FACEBOOK and ADAPTATION

Abstract

The present study is a longitudinal examination of the role of Facebook on the cultural adaptation of Muslim immigrants to the United States \( (n = 379) \). Immigrants’ use of Facebook affects interactions with the dominant culture and with the ingroup. Respondents were asked about their use of Facebook, motivation to culturally adapt, and perceptions of the US at two different points in a 6-year period. Analysis revealed the following. Muslim immigrants to the US from 2006 to 2012 who used Facebook more for social interaction with the ingroup were less likely to be motivated to culturally adapt to the US dominant culture and these same immigrants were more likely to have a negative perception of the US dominant culture as their Facebook use increased.
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Communication scholars have theorized and studied the relationships between media, social media use, and cultural adaptation. Cultural adaptation is the process through which newcomers to a culture adapt to the surrounding cultural milieu to reach a state of functional fit with the host culture (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Kim, 1998, 2001; McKay-Semmler & Kim, 2014). Researchers studying immigrants, particularly international students, to a new culture generally agree these individuals will use social media like Facebook and other online forums to facilitate integration into the host culture. The use of social media outlets, like Facebook, facilitates individuals to both integrate into the host culture (Chen, Bennett, & Maton, 2008; Sawyer & Chen, 2012; Ye, 2006a), and emphasize their ethnic identity through explicit and elaborate narratives of self (Croucher, 2011; Grasmuck, Martin & Shanyang, 2009). Research demonstrates long-term immigrants receive more support from online ethnic social groups than immigrant students who have lived in the host countries for a shorter time (Ye, 2006b). However, research among non-student samples has found the use of such media is used by immigrants to separate from the host culture (Croucher, Oommen, & Steele, 2009; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011). Thus, the basic questions of how and why newcomers to a culture use social media warrant further research.

One context that may provide further insights into this discussion over the use of Facebook, as one particular form of social media, and cultural adaptation is Muslim immigration to the United States. Immigration of Muslims to non-Muslim nations like the US has increased rapidly over the past 10 years (Bowen, 2009). With this increase in immigration has come an increase in Islamophobia (fear of Islam), and pressure for Muslims to adapt to their new cultural surroundings (Croucher, 2013; González, Verkuyten, Weesie, & Poppe 2008; Ogan, Willnat,
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Pennington, & Bashir, 2014; Love, 2009). As Croucher et al. (2009) and Croucher and Cronn-Mills (2011) noted, Muslim immigrants to France and Britain were more likely to use ethnic media instead of media produced in the dominant culture, such as (print, television, and online) when they felt like they were being pressured to culturally adapt to the dominant cultures. Historically, researchers studying cultural adaptation have focused primarily on the adaptation of international students (Chen et al., 2008; Raman & Harwood, 2008; Madge, Meek, Wellens, & Hooley, 2009; Sandel, 2014; Sawyer & Chen, 2012; Tufekci, 2008; Ye, 2006b).

Moreover, cultural adaptation researchers have not adequately studied immigrant motivation to culturally adapt (Croucher, 2013); instead researchers have assumed immigrants are motivated to adapt. Despite the value of existent research, which focuses overwhelmingly on international students, such work neglects the larger intercultural immigration experience (Croucher, 2013). Furthermore, this study fulfills the need for further research linking intercultural communication (behaviors, traits, states, etc.) and media (Croucher, 2011; Shuter, 2011, 2012). As immigration becomes increasingly diverse and politicized in nations like the US, it is imperative to explore the relationship between cultural adaptation and media use in broader contexts. Shuter (2012) pointed out that while researchers have studied how new media (like Facebook and other SNSs) are used in different cultures; very little research is conducted on the impacts of new media on intercultural communication. The current study answers this call for analysis of the impact of new media on intercultural communication by combining research on cultural adaptation and new media and the degree to which Facebook use is related to cultural adaptation.

