat (2015). *Migration and migrant population statistics.* Retrieved September 2017, from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-

explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics

Ezzy, D. (2000). Illness narratives: time, hope and HIV. *Social Science & Medicine*, *50*(5), 605–617.

Feliciano, C. (2001). The benefits of biculturalism: Exposure to immigrant culture and dropping out of school among Asian and Latino youths. Social Science Quarterly, *82*, 866-879.

Fivush, R., Booker, J.A., & Graci, M.E. (2017). Ongoing narrative meaning-making within events and across the life span. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality: Consciousness in Theory, Research, and Clinical Practice*, *37*(2), 127-152.

Fleury, C. (2010). Les attitudes et les pratiques de solidarité intergénérationnelle des immigrants portugais du Luxembourg : Une étude comparative [The attitudes and practices of intergenerational solidarity of Portuguese immigrants in Luxembourg: A comparative study]. *CEPS/INSTEAD, Working Paper No 2010-24.*

Foner, N. (1997). The immigrant family: Cultural legacies and cultural changes. *The International Migration Review*, *31*(4), 961-974.

Galliher, R.V., McLean, K.C., & Syed, M. (2017). An integrated developmental model for studying identity content in context. *Developmental Psychology*, 53*(11),* 2011-2022.

Gamsakhurdia, V. (2018). Adaptation in a dialogical perspective—From acculturation to proculturation. *Culture & Psychology*, *0*(0), 1-15.

Gillespie, A., & Martin, J. (2014). Position exchange theory: A socio-material basis for discursive and psychological positioning. *New Ideas in Psychology, 32*, 73-79.

Glick, J.E. (2009). Connecting Complex Processes: A Decade of Research on Immigrant *Families. Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 498-515.

Grossen, M. (2010). Interaction analysis and psychology: A dialogical perspective. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioural Science*, *44*, 1-22.

Grotevant, H.D., & Cooper, C.R. (1985). Patterns of interaction in family relationships and the development of identity exploration in adolescence. *Child Development*, *56*(2), 415-428.

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "culture": Space, identity and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, *7*(1), 6-23.

Haritatos, J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2002). Bicultural identities: The interface of cultural, personality, and socio-cognitive processes. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 598–606.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2001). Conceptions of self and identity: Toward a dialogical view. *International Journal of Education and Religion*, *1*, 43–62.

Hermans, H.J.M. & Kempen, H.J.G. (1993). *The dialogical self: Meaning as movement.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Hermans, H.J.M., Konopka, A., Oosterwegel, A., & Zomer, P. (2017). Fields of Tension in a Boundary-Crossing World: Towards a Democratic Organization of the Self. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science*, *51*, 505–535.

Herold, V. (2018). Meine Heimat ist die portugiesische Sprache [My homeland is the Portuguese language]. *Forum für Politik, Gesellschaft und Kultur*, *381*, 28–30.

Hily, M.-A., & Oriol, M. (1993). Deuxième génération portugaise : la gestion des ressources identitaires [Second Portuguese generation: the management of identity ressources]. *Revue européenne des migrations internationales*, *9*(3), 81-93.

Hong, Y., Morris, M.W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, *55*(7), 709-720.

International Organization for Migration, IOM. (2017). Migration and migrants: A global overview. In IOM, *World Migration Report*, IOM: Geneva. Retrieved February 2018, from http://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2018

Islam, M.R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Intergroup attributions and affective consequences in majority and minority groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(6), 936-950.

Jensen, L.A. (2003). Coming of age in a multicultural world: Globalization and adolescent cultural identity formation. *Applied Developmental Science*, *7*, 189-196.

Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Turner, L.A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(2), 112-133.

Kiang, L., & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). Ethnic identity and family processes among adolescents from Latin American, Asian, and European backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 228–241.

König, J. (2009). Moving experiences: Dialogues between personal cultural positions. *Culture & Psychology*, *15*(1), 97-119.

Kroger, J., & Marcia, J.E. (2011). The identity statuses: Origins, meanings, and interpretations. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V.L. Vignoles (Eds.). *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research* (pp. 31–53). New York: Springer.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L.K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*(3), 395–412.

Lemish, D. (2015). Media and individual development. In D. Lemish, *Children and media: A global perspective* (pp. 38-71). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Linell, P. (2009). Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of sense-making. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Mannheim, K. (1928). Das Problem der Generationen [The problem of generations], *Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie*, *7*, 157-185, 309-330.

