

Debate in Science: The Case of Acculturation

Floyd Webster Rudmin
Psychology Department
University of Tromsø, Norway

A 2004 draft of this manuscript was awarded the SPSSI (APA Division 9)
2005 Otto Klineberg Intercultural and International Relations Prize

Running head: Debate

Draft of Dec. 31, 2005

© by Floyd W. Rudmin

Anyone wishing a full copy of the manuscript should contact the author.

Critical commentary and suggestions welcomed.

Correspondence should be addressed to:

Floyd W. Rudmin

Psychology Department

University of Tromsø

Norway N-9037

Email: frudmin@psyk.uit.no

Debate in Science: The Case of Acculturation

Abstract

(144 words, 996 characters)

The acculturation research paradigm of measuring assimilation, separation, integration and marginalization confuses dimensional and categorical conceptions of its constructs, fails to produce ipsative data from mutually exclusive scales, misoperationalizes marginalization as distress, mismeasures biculturalism using double-barreled questions instead of computing it from unicultural measures, then misinterprets and miscites this faulty science. Extensive published but widely uncited data cast doubt on claims that integration is preferred by minority groups or is beneficial for them. Such salient but widely unseen problems suggest that acculturation researchers are biased and blinded by an ideology, probably liberalism, which advocates freedom of choice, tolerance, plurality, and redress of harm. Phenomenological observations that challenge the paradigm include the absence of studies of majority group acculturation, the well-replicated fact that minorities never prefer pure uniculturalism, the indistinctiveness of cultures, and the predominance of research from similar Anglo-Saxon settler societies (USA, Australia, Canada).