Finally, this research more accurately captures the cultural adaptation process than previous studies through the use of a longitudinal design. Previous analyses of the cultural
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adaptation process have relied on cross-sectional designs (Berry, 2005; Chen, Bennett, & Maton, 2008; Croucher, 2009; Cui, Sjef van den, & Jiang, 1998; Hsu, 2010; Kim, Y-S., 2008; McKay-Semmler & Kim, 2014; Sandel, 2014; Tufekci, 2008), which only provide one opportunity to understand how newcomers to a culture perceive their adaptation process. This study’s longitudinal design affords a more comprehensive understanding of the cultural adaptation process, as the design tracks the changes that take place during the process of adaptation. Ultimately, via a longitudinal design, the relationships between Facebook use, motivation to culturally adapt, and perception of the dominant US culture are explored in connection with Muslim immigrants in the United States.

Theoretical Overview

Adapting to a new culture is not an easy process. The process can be facilitated through the use of new media, such as Facebook (Croucher, 2011; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). Social media such as Facebook is an important and newly developing form of communicating that: offers a many-to-many scale of communication, reshapes cultural identities (Chen & Dai, 2012), forms third cultures (McEwan & Sobre-Denton, 2011), alters perceptions of intercultural communication (Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; Pfister & Soliz, 2011; Shuter, 2012), and can aid newcomers culturally adapt. The cultural adaptation process is facilitated through social networking sites (SNS) like Facebook by: making connections with the host culture, reducing emotional stress, improving linguistic fluency, increasing social support, and providing host information (Shuter, 2012; Tsai, 2006; Wang, Huang, Huang, & Wang, 2009; Wang, Sun, & Haridakis, 2009; Ye, 2006b). Such media can also serve as ways for newcomers to maintain connections with their homelands, retro-acculturate, and strengthen their ethnic identities (Chan, 2005; Eriksen, 2007; Marcheva, 2011; Wang, Huang et al., 2009) or to strengthen their ingroup
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connections (Schofield Clark & Sywyj, 2012). The work on the relationship between Facebook use and cultural adaptation is divided. Research among predominantly Chinese international student immigrants, who are generally short-term immigrants, has shown increased use of this media leads to decreased culture shock and increased cultural adaptation (Sawyer & Chen, 2012). On the other hand, research on Muslim non-student immigrants, who plan on staying in their new home for the long-term, has shown social media and Facebook use leads to decreased culture shock, and to decreased motivation to culturally adapt (Croucher, et al., 2009; Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011). Facebook use is related to the adaptation process, but in different ways depending on the immigrant group, their immigration intent, and the extent of intercultural interactions (Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011; Shuter, 2012). As this study explores long-term immigrants, the first hypothesis proposes the following regarding the relationship between Facebook use and motivation to culturally adapt:

\[ H1: \text{There is a negative relationship between Facebook use to communicate with the ingroup and immigrant motivation to culturally adapt.} \]

The second purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between Facebook use, cultural adaptation motivation, and perception of the dominant US culture. There is an abundance of literature showing that when a minority or immigrant group feel ostracized, restricted, or separated from the dominant culture, by that dominant culture, they are likely to resent that dominant culture in an attempt to protect their own group vitality (Barker & Giles, 2002; Croucher, 2009; Giles & Johnson, 1981). This resentment can lead to the immigrant group not being motivated to culturally adapt to the dominant culture in places such as Canada (Charland, 1987; Croucher, 2006), France (Croucher, 2009; Watson, 2003), Singapore (Bokhorst-Heng, 2003), Spain (Doyle, 1996; Edles, 1998), the United Kingdom (Honeyford,
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2006), and/or the US (Barker & Giles, 2002; Croucher, 2013; Palozzi, 2006). In an attempt to respond to pressures to culturally adapt, increased resentment toward the majority, and perceived threats toward ingroup vitality, immigrants will often turn to social media (Clothier, 2005; Croucher, 2011; Tufekci, 2008; Wang et al., 2009).