Marinho Ribeiro, G. (2014). „Der Apfel fällt nicht weit vom Stamm" – Identitätsbildung und inter-generative Wertetransmission bei der ersten und zweiten Generation an portugiesischen Migranten in Luxemburg ["The apple never falls far from the tree" – Identity constructions and intergenerational value transmission in first and second generation Portuguese immigrants in Luxembourg]. Unpublished bachelor thesis, University of Luxembourg.

Marsico, G., & Tateo, L. (2017). Borders, tensegrity and development in dialogue. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science*, *51*(4), 536-556.

Mok, A., Morris, W.M. (2009). Cultural chameleons and iconoclasts: Assimilation and reactance to cultural cues in biculturals' expressed personalities as a function of identity conflict. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 884-889.

Moore, M.M., & G.G. Barker (2012). Confused or multicultural: Third culture individuals' cultural identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*, 553–562.

Murdock, E. (2017). Identity and its construal: Learning from Luxembourg. *Integrative Psychological & Behavioral Sciences*, *51*(2), 261–278.

Nedergaard, J.I., Valsiner, J., & Marsico, G. (2015). "I am not that kind of…": Personal relating with social borders. In B. Wagoner, N. Chaudhary, & P. Hviid (Eds.), Integrating experiences: Body and mind moving between contexts (pp. 245-263). Information Age Publishing, Inc: Charlotte, NC.

Nienaber, B., Dionisio, L., & Sommarribas, A. (2015). International Migration in Luxembourg: Continuous Reporting System on Migration OECD - Luxembourg. Luxembourg-city, Luxembourg: OLAI. Retrieved from http://orbilu.uni.lu/bitstream/10993/22528/1/INTERNATIONAL%20MIGRATION%20LUXEMBOURG_FINAL.pdf

Noels, K.A., & Clément, R. (2015). Situational variations in ethnic identity across immigration generations: Implications for acculturative change and cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Psychology*, *50*(6), 451–462.

Northover, M. (1988). Bilingual or "dual linguistic identities"? In J. Berry, & R. Annis (Eds.), Ethnic psychology: Research and practice with immigrants, refugees, Native peoples, ethnic groups and sojourners (pp. 207–216). Berwyn, PA: Swets North America.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H.M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 3–72.

Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*(3), 499–514.

Phinney, J., & Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *7*, 3–32.

Phinney, J., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(3), 493-510.

Ramirez, M. (1983). Psychology of the Americas: Mestizo perspectives on personality and mental health. New York: Pergamon.

Ramirez, M. (1984). Assessing and understanding biculturalism-multiculturalism in Mexican-American adults. In J. Martinez, R. Mendoza (Eds.), *Chicano psychology* (pp. 77–94). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Roberge, M.M. (2002). California's generation 1.5 immigrants: what experiences, characteristics, and needs do they bring to our English classes? *The CATESOL Journal, 14*(1), 107-129.

Rudmin, F.W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, *7*(1), 3-37.

Schachter, E.P. (2005). Context and identity formation: A theoretical analysis and a case study. Journal of Adolescent Research, *20*(3), 375-395.

Schwartz, S.J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and, neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity*, *1*(1), 7-58..

Schwartz, S.J., Montgomery, M.J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, *49*(1), 1-30.

Shweder, R.A. (1979). Rethinking Culture and Personality Theory Part I: A Critical Examination of Two Classical Postulates. *Ethos, 7*(3), 255-278.

Siahaan, F., Lee, D.Y., & Kalist, D.E. (2014). Educational attainment of children of immigrants: Evidence from the national longitudinal survey of youth. *Economics of Education Review*, *38*, 1-8.

Sokol, J.T. (2009). Identity development throughout the lifetime: An examination of Eriksonian theory. *Graduate Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *1*(2), 1- 11.

Statec (2018a). *État de la population [Population status]*. Retrieved September 2017, from http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=12853&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=1

Statec (2018b). Les principales communautés du pays *[The main communities of the country]*. Retrieved June 2018, from http://www.statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/population/population/2018/06/20180608/index.html

Syed, M., & McLean, K.C. (2016). Understanding identity integration: Theoretical, methodological, and applied issues. *Journal of Adolescence*, *47*, 109–118.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tsai, J., Ying, Y., & Lee, P. (2000). The meaning of "being Chinese" and "being American": Variation among Chinese-American youth adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *31*, 302-332.