As anti-Muslim discourse has increased in the US and in other “Western” nations (Award, 2013; Croucher, 2013; González et al., 2008; Wike & Grim, 2010), many Muslim immigrants, and other immigrant groups, have begun to adapt less to their new homes. Furthermore, many Muslim immigrants in these nations, who are faced with rising Islamophobia, have growing resentment toward their new homes. The Internet serves as a place for many isolated, unhappy, disenchanted, and separated immigrants to join as a community, and separate from the dominant culture (Cheong, Martin, & MacFayden, 2012; Oh, 2012). Thus, the second hypothesis is posed examining the relationship between perception of the dominant culture and Facebook use:

\[ H2: \text{There is a positive relationship between negative perception of the dominant culture and minority groups’ use of Facebook to communicate with the ingroup.} \]

Method

Participants and Procedures

A total of 379 Muslim first-generation immigrants to the United States completed this longitudinal study. In the first phase of the study conducted in 2006, 529 participants completed an online or paper survey. The participants’ ranged in age in 2006 from 18 to 47 (\(M = 28.25, SD = 2.25\)). In 2006, the average length of time a participant had lived in the US was 3.45 years (\(SD = 4.75\)). In 2006, the average length of time a participant had lived in the US was 3.45 years (\(SD = 4.75\)). Then in 2012, 379 of the 529 participants completed the same online or paper survey,
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for a study completion rate of 71.6%. In 2012, participants ranged in age from 24 to 54 ($M = 34.29$, $SD = 1.99$). In 2012, the average length of time a participant had lived in the US was 9.45 years ($SD = 4.75$). Of the 379 participants who complete the 2006 and 2012 phases, 178 were male (44.8%) and 219 were female (55.2%). The participants were from a variety of nations: 103 from Pakistan (25.9%), 87 from Iran (21.9%), 64 from Bangladesh (16.1%), 46 from Tunisia (11.6%), 37 from Senegal (9.3%), 35 from Morocco (8.8%), and 25 from Algeria (6.3%). Of the participants 304 (80.21%) self-identified as Sunni-Muslim, while 75 (19.79%) self-identified as Shi’a-Muslim.

The participants came from a wide-range of professions/backgrounds, which remained relatively unchanged from 2006 to 2012. In 2006, 99 (26.1%) students, 27 were unemployed (7.1%), 7 worked in a religious job (1.8%), 19 in food services (5%), 29 in a “blue-collar profession” (7.7%), 27 in tourism (7.1%), 16 in finance (4.2%), 123 in miscellaneous “white-collar professional jobs” (32.4%), and 32 in the medical field (8.4%). In 2012, the occupational profile remained relatively similar, but the number of students dropped considerably: 64 (16.9%) students, 40 were unemployed (10.6%), 10 worked in a religious job (2.6%), 30 in food services (7.9%), 30 in a “blue-collar profession” (7.9%), 29 in tourism (7.7%), 17 in finance (4.5%), 126 in miscellaneous “white-collar professional jobs” (33.2%), and 33 in the medical field (8.7%).

In 2006 and 2012, data were collected through self-administered online and paper questionnaires. Survey Monkey was used to collect the online surveys. The researcher contacted participants through previously established social networks in the Midwestern United States. The researchers have done previous research, worked in, and traveled extensively in this area. In particular, the principal investigator has worked with various NGOs, religious organizations, and other institutions (religious and non-religious) that were instrumental in
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contacting potential participants. Therefore, the researchers contacted individuals they knew, and a snowball sampling took place from there. Between 2006 and 2012 all participants were tracked via e-mail and telephone number, if possible to facilitate completion of the 2012 survey. Such a sampling procedure typically happens in intercultural/cross-cultural communication (Croucher, 2013; Gudykunst, 2002). Participants received no financial incentive for participation. The sampling strategy is a convenience sample; random sampling is extremely difficult, if not impossible in intercultural communication research that does not rely on student samples. Therefore, it is proper to “sample to” as opposed to “sample from” a population (DeMaris 2004). Sampling to a population represents a hypothetical population, whose nature can to some extent be understood only based on socio-demographic characteristics. However, it does represent a larger group from which results can be generalized.

Measures

Facebook Use. To measure Facebook use, three modified items from Greenberg’s (1974) Television viewing motives scale was used in addition to two added items. The scale was altered in the following ways. First, instead of asking about television use, all statements were altered to say: “I use Facebook.” Second, all statements including the statement “watch it” were replaced with the phrase “use it.” Third, the instructions were modified to focus on Facebook use and not television use. A modified version of Greenberg’s scale was used instead of using a scale only designed for social networking use because this scale has shown a history of reliability and validity in measuring “media use.” Researchers have argued this scale when modified is reliable and valid for measuring broad “media use”, not just “television use” (Armstrong & Rubin, 1989; Spencer, Croucher, & Hoelscher, 2012). All items were ranked on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) not at all to (5) exactly. The three items retained focus on social interaction as
a motive for using a media. Along with the three items from Greenberg, two additional items were added. A sample item from the original scale (modified to focus on Facebook) is: “I use Facebook so I can be with other members of the family or friends who use it.” The two added items focused on using Facebook to get to know non-Muslim Americans, or to retain/strengthen ties with Muslims. A sample question is: “I use Facebook to get to know Americans who are not Muslims.” Alphas for the measure have ranged from .62 to .87 (Finn, 1992; Rubin & Perse, 1987). A high score on this scale, as coded, signifies Facebook use for ingroup social interaction. The difference between the scores obtained in 2012 and 2006 is coded as FacebookDIFF. The extent to which a participant’s FacebookDIFF score is positive represents the extent to which the participant’s use of Facebook for social interaction increased from 2006 to 2012. See Table 1 for means, standard deviations, alphas, and correlations for all study variables.

**Motivation to Culturally Adapt.** To measure immigrant motivation to culturally adapt, individuals were asked 7 Likert-type questions from Croucher (2009). Sample questions include: “I want to become X”, “I try to act X in public,” and “I think it’s important to fit in.” The scale ranges from (1) *false* to (7) *true*. The alpha for this scale was .83 in the original study. The difference between the scores obtained in 2012 and 2006 is coded as motivationDIFF. The extent to which a participant’s motivationDIFF score is positive represents the extent to which the participant’s motivation to culturally adapt increased from 2006 to 2012.

**Perception of the Dominant Culture.** Perception toward the dominant culture was measured through a set of 13-bipolar adjectives (Croucher, 2009). Participants were provided with a statement: “The US people are:” and then provided with some of the following bipolar adjectives and asked to represent their feelings on a 7-point semantic differential scale with 1
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representing the favorable adjective and 7 the negative adjective: good-bad, valuable-worthless, vital superfluous, wanted-unwanted, and nice-mean, etc… The difference between the scores obtained in 2012 and 2006 is coded as perceptionDIFF. The extent to which a participant’s perceptionDIFF score is positive represents the extent to which the participant’s negative perception of the US increased from 2006 to 2012.

**Intergroup Contact.** Four items from Gonzalez, Verkuyten, Weesie, and Poppe (2008) measured intergroup contact. The items were: “How many non-Muslim American friends do you have?” “Do you have contact with non-Muslim American students or co-workers” “Do you have contact with non-Muslim Americans in your neighborhood” and “Do you have contact with non-Muslim Americans somewhere else, such as at a sports club (gym) or other organization?” The first item was rated from (1) *none* to (4) *only non-Muslim American friends*. The remaining three items were rated from (1) *never* to (4) *often*. The alpha for the scale was .70 in the Gonzalez et al. (2008). The difference between the scores obtained in 2012 and 2006 is coded as contactDIFF. The extent to which a participant’s contactDIFF score is positive represents an increase in intergroup contact from 2006 to 2012.

(Insert Table 1 here)

**Results**

To analyze the hypotheses, a two-step multiple regression was constructed for each hypothesis. The differences in an individual’s score between 2006 and 2012 on motivation to culturally adapt (motivationDIFF), perception of the dominant culture (perceptionDIFF), and Facebook use (FacebookDIFF) were used in the final statistical analysis.