Tadmor, C.T., & Tetlock, P.E. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*(2), 173-190.

Useem, J., Donoghue, J.D., & Useem, R.H. (1963). Men in the middle of the third culture: The roles of American and non-western people in cross-cultural administration. *Human Organization*, *22*(3), 169–179.

Valsiner, J. (1987). Culture and the development of children's action: A cultural-historical theory of developmental psychology. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Valsiner, J. (2002). Forms of dialogical relations and semiotic autoregulation within the self. *Theory & Psychology*, *12*(2), 251-265.

Valsiner, J. (2014). An Invitation to Cultural Psychology. London: Sage

Varnum, M.E.W., & Grossmann, I. (2017). Cultural change: The how and the why. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *121*(6), 956–972.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. *30* (6): 1024–1054.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wamwara-Mbugua, L.W., & Cornwell, T.B. (2006). Immigrant acculturation as a dialogical process. Advances in Consumer Research, M.C. Lees, T. Davis, & G. Gregory (Eds.) (vol. 7; pp. 192-193), Association for Consumer Research: Sydney, Australia.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for age and years spent in Luxembourg, & gender frequencies for AC

| | Age | | Years spent in LU | Gender | Language skills | |
| | | | | | PT | LU |
	M (SD)	Range	M (SD)	%	M (SD)	M (SD)
Mothers (n = 70)	54.7 (7.5)	41-79	29.9 (7.8)	/	5.69 (.86)	2.20 (1.5)
Fathers (n = 65)	57.51 (7.9)	45-80	31.5 (8.4)	/	5.66 (1.1)	1.82 (1.01)
Adult **C**hildren (n = 71)	27.7 (8.0)	18-52	61.6% born in LU, 38.9% arrived at age of 5.4 (4.7)	61.6% ♀ 38.4% ♂	5.56 (1.2)	5.66 (1.2)
F-values					$F(2, 133.4) = .27^+$	**$F(2, 125.5) = 222.15*\ ^+$**
t-tests for Adult children					$t(72) = .521$	

* p < .001

[+]Levene's test of homogeneity of variances is significative; the robust test "Welch" of equality of means is used instead

Table 2

Frequencies for nationalities

Nationalities

| | 1st (%) | | 2nd (%) | | Only one nationality (n) | | Double nationality (n) |
	PT	LU	PT	LU	PT	LU	PT & LU
Mothers (n = 70)	95.8	4.2	4.2	9.9	60	1	9
Fathers (n = 65)	86.2	13.8	1.5	9.2	50	8	7
Adult children (n = 71)	58.9	41.1	19.2	24.7	25	16	30

Table 3

Mean, Standard deviation, F-values and t-tests for cultural identification, attachment to culture, identity configuration

	Mother		Father		Adult child		Cronbach	Group differences
	M	*SD*	M	*SD*	M	*SD*		F-values
Attachment to culture								
PT	4.05	*.68*	4.08	*.75*	4.02	*.53*	.65 < α < .83	*F*(2, 205) = .14
LU	3.27	*.78*	3.31	*.85*	3.75	*.62*	.76 < α < .86	**F(2, 130.8) = 10.2*+**
t-test	**t(69) = 7.62***		**t(64) = 6.55***		**t(70) = 3.67***			
Cultural identity orientation								
Conflicted	2.49	*.97*	2.55	*.92*	2.39	*1.05*	.74 < α < .87	*F*(2, 205) = .44
Compatible	4.26	*.88*	4.17	*.95*	4.86	*.75*	.56 < α < .62	**F(2, 206) = 13.1***
Frame-switching	3.54	*1.15*	3.49	*1.2*	3.49	*1.05*	.61 < α < .78	*F*(2, 206) = .06

* *p* < .001

+Levene's test of homogeneity of variances is significative; the robust test "Welch" of equality of means is used instead

Annex 1
BIOScale revised for the Luxembourgish context – Factor pattern loadings, communalities, eigenvalues and percentage of total variance explained by each factor