For *H1*, immigrant motivation to culturally adapt (motivationDIFF) served as the criterion variable. In model 1, number of years in the US, nation of birth, intergroup contact, and
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occupation served as control variables. Number of years in the US was entered for the following reasons. First, many immigrants are more likely to use more host media the longer they are in a nation (Chen et al., 2008; Tufekci, 2008), while other immigrants are more likely to use less host media the longer they are in a nation based on their level of comfort with the host (Croucher & Cronn-Mills, 2011). Furthermore, length of time in the host culture can have an impact on social media use (Croucher, 2011). Nation of birth was also entered as a control variable because cultural similarities between the host and native culture, and the geopolitical situation between the host culture and native culture can influence an immigrant’s motivation to adapt and the willingness of the host culture to accept an immigrant’s adaptation advances (Croucher, 2013; Kim, 2001). Nation of birth was coded with “Pakistan” as the reference/comparison group. Occupation was entered as a control variable because previous literature is divided on the role of occupation in the adaptation process. Some research shows increased occupational status leads to increased steps toward cultural adaptation (Geng & Njoku, 1992; Kim, 2001; Wilcock, 1993), while other research shows increased occupational status leads to decreased steps toward cultural adaptation into the dominant culture (Dion, Dion, & Pak, 1990). Occupation was coded with “Student” as the reference/comparison group.

In the first model ($R^2_{adj} = .49$), length of time in the US, nationality, occupation, and contactDIFF all had significant effects on immigrant motivation to culturally adapt (motivationDIFF). In the second model, Facebook use was added (FacebookDIFF) ($R^2_{adj} = .50$). This model was a significant improvement over model one, ($\Delta F = 2.16, p < .05$). Thus, model 2 was retained for final analysis. Based on model 2, in Table 2, the following can be ascertained. Length of time in the US had a significant effect on the motivation to culturally adapt from 2006 to 2012 ($b = .13$). Nation also had a significant effect on the motivation to culturally adapt.
Pakistanis served as the reference/comparison groups. In this case, Algerians \( (b = -.31) \), and Tunisians \( (b = -.27) \) significantly decreased in their motivation to culturally adapt when compared to Pakistanis, while Senegalese \( (b = .47) \) significantly increased from 2006 to 2012 in comparison to Pakistanis. Compared to students, from 2006 to 2012, blue-collar \( (b = -.15) \) and people working in religious jobs \( (b = -.10) \) significantly decreased in their motivation to culturally adapt. Intergroup contact (contactDIFF) also had a significant effect on motivation to culturally adapt. Increased intergroup contact from 2006 to 2012 was positively related to an increase in motivation to culturally adapt \( (b = .26) \). As predicted, there was a negative relationship between motivationDIFF and using Facebook for social interaction \( (b = -.13, p < .01) \); thus, the more Muslim immigrants use Facebook the less motivated they are to culturally adapt. See Table 2 for the full regression results.

(Insert Table 2 here)

For \( H2 \), perception of the dominant culture (perceptionDIFF) served as the criterion variable, number of years in the US, nation of birth, intergroup contact, and occupation served as control variables, and Facebook use (FacebookDIFF) was the predictor variable. In model 1 \( (R^2_{adj} = .40) \), length of time in the US, nationality, occupation, and contactDIFF all had significant effects on perception of the dominant US culture. In the second model, Facebook use was added (FacebookDIFF) \( (R^2_{adj} = .41) \). This model was a significant improvement over model one, \( (\Delta F = 2.71, p < .05) \). Thus, model 2 was retained for final analysis. Based on model 2, in Table 2, the following can be stated. Length of time in the US had a significant effect on negative perception of the dominant US culture from 2006 to 2012 \( (b = -.10) \). Nation did have a significant effect on perception of the dominant US culture. Pakistanis served as the reference/comparison group. In this case, Algerians \( (b = -.20) \) significantly decreased in their
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negative perception of the US in comparison to Pakistanis, while Senegalese \( b = .21 \) significantly increased. Compared to students, from 2006 to 2012, white collar employees’ \( b = .18 \) and people working in religious jobs \( b = .25 \) significantly increased in their negative perception of the US. Intergroup contact (contactDIFF) also had a significant effect on negative perception of the US culture. Increased intergroup contact from 2006 to 2012 was positively related to an increase in negative perception of the US culture \( b = .34 \). Finally, as predicted, there was a positive relationship between perceptionDIFF and using Facebook for social interaction \( b = .17 \). See Table 3 for the full regression results.

(Insert Table 3 here)

In sum, Muslim immigrants to the US from 2006 to 2012 who used Facebook more for social interaction with the ingroup were less likely to be motivated to culturally adapt to the US dominant culture \((H1)\). Moreover, these same immigrants were more likely to have a negative perception of the US dominant culture as their Facebook use increased \((H2)\).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of Facebook in the cultural adaptation process of Muslim immigrants to the US. Five conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, the longer Muslim immigrants are in the US, the more negatively they perceive American culture. Scholars have proposed increased contact (quality and quantity of) between groups should decrease prejudice and negative feelings between groups (Allport, 1954, Allport & Ross, 1967; Pettigrew, 1997). Amir (1969, 1976) noted that prejudice, alienation, and intergroup tension may increase under certain negative conditions. In the current study length of time in a nation led to this effect. It is clear from the results of this study that negative perception increased as length of time and contact increased. Linking intergroup contact to adaptation
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strategy, it is evident that the majority of the immigrants surveyed chose to separate from the dominant culture. This separation is an acculturation strategy resulting from immigrants’ tendency to keep their original identity and their lack of interest in daily interaction with the host society (Berry, 2005). This strategy is a rather stressful process with a high level of cultural conflict. To avoid this conflict, many immigrants refuse to continue the acculturation process. This can possibly be attributed to the political and social situation in the US, which has gone through the War on Terror and an immigration debate where Muslims have been the center of attention. In such a situation, length of time in the US has led to a negative feeling about the nation for these new immigrants. Future research should continue to explore how living and experiencing a culture influences perceptions of that culture.

Second, the use of Facebook for increased social interaction among the ingroup is a sign of Muslim immigrants protecting the group vitality of their community. Croucher (2011) explained how the use of social media, like Facebook, during the cultural adaptation process could be a symptom of an immigrant group attempting to maintain ethnic ties, and separate themselves from the dominant culture. This appears to be the case with this particular sample of Muslim immigrants in the US. The more these immigrants used Facebook to interact with members of their ingroup, other Muslims, the less likely they were to be motivated to culturally adapt to the US. In essence, this group was not taking steps toward functional fitness (Kim, 2001; McKay-Semmler & Kim, 2014). Instead, this group is using Facebook to strengthen ethnic ties, often at the expense of ties with the dominant culture. As Wang et al. (2009) stated, the Internet and other forms of social media may serve as a substitution for host interaction, which could decrease immigrant loneliness. This may lead to more immigrants using Facebook to communicate with their ingroup and in turn separating themselves from the dominant culture.
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It would be advantageous to explore the follow-up question of why the group is doing this. Such a study could take a qualitative or quantitative approach and provide more in-depth analysis of this phenomenon.

Third, immigrants from Pakistan were significantly less motivated to culturally adapt and had a more negative perception of the US culture than immigrants from other nations in this sample. While on the other hand, immigrants from Senegal were the most motivated to adapt and had the most positive perception of the US culture. It is possible many of the Pakistani respondents feel unwelcomed or alienated in the US. A 2012 Pew Center survey found that 10% of Americans felt they could trust Pakistan (Pewresearch.org, 2013). Issues such as drone attacks, relations with Afghanistan, Muslim extremism, and lingering mistrust over Osama bin Laden’s hiding in Pakistan remain for many Americans in the survey. During survey collection some of the Pakistani participants stated how American media depicts Muslims as threats and unwelcomed in the US. Participants from other nations did not voice such thoughts. Compared to Pakistani immigrants, Senegalese immigrants are less known in the US. Also, due to the fact that many Americans believe “Muslims” are “Middle Eastern,” in origin (Siddiqui, 2014; Wike & Grim, 2006), Senegalese Muslims may be more easily able to avoid negative depictions and stereotyping. It would be beneficial to further explore the thoughts and feelings of these immigrant groups in relation to the perceptions of whether they feel welcomed. Such inquiries could be conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methods to better understand the relationships between cultural adaptation and perceptions of the dominant culture.