Items	Factors			Communalities
	1	2	3	
Sometimes I am really confused about my cultural identity.	**.895**	.048	.026	.80
I have a conflict within myself regarding the culture to which I belong.	**.712**	-.033	.126	.52
I feel that I must decide which culture is central to my identity.	**.647**	-.093	.129	.44
I have difficulty reconciling the differences between my Portuguese culture and the Luxembourgish culture.	**.521**	-.300	.199	.40
I feel it is easier to belong just to one culture.	**.486**	-.335	.109	.36
I feel my identity is a mix of the Portuguese culture and the Luxembourgish culture.	.119	**.651**	.239	.50
I feel it is rewarding that I belong to many cultures.	-.158	**.544**	.105	.33
My Portuguese culture is compatible with the Luxembourgish culture.	-.033	**.542**	.076	.30
I adapt my cultural identity to the relevant circumstances.	.126	.086	**.840**	.73
I adapt my identity depending on whether I am with Portuguese or Luxembourgers.	.107	.150	**.677**	.49
My cultural identity depends on whom I am with.	.082	-.009	**.477**	.23
I feel it is difficult to reconcile the Portuguese and Luxembourgish lifestyle.	*.303*	*-.573*	*.221*	*.47*
I feel one should be loyal to only one cultural group.	*.448*	*-.494*	*.021*	*.44*
Eigenvalues	3.71	2.40	1.39	
% of variance accounted for by the factor	24.71	14.49	7.20	

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Annex 2

Qualitative interviews: names, gender, descriptive statistics for age and years spent in Luxembourg

Portuguese Families	Dyad	Names (aliases)	Age	Country of birth	Nationality	Years in LU	Age when arriving to LU
1	M – D	Francisca – Patricia	66 - 45	PT – PT	PT – PT/LU	40 - 40	26 - 5
2	F - D	Antonio – Karina	49 - 23	PT – LU	PT – LU/PT	30 – *	19 - *
3	M – D	Célia – Daniela	57 - 24	PT – PT	PT – PT	12 -12	45 - 12
4	M – D	Maria – Sofia	59 - 36	PT – PT	PT – PT	25 - 25	34 - 11
5	M – D	Carolina – Ana	53 - 27	PT – PT	PT – PT	15 – 15	38 - 12
6	F – D	Raul – Joana	57 - 28	PT – LU	PT – PT/LU	37 – *	20 - *
7	M – D	Fernanda – Mariana	51 - 24	PT – LU	PT – LU/PT	30 – *	21 - *
8	F – D	Paulo – Filipa	58 - 35	PT – LU	PT – LU	36 – *	22 - *
9	M – D	Fiona – Gabi	48 - 22	PT – LU	PT – LU/PT	23 – *	25 - *
10	M - S	Marta – Diogo	49 - 25	PT – LU	PT – PT/LU	29 – *	20 - *

* Adult children already born in LU

Annex 3
Answers of participants of the qualitative interviews regarding the bicultural identity orientation scale

	Patricia	Karina	Daniela	Sofia	Ana	Joana	Mariana	Filipa	Gabi	Diogo
Conflicted Identity Orientation	**2**	**4.4**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**1.8**	**1**	**2.4**	**3**	**1.4**
Sometimes I am really confused about my cultural identity.	2	3	1	2	2	4	1	2	4	1
I have a conflict within myself regarding the culture to which I belong.	2	6	1	2	2	1	1	3	4	1
I feel that I must decide which culture is central to my identity.	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
I have difficulty reconciling the differences between my Portuguese culture and the Luxembourgish culture.	2	6	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
I feel it is easier to belong just to one culture.	3	5	1	2	2	2	1	3	3	3
Compatible Identity Orientation	**5.4**	**4.8**	**6**	**5**	**4.4**	**5.8**	**5.2**	**3.8**	**5.4**	**5.8**
I feel my identity is a mix of the Portuguese culture and the Luxembourgish culture.	5	4	6	5	2	5	6	3	6	6
My Portuguese culture is compatible with the Luxembourgish culture.	6	6	6	5	5	6	4	4	6	6
I feel it is rewarding that I belong to many cultures.	6	3	6	5	6	6	6	4	5	6
Frame-switching Identity Orientation	**3.3**	**2.7**	**3**	**5**	**2**	**5.7**	**1**	**2.7**	**4.7**	**4.7**
I adapt my cultural identity to the relevant circumstances.	2	3	6	5	2	6	1	2	4	5
I adapt my identity depending on whether I am with Portuguese or Luxembourgers.	6	1	1	5	2	6	1	3	5	5
My cultural identity depends on whom I am with.	2	4	2	5	2	5	1	3	5	4