Fourth, the conclusions from this study further a growing trend to explore cultural adaptation among non-university student samples (e.g., Croucher, 2006, 2009; Hsu, 2010; Kim, 2008; Kim & Kim, 2007; McKay-Semmler & Kim, 2014; Semlak, Pearson, Amundson, &
Kudak, 2008). While research conducted among international student samples has provided a wealth of knowledge, such research is limited in two ways: these individuals represent a microcosm of the immigrant population, and as many of the samples for such studies have mean ages of under 25 years of age, their lived experiences many be limited compared to older samples of even over 25 years of age. Research should continue to explore non-student samples for a more representative understanding of the immigrant adaptation experience.

Fifth, this study contributes to the growing body of research linking intercultural communication (behaviors, traits, states, etc.) and new media studies (Chen, 2012; Croucher, 2011; Kent, 2015; Sawyer & Chen, 2012; Shuter, 2011, 2012). While studies have been conducted on how new media is used in different cultures (Croucher, 2011; Shuter, 2012), very little research has explored the impacts of new media on intercultural communication. The current study is one such attempt to further link intercultural communication studies with new media studies.

Sixth, this is the only longitudinal examination of the cultural adaptation process. While numerous published studies have provided valuable theoretical explorations and empirical tests of an immigrant’s cultural adaptation experience at one point in time, none have provided longitudinal pictures of change in immigrants (e.g., Cheah, Karamcic-Muratovic, Matsuo, & Poljarevic, 2011; Croucher, 2006, 2009, Cui, Sjef van den Berg, & Jiang, 1998; Hsu, 2010; Kim, 1977; Kim & Kim, 2007). A longitudinal examination of the cultural adaptation process offers a key advantage to the typical cross-sectional studies. As opposed to a cross-sectional study, such an examination provides a chance to compare immigrant perceptions at two different points in time. While this study does not claim to control for extraneous variables, the results of this study do reveal marked changes in perception of the dominant culture and motivation to adapt. In a
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cross-section design, such changes could not be observed. More work should strive to follow immigrant groups and conduct longitudinal research among these populations to better evaluate the cultural adaptation process. Such studies may help in providing greater insight into the adaptation process.

The results of this study reveal that among Muslims in the United States, Muslim immigrants in the US between 2006 and 2012 who used Facebook more for social interaction with the ingroup were less likely to be motivated to culturally adapt to the US dominant culture. Also, these immigrants were more likely to have a negative perception of the US dominant culture as their Facebook use increased. A better understanding of the relationship between social media and cultural adaptation is essential as nations continue to diversify with immigration. Future studies should continue to explore this phenomenon and explore other variables that might influence immigrant interaction with the ingroup and the dominant culture.
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Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, Alphas, and Correlations for Study Variables from 2006 to 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Perception</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Motivation</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Facebook</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contact</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Perception</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Motivation</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Facebook</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contact</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Difference from 2006 to 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Perception</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Motivation</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Facebook</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Contact</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *p < .05, **p < .01.*
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Table 2

*Regression Model for Immigrant Motivation to Culturally Adapt (MotivationDIFF)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>27.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Nation</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerians</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegalese</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyans</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisians</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshis</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranians</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Employees</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Employees</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Employees</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContactDIFF</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FacebookDIFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>16.15**</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ΔF$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[ R^2 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.53</th>
<th>.54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ R^2_{adj} ]</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05, ** p < .01.
## TABLE 3

**Regression Model for Negative Perception of US Culture (PerceptionDIFF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Nation</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerians</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegalese</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyans</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisians</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshis</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranians</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar Employees</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Employees</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Employees</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContactDIFF</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FacebookDIFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>11.41**</td>
<td>10.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta F )</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[
\begin{align*}
R^2 & \quad .44 & \quad .46 \\
R^2_{adj} & \quad 40 & \quad 41 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Note: * \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \).