University of Groningen

Turkish-Dutch Youths' Attitude Toward Violence for Defending The In-Group

van Bergen, Diana D.; Ersanilli, Evelyn F.; Pels, Trees V. M.; de Ruyter, Doret J.

Published in:
Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology

DOI:
[10.1037/pac0000173](https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000173)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Bergen, D. D., Ersanilli, E. F., Pels, T. V. M., & de Ruyter, D. J. (2016). Turkish-Dutch Youths' Attitude Toward Violence for Defending The In-Group: What Role Does Perceived Parenting Play? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 22(2), 120-133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000173>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Turkish-Dutch Youths' Attitude Toward Violence for Defending the In-Group: What Role Does Perceived Parenting Play?

Diana D. van Bergen
Groningen University

Evelyn F. Ersanilli, Trees V. M. Pels, and
Doret J. De Ruyter
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

This study examines a factor that has thus far received little attention in research on attitudes toward violent in-group defense, namely, the role of perceived parental ethnic socialization. We hypothesized that perceived parental ethnic socialization (i.e., cultural socialization, egalitarianism, bias/mistrust) affects attitudes toward violence in defense of the in-group by others as well as willingness to use such violence oneself via its influence on collective identity factors (in-group connectedness, collective deprivation, religious superiority, connectedness with mainstream society). We analyzed a sample of children of Turkish Muslim migrants in the Netherlands. The data came from a survey conducted among pupils at 7 secondary schools (age 14–18, $N = 133$). Results show that perceived parental ethnic socialization has an indirect effect on attitudes toward and willingness to use a violent in-group defense that runs via the collective identity factors. Perceived parental socialization that emphasizes equality is related to less willingness to use violent in-group defense. Perceived parental messages of mistrust of the other and preparation for bias were associated with a more positive attitude toward violent in-group defense by others and toward willingness to use such violence. Perceived cultural socialization correlates positively with attitude toward violent in-group defense by others and willingness to use violent in-group defense. The total size of the indirect effects of perceived parental ethnic socialization was modest. We did not find a direct effect of perceived parental socialization.

Keywords: parental ethnic socialization, ethno-religious violence, Turkish-Dutch Muslim youth, ingroup identity, intergroup relations

Over the past few decades, several Western European countries have witnessed political polarization on issues of culture, religion, and ethnicity (Ivarsflaten, 2008; Moors, Balogh, Van Donselaar, & De Graaff, 2009). This has resulted in conflicts between ethnic and religious groups (Stroink, 2007), threatening peaceful coexistence and social cohesion. Several researchers have suggested that there is a relation between increasingly hostile anti-Islam sentiments and religiously or ethnically motivated violence in Europe (Abbas, 2012; Pantucci, 2011; Stroink, 2007). Violence is committed by rightwing extremists targeting immigrants (or those seen as supporters of immigrants) and radical Muslims committing violent

acts in retaliation for violence against Muslims elsewhere in the world or perceived threats to their religion (Stroink, 2007). The latter are often the children of immigrants.

The Netherlands ranks among the European countries with the highest level of anti-Muslim sentiments (Savelkoul, Scheepers, van der Veld, & Hagendoorn, 2012). As Dutch Muslim immigrants are increasingly confronted with hostility (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012), they may feel their in-group is threatened. Thus, some Dutch Muslims might distance themselves from mainstream society (Doosje, Loseman, & van den Bos, 2013; Moors et al., 2009) or come to believe that their own religious

This article was published Online First April 7, 2016.

DIANA D. VAN BERGEN, received her PhD in sociology from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. She is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Pedagogy and Educational Sciences, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, at Groningen University. Her research interests are “vulnerable” youth populations, suicidal behavior in young minority women, ethnic socialization, ethnic and religious conflict among youth, lesbian, gay and bisexual youth and stigmatization.

EVELYN F. ERSANILLI, received her PhD in sociology from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. She is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Her research interests are immigration and integration policies, immigrant integration, citizenship, identity, and migrant families.

TREES V. M. PELS, received her PhD in psychology from Leiden University. She is currently a professor in the Department of Theory and

Research in Education, Faculty of Psychology and Education, at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Her field of study is the socialization and development of minority children in the Netherlands and the interaction between their families, peer group, school and other socializing agents and institutions.

DORET J. DE RUYTER holds a PhD in the philosophy of education from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. She is currently a professor in the Department of Theory and Research in Education, Faculty of Psychology and Education, at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Her research interests are Ideals in education, Human flourishing, Ethics and education, Parental responsibility and Children's rights.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Diana D. van Bergen, Department of Pedagogy and Educational Sciences, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Groningen University, Grote Rozenstraat 38, 9712 TJ, Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: d.d.van.bergen@rug.nl

or cultural identities are superior (Doosje et al., 2013). Ultimately, this may lead to the belief that the use of violence in defense of their religion or ethnicity is an appropriate response to the perceived aggressor (Doosje et al., 2013; Moghaddam, 2005; Sageman, 2008; Twenge, Baumeister, Tice, & Stucke, 2001). An example is the *Hofstadgroup*, a group of young Dutch Muslim radicals who planned and committed violent acts in defense of their religion in the Dutch city of the Hague. The group members legitimized their acts by claiming that Muslim citizens had been rejected and mistreated by Dutch society and that their religion, which they perceived as superior, was repressed and imperiled (Vidino, 2007).

Ethnic or religious violent action is a complex phenomenon with many possible routes, causes, and precursors in which the interaction between the social environment and individual predispositions is crucial (Moghaddam, 2005). Collective identity factors—such as in-group connectedness, collective relative deprivation, connectedness with mainstream society, and in-group superiority—play an important role in the process leading to violence (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2010; Doosje et al., 2013; Moghaddam, 2005; Stroink, 2007). A person's collective identity is shaped by socialization in a range of contexts, including school, the peer group, social media, and home. In this study, we focused on the role of socialization at home, more specifically, the role of parents. The literature on youth's attitude toward violence in defense of the in-group has largely overlooked the potential role of parents, while research on parental ethnic socialization has rarely addressed children's attitudes toward violent in-group defense (Pels & De Ruyter, 2012). In this paper, we build on previous research, by not only examining how perceived parental ethnic socialization affects the collective identity of children but also how this, in turn, may be related to children's attitude toward violent in-group defense and willingness to use such violence themselves.

As the primary socializing agents, parents likely play an important role in youth's (collective) identity development and influence how their children cope with hostility toward their group. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) contends that parents are a model for children's attitudes and views. The theory posits that if children recognize their parents' expressions and behavior as meaningful and in line with their needs, the children subsequently cognitively process and retain these parental cues. Following social learning theory, we postulate that children learn their views on defending their ethnic and religious in-group (and the concomitant motives, rationalizations, and attitudes) by observing their parents' behavior, expressions, emotions, and reactions to their own behavior. Muslim minority parents have to balance the preservation of ethno-cultural and religious identities with adaptation amid a hostile societal climate. The emphases in this balancing act may influence how adolescents position themselves in their ethnic community and in wider society. This, in turn, may protect adolescents from or make them more susceptible to positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense.

In this paper, we examine the influence of parents on the views and attitudes of Turkish-Dutch Muslim youth. Using a structural equation model (SEM), we explored in what way perceived socialization of parents is associated with their children's attitudes vis-à-vis different ethnic or religious groups and children's willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. We focused on

ethnic socialization, that is, socialization processes that have a bearing on ethnicity, race, culture or religion, and interethnic group relations (see Hughes et al., 2006). We examined youth's perception of parental socialization instead of reports by parents, because a prerequisite for adopting parental views and behavior regarding in-group defense is that children perceive these views as adequate and meaningful. Thus, the perceptions of parents' intentions, instead of the parents' actual intentions, are likely to play a role in youths' collective identity formation and susceptibility to violent in-group defense. A potential problem with measuring children's perceptions of parenting is that they might project their views on their parents, leading to an overestimate of the influence of parental socialization. Therefore, we also tested an alternative model in which the paths were reversed, running from collective identity to perceived parenting.

Parental Ethnic Socialization, Collective Identity Factors, and Attitudes Toward Violent In-Group Defense

According to social learning theory, children are influenced by their parents' behavior. This behavior expresses the norms, values, and ideals held by parents. Through their ethnic socialization practices, parents intentionally or unintentionally transmit their ideals and values regarding ethnicity, race, culture, religion, and interethnic group relations to their children (Hughes et al., 2006; Hughes et al., 2008; Pels & De Ruyter, 2012). In a metareview covering 45,000 parent-child dyads of numerous ethnic groups in the United States and Europe, Degner and Dalege (2013) found evidence of parent and child similarity in bias, prejudice, and stereotyping, with medium effect sizes.

We hypothesized that the path from parental ethnic socialization to violent in-group defense runs via four key factors identified in research that investigated precursors of (attitudes toward) ideology-based violence among second-generation Muslim youth (Dalgaard-Nielsen, 2010; Doosje et al., 2013; Doosje, Van den Bos, Loseman, Feddes, & Mann, 2012; Mazarr, 2004; Moghaddam, 2005; Stroink, 2007). These factors, which can be summarized as collective identity factors, are in-group connectedness, collective relative deprivation, connectedness with mainstream society, and in-group superiority.

Perceived parental ethnic socialization is conceptualized in this study as the strategies found by Hughes et al. (2006) and Hughes et al. (2008) in their U.S. research among several ethnic groups: (a) cultural socialization (teachings about own culture), (b) egalitarianism (stressing that we are all equal), (c) bias (emphasizing inequality and discrimination), and (d) mistrust (be on your guard against the other). Our factor analyses indicated the presence of only three of these four types: bias and mistrust formed a combined factor (see the Method section). Figure 1 presents our hypotheses for how each of the parental ethnic socialization types affects attitudes toward violent in-group defense or willingness to use such violence oneself through their relationship with collective identity factors. We discuss the hypothesized relationships of each strategy separately.

Cultural Socialization, Collective Identity Factors, and Attitudes Toward Violent In-Group Defense

People have a need for a positive group identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Cultural socialization, that is, passing on cultural

Figure 1. Hypothesized model.

and ethnic heritage (e.g., traditions, values, ethnic pride, language, and cuisine), results from the importance ethnic minorities attach to maintaining their in-group culture (Hughes et al., 2008). Studies have shown that immigrant parents are successful in transmitting ideas and values of ethnicity, religion, and intergroup interactions to their children (e.g., Branch & Newcombe, 1986; Carol, 2014; Güngör, Fleischmann, & Phalet, 2011; Idema & Phalet, 2007; Maliepaard & Lubbers, 2013; Nauck, 2001; Phalet & Schönflug, 2001; but see Aboud & Doyle, 1996). Research by Hughes et al. (2008) on four ethnic groups in the United States showed that parents who felt greater attachment to their ethnic group reported more cultural socialization practices. Several studies found that cultural socialization facilitates children's knowledge about their ethno-racial group and that it leads to more favorable in-group attitudes (validated for African Americans and Mexican Americans, see Stevenson, 1995; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2004). From a social learning theory perspective, this can be interpreted as parents providing their children with many positive examples of in-group cultural practices that foster in-group attachment. Therefore, cultural socialization is likely to have a positive relation with in-group connectedness.

Collective relative deprivation of the group one identifies with is considered an important element in the process of developing an

understanding of the use of violence in defense of one's ethnic or religious identity (Moghaddam, 2005). Collective relative deprivation originates from the perception that one's in-group is unfairly treated worse than other groups (whether in cultural, political, religious, or socioeconomic terms; Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Smith, Pettigrew, Pippin, & Bialosiewicz, 2012). This perception may go hand-in-hand with feelings of anger and dismay (Smith et al., 2012). Collective relative deprivation has been shown to have a positive relation with a broad range of outcomes such as collective action, deviance, and hostile intergroup attitudes (Smith et al., 2012), as well as with attitudes toward violent in-group defense among Muslim youth (Doosje et al., 2013; Moghaddam, 2005; Stroink, 2007).

In the presence of a sense of collective relative deprivation, in-group connectedness can trigger another critical factor associated with attitude toward violent in-group defense, namely, perceived superiority of the in-group (Doosje et al., 2012; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002). In general, believers (of any religion) consider themselves to be living a morally good life. This may turn into moral superiority if they are absolutist believers (that is, they believe that their religion or faith is the only true one, in contrast to pluralists or fallibilists) and if they believe their faith is threatened by other believers or infidels. Feelings of moral superiority

based on being a Muslim may emerge as protection of the self-image for Muslim youth who perceive their identity to be under attack by society at large (Geelhoed, 2011). Feelings of superiority based on a collective identity, in turn, have been shown to be related to positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense (Doosje et al., 2012, 2013; Leidner, Castano, Zaiser, & Giner-Sorolla, 2010). Furthermore, researchers have shown that sympathy for others who use violence to defend their religious orientation and ethnic origins increases willingness to use such violence oneself (Doosje et al., 2013). Thus, we hypothesized that cultural socialization would be positively associated with in-group connectedness, which, for those who experience a sense of collective relative deprivation, would be related to increased feelings of religious superiority. Collective relative deprivation thus would act as a moderator of this relationship. Superiority would be associated with more positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense by others and, subsequently, with a higher intent to use such violence (H1).

Socialization of Bias and Mistrust, Collective Identity Factors, and Attitudes Toward Violent In-Group Defense

Muslim parents in the Netherlands may feel they have to socialize their children amid a relatively hostile climate in which Muslim youth have a lower status in society than majority Dutch youngsters (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012) and are confronted with discrimination (Pels & De Ruyter, 2012). Muslim parents may therefore believe that it is important to prepare their children for understanding and dealing with such bias (Pels, 2006). This form of ethnic socialization in which parents attempt to foster awareness of, and resilience against, discriminatory practices is generally referred to as *preparation for bias* (Hughes et al., 2006). In addition, parents may inculcate an attitude of distrust in their children, mostly referred to as the ethnic socialization type *promotion of mistrust* (Hughes et al., 2006). This form of socialization entails that parents spread messages of caution and wariness about other ethnic and/or majority groups and advise their children to maintain a social distance from these other groups. Hughes and Johnson (2001) have shown that parents who perceived that their children had been unfairly treated by other ethnic groups were more likely to warn children about intergroup relations and promote a sense of mistrust. In line with predictions based on social learning theory, studies have shown that parents pass on their defensive or mistrustful attitudes to their children (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Hughes et al., 2008; Nauck, 2001). We postulated that when Turkish-Dutch youth feel that their parents emphasize the risk of being confronted with bias in mainstream society because of their ethnic or religious group membership they may evoke youth's feelings of being treated unfairly as a group. These feelings may furthermore lead youth to develop a sense of collective relative deprivation. This, in turn, may result in claims of moral superiority as a counterstrategy, in turn increasing positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense by others, as well as the likelihood of willingness to use such violence oneself (Doosje et al., 2013; H2).

Researchers have shown that perceived rejection of the in-group by mainstream society is associated with decreased national Dutch identification in the case of young Dutch Muslims (Doosje et al.,

2013; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). Perceptions of rejection by mainstream society can result from youth's own experience but may also result from perceived ethnic socialization. Socialization of bias and mistrust may create the impression that the in-group has been rejected by mainstream society and thus lead to a diminished sense of connection to mainstream society. Doosje et al. (2013) found that feeling socially disconnected was associated with Muslim Dutch youth's positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense. Thus, we hypothesized that socialization of bias and mistrust, through a decrease in connectedness with mainstream society, would be associated with a more positive attitude toward violent in-group defense and, subsequently, with increased willingness to use such violence oneself (H3).

Socialization of Egalitarianism, Collective Identity Factors, and Attitudes Toward Violent In-Group Defense

Socialization of egalitarianism teaches children that individuals are of equal value irrespective of their (ethnic, cultural, religious) background (Hughes et al., 2006). Consequently, openness toward the other, diversity, and interethnic contact are viewed positively by children who are taught egalitarianism by their parents (La-Fromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Hughes et al. (2008) found a correlation between egalitarian parenting and egalitarian views expressed by children in four ethnic groups in the United States. Because the core belief of egalitarianism is the equality of individuals, this belief contradicts feelings of superiority based on in-group membership.

Researchers have shown that Muslim youth in the Netherlands who feel connected to mainstream society have lower scores for acceptance of violent in-group defense (van Bergen, Feddes, Doosje, & Pels, 2015). Therefore, we hypothesized that if Turkish-Dutch youth perceived parental egalitarian messages, the youth would feel more connected to Dutch society, and they would be less likely to have positive attitudes toward violent in-group defense by others and lower willingness to use such violence themselves (H4). In addition, it seems likely that Turkish-Dutch youth who report that their parents spread messages of egalitarianism will feel less superior as Muslims, because they have adopted the idea of equality between religions. A lower sense of Muslim superiority is expected to lead to a less positive attitude toward the use of violence to defend the in-group and, subsequently, less willingness to use such violence oneself (H5). Finally, if parents are perceived to express that all ethnic and religious groups are of equal value, then feelings of collective deprivation likely will be reduced. This would be related to lower levels of perceived superiority as Muslim and associated with a less positive attitude toward the use of violence for in-group defense and use of such violence oneself (H6).

Turkish-Dutch Muslim Youth

With a population of about 400,000, Turkish migrants and their descendants are the largest immigrant group in the Netherlands (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012). Turkish-Dutch are predominantly Muslim (95%), and most are Sunni (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2009). During the 1960s, Turkish immigrants from mostly rural areas came to the Netherlands as guest workers to fill the lower seg-

ments of the labor market (as in other European countries such as Germany and France). Although the second generation has made notable gains in education compared to their parents, the Turkish community is in a disadvantaged socioeconomic position compared to the Dutch majority (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012). Turkish families in Western Europe demonstrate what Portes and Rumbaut (2001) called “selected or lagged acculturation” (Phalet & Schönplig, 2001). They show high levels of ethnic retention, for example, in terms of use of native language, partner choice, and high primary identification as Turks, as well as low rates of interethnic contact with majority Dutch (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012; Ersanilli & Koopmans, 2011).

Studies have shown that Turkish-Dutch youth have high ethnic identification as Turkish and high religious identification as Muslim (Dagevos & Huijnk, 2012; Ersanilli, 2009). Ethnic and religious identification among Turkish-Dutch has a positive correlation (Maliepaard, Lubbers, & Gijsberts, 2010; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2014). This correlation is more pronounced among the second generation than among the first (Maliepaard et al., 2010; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2014). Verkuyten and Martinovic (2014) observed, “Members of groups holding multiple disadvantaged statuses experience these social categories (i.e. religion and ethnicity) in close association and simultaneously” (p. 66), which may generate “an inclination for simplified (that is, overlapping) social identity structures” (p. 66). Turkish-Dutch youth are thus likely to see their Muslim and Turkish identities as overlapping.

Previous studies have shown that some children of Turkish migrants agree that violence can be a justifiable method for defending the in-group (Schiffauer, 1999; Sloomman & Tillie, 2006; Huijnk, Andriessen, & Sterckx, 2015). In a survey among Turkish-Dutch Muslims in Amsterdam, 37% of youths (age 16–18) showed a combination of religious orthodoxy with the feeling that Islam is under attack by modern society and is a focal point of political conflict (Sloomman & Tillie, 2006). A more recent study showed that 11% of Turkish-Dutch show *some* or *a lot* of understanding of people using violence to defend their faith, including 14% of the 15- to 24-year-olds. Of this age group, 17% indicated they had *some* or *a lot* of understanding for people traveling from the Netherlands to the Islamic State (Huijnk et al., 2015).

Method

Sample and Participants

The data in this paper came from the Young and Diverse survey conducted from April until July 2011 at secondary schools in the Netherlands. Eleven schools were included in the full sample; however, the sample retained for the analyses in the present study was from seven schools (not all schools had Turkish-Dutch pupils). The schools were selected based on their ethnic composition. Schools with a high percentage of immigrant origin youth were oversampled to obtain a large enough sample for statistical analyses. The percentage of Turkish-Dutch pupils in the sample (15%) was higher than the total percentage of students of Turkish origin enrolled in Dutch schools (3.5%; Statistics Netherlands, 2012). Of the schools in this study, in three schools, more than 95% of the pupils had a non-Western immigrant background; in three schools, more than 50%; and in one school, approximately 30%. We followed a procedure of passive informed consent by parents in

addition to written informed consent by the respondents; the boards of the participating schools notified the parents and informed them of the content and aim of the study, allowing parents to refuse to allow their child to participate in the research. The school board of one school, however, stated that participation by their pupils in surveys deemed important by the school had been incorporated in their school policy to which the parents had agreed by enrolling their children in the school. Respondents gave their written informed consent before participating. One family refused to allow their child to participate, and two students opted out. The first author was present during data collection to introduce the study and to answer questions. A teacher was present in the classroom to keep order while the students filled out the survey.

A survey website with restricted access was designed especially for the study. A total of 970 students filled out the survey. For this paper, we analyzed a subset of all Turkish Sunni ($N = 133$) students in the sample¹ (Turkish ethnicity, 97%; Kurdish ethnicity, 3%; 48% boys) from seven schools and 25 classes, age 14 to 18 years ($M = 15.58$, $SD = 0.95$). We chose age 14 as the threshold for participation in the study as willingness to use violence to defend the in-group is rare before this age (Sageman, 2008; Sloomman & Tillie, 2006). The Turkish-Dutch respondents were enrolled in all tiers in the Dutch secondary education system (vocational training, 32%; higher intermediate education, 38%; preuniversity education, 30%). One school in the sample offers all three levels of education; the other schools offer either vocational education only or intermediate and preuniversity education.

Measures

Parental ethnic socialization. Ethnic socialization was measured with 19 of the 30 items of the ethnic socialization scale (adolescent version) developed by Hughes et al. (2008). An expert in the field of ethnic socialization of Muslim youth in the Netherlands (the last author) established which items would be appropriate for Turkish-Dutch youth as the original scale was developed based on four ethnic minority groups in the United States. The items were translated into Dutch by the first author and checked and approved by a professional translator. All items were measured on a 5-point scale (1 = *never*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, 5 = *very often*). The constructs of ethnic socialization we used (Hughes et al., 2008) have not been validated for the ethnic groups and national context studied. Because we were unable to obtain information about the factor structure found by Hughes et al., we performed an exploratory factor analysis in *Mplus*. Because the data were clustered but the dataset was not large enough to conduct a multilevel model, the Type = Complex setting of *Mplus* (robust maximum likelihood) was used to correct for clustering at the class level. The scree-plot and a comparison of fit indices of different factor solutions suggested a three-factor model. The quartimin (oblique) rotated factor loadings and fit indices of the three-factor solution are presented in the Appendix.

¹ Of the 143 students with one or both parents born in Turkey, five identified as nonreligious. They were left out of the analyses because one of the collective identity factors (religious superiority) could not be measured for these respondents. In addition, five out of 143 students identified as Alevi. These respondents were also left out of the analyses, as Alevism is considered a very different religion from Sunni Islam and not all Alevi consider themselves Muslims (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2009).

Two of the factors correspond to Hughes' et al. (2008) scales, namely, cultural socialization and egalitarianism, but the other two subscales found by Hughes—bias and mistrust—resulted in one factor that we will refer to as “bias/mistrust.”

Cultural socialization was measured with five items (e.g., “How often have your parents taken you to places with predominantly people of your ethnic group [e.g., restaurants, language classes]?”; “How often have your parents told you that you should be proud of your ethnic background?”) with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.77. Egalitarianism was measured with four items (e.g., “How often have your parents said that it is important to appreciate people of diverse ethnic backgrounds?”; “How often have your parents told you that all people are equal regardless of ethnicity or religion?”) and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.69. The Bias/Mistrust scale had 10 items (e.g., “How often have your parents talked to you about how to handle situations where you are treated unfairly because of your ethnic background?”; “How often have your parents done or said things to keep you from trusting other kids who are not [of your ethnic background]?”) with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.84. Because of the modest sample size, the scores on the three types of ethnic socialization were calculated as the mean scores of the items that loaded on each scale in the factor analysis (printed in bold in the Appendix) instead of as factor scores.²

Four collective identity factors. The items of all four collective identity factors (in-group connectedness, mainstream connectedness, perceived superiority, and collective relative deprivation) were included in an exploratory factor analysis. A four-factor solution provided a good fit and a straightforward interpretation of the quartimin (oblique) rotated factor scores. The factor scores and the fit indices are presented in the Appendix.

Connectedness with the in-group. We used the Dutch version of the Psychological Acculturation Scale (PAS; original by Tropp, Erkut, Coll, Alarcon, & Garcia, 1999 for the United States; Dutch version developed and validated by Stevens et al., 2004) that measures an individual's sense of emotional attachment to, belonging to, and understanding of the culture of his or her own ethnic group of origin (in-group). Respondents were asked to indicate their attachment to Turks (T-PAS; e.g., “I feel comfortable with Turkish people”). Answers were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*). The score on this scale was the mean of six items. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .88.

Connectedness with mainstream society. We also used the PAS, but in this case, the items of psychosocial connectedness to Dutch majority culture (D-PAS; e.g., “Dutch people understand me”). Answers were rated on the same 5-point Likert-type scale as connectedness with the in-group. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale of 6 items was .81.

Perceived in-group superiority as Muslims. To assess perceived in-group superiority based on Islam and Muslim identity, three items were chosen from a longer questionnaire used by Doosje et al. (2013; e.g., “It makes me angry when people are not proud of being Muslim”; “It would be best if everyone were Muslim”). Response options varied from (1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*). The score was calculated as the mean across the three items. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .67.

Collective relative deprivation. Collective relative deprivation was assessed with three items taken from Doosje et al. (2012) and Doosje et al. (2013); for example, “I think people of my ethnic background or religion do not get as many chances as others in the

Netherlands”; “People of my ethnic background or religion are discriminated against in the Netherlands”). The 5-point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (*disagree completely*) to 5 (*agree completely*). We created a scale using the mean score of the three items (Cronbach's alpha = .68).

Attitude toward violent in-group defense by others. Attitude toward others who use violence in defense of their ethnicity or religion was measured with the following item (Doosje et al., 2013): “I can understand people who use violence to defend their ethnic and religious group.” The 5-point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (*disagree completely*) to 5 (*agree completely*).

Willingness to use violence in defense of the in-group. Willingness to use violence for in-group defense was measured with the following item (Doosje et al., 2013): “I would use violence to defend my ethnic origin or religion.” The 3-point scale ranged from 1 (*not true*) to 3 (*very true*).

Ethnicity and religion. Respondents reported the country of birth of their father and mother. Because there is also a small third generation of immigrant youth in the Netherlands who cannot be identified based on the country of birth of their parents and because some children have a mixed ethnic background, we also asked for ethnic self-identification (*Turkish + Alevi*, *Turkish + Kurdish*, and *Turkish* were the options related to Turkish identification). The respondents were categorized by comparing the country of birth of both parents with the respondents' self-identification (the latter was the determinant in the case of mixed parentage). At least one of the countries where the respondents' parents were born had to match the self-chosen ethnicity of “Turkish” in order for a youngster to be classified as second-generation Turkish. There were no respondents in the survey whose parents were born in Turkey and who did not identify as Turkish. Finally, we assumed that there were no first-generation immigrants in the survey, because in the Netherlands first-generation immigrants (i.e., those who arrived after the age of 12) receive specific education tailored to their language needs. School classes of this type did not participate in the survey.

Analyses

The hypothesized path model was tested in *Mplus*. The estimates were calculated using robust maximum likelihood and were controlled for clustering at the class level. The number of schools (seven) was too low to run a multilevel model controlled for school and class effects.

Because of the small size of the sample, we did not include the measurement model in the SEM analysis. Instead, we used sum scores for each variable measured with multiple items (see above). Because boys are known to be more likely to use violence than girls (Carr, 2006), we included gender as a covariate on all variables in the model (not depicted).

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations of all variables in the analyses. The correlations are in line with much of the theory suggested above. The pattern of correlations with egal-

² Factor scores are sensitive to sampling variation. For smaller samples, it is therefore preferable to calculate indices based on means instead of on factor scores (Treiman, 2009).

Table 1
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations of All Variables in the Model

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Cultural socialization	—									
2. Bias/Mistrust socialization	.43***	—								
3. Egalitarian socialization	.26**	.04	—							
4. In-group connectedness	.38***	.10	.12	—						
5. Mainstream connectedness	-.23**	-.37***	.26**	-.08	—					
6. Collective deprivation	.15†	.38***	.03	.09	-.30**	—				
7. Perceived Muslim superiority	.32**	.40***	-.15†	.25**	-.42***	.30***	—			
8. Ethno-religious violence others	.18*	.28**	-.17†	.15†	-.30***	.23**	.36***	—		
9. Ethno-religious violent intentions	.36***	.39***	-.16†	.35***	-.24**	.29***	.43***	.52***	—	
10. Boy (ref = girl)	.16†	.37***	-.24**	.14	-.10	.19*	.11	.17*	.37***	—
<i>M</i>	3.58	1.95	3.50	4.41	3.58	3.37	3.23	2.78	1.75	.48
<i>SD</i>	.89	.76	.90	.76	.85	1.00	1.12	1.49	.82	.50

Note. $N = 133$.

Two-tailed, † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

itarian socialization is clearly distinct from that of the other two socialization strategies. The correlations with all variables except in-group connectedness and collective deprivation have the opposite sign. Boys and girls reported different perceived parenting strategies. Boys especially reported more bias/mistrust.

The hypothesized model³ had a poor fit, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(27, 133) = 466.457$, $p < .001$, comparative fit index (CFI) = .31, standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = .15 and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .35; 90% confidence interval (CI) [.32, .38]. First, the insignificant interaction term between collective relative deprivation and in-group connectedness on superiority was removed from the model. Saris, Satorra, and Van der Veld (2009) showed that a SEM can have satisfactory or even good fit index scores despite the presence of substantively important misspecifications. Therefore, they recommended looking at modification indices (MIs) while taking the statistical power of the misspecification into account. Taking power into account is especially important given the small size of the sample. We followed the guidelines developed by Saris et al. (2009) and evaluated MIs using JRULE for Mplus.⁴ Based on the output from JRULE, we added substantively meaningful paths one by one, until the remaining MIs were judged inconclusive by JRULE or nonsensible (Byrne, 2011). The resulting model included five paths not specified in the hypothetical model: (a) from cultural socialization to superiority as Muslims, (b) from bias/mistrust to superiority as Muslims, (c) from in-group connectedness to willingness to use violence, (d) from superiority as Muslims to connectedness with mainstream society, and (e) from superiority as Muslims to willingness to use violence. This model had a good fit, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(17, 133) = 22.707$, $p = .16$, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .05 and 90% CI [.00, .10].⁵ Subsequent removal of the nonsignificant path from perceived egalitarian socialization to perceived collective deprivation did not significantly decrease model fit, $\Delta\chi^2_{adj}(1, 133) = .135$, $p = .71$. The final model had a good fit, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(18, 133) = 22.799$, $p = .20$, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .05 and 90% CI [.00, .09]. Figure 2 shows the final SEM with standardized beta coefficients.⁶

An alternative model in which the paths between the collective identity factors and ethnic socialization types as shown in Figure 2 are inverted had a poorer fit; the sample size adjusted Bayesian information criterion is 3,017.987 compared to 2,040.209 for the model displayed in Figure 2.

The fit indices for this model indicate a moderate to poor fit, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(18, 133) = 52.199$, $p < .001$, CFI = .89, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .12 and 90% CI [.08, .16].

As hypothesized (H1), the final model included a path from perceived cultural socialization to in-group connectedness with a positive coefficient. Contrary to this hypothesis, the relation between in-group connectedness and in-group superiority as Muslims was not moderated by collective relative deprivation; instead, we found a direct path. The path continued as expected from in-group superiority as Muslims to attitude toward and then to willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. In addition to the path from cultural socialization via in-group connectedness to in-group superiority as Muslims, there was also a direct path from perceived cultural socialization to in-group superiority as Muslims, which had not been hypothesized. Thus, when Turkish-Dutch children reported that their parents aimed to pass on their Turkish heritage, this led to a modest increase in these youngsters' sense of superiority as Muslims. Furthermore, there were direct paths from in-group connectedness and from in-group superiority as Muslims to willingness to use violence. Last, there was an unpredicted path from in-group superiority as Muslims to connectedness with mainstream society to attitude toward and then willingness to use violence. The more Turkish-Dutch youth feel that Muslims are superior, the less they feel connected to Dutch society⁷ and the higher the

³ In the test of the hypothesized model, the score for relative deprivation was centered to reduce collinearity with the interaction term.

⁴ This program was developed by Daniel Oberski and can be found at <https://github.com/daob/JRuleMplus/wiki>. The settings were misspecification of .1, power of .80, and Cronbach's alpha of .05.

⁵ JRULE was inconclusive on two substantively plausible paths: cultural socialization with willingness to use violence and between collective deprivation and connectedness with the mainstream.

⁶ The final model contains two significant residual correlations: cultural socialization with willingness to use violence and cultural socialization with connectedness with mainstream society.

⁷ We tested an alternative model in which the direction of the path between connectedness with mainstream society and superiority was reversed and the model in which this relation was modeled as a correlation instead of a path. These models had a similar sample size adjusted Bayesian information criterion as the model in Figure 2 (2,044.818), but the fit was poorer, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(18, 133) = 28.188$, $p = .06$, CFI = .96, SRMR = .04, RMSEA = .07, and 90% CI [.00, .11]. It cannot be ruled out that the direction of the relationship is the inverse of what is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Structural equation model with standardized beta coefficients. Controlled for gender (not shown). Robust maximum likelihood estimation, standard errors clusters by class. Two-tailed tests, † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. $N = 133$.

understanding of and willingness to use violence to defend the in-group.

Socialization that stresses bias and mistrust, as predicted (H2), was associated with a stronger sense of collective relative deprivation, which as expected was related to stronger in-group superiority as Muslims and continued to more favorable attitudes toward violent in-group defense and willingness to use such violence. Stronger in-group superiority as Muslims had a negative relation with connectedness with mainstream society.

In line with the third hypothesis (H3), perceived bias and mistrust socialization was negatively related to connectedness with mainstream society, leading to a more positive attitude toward violent in-group defense and willingness to use such violence. The results also showed an unexpected direct path from bias and

mistrust socialization to increased in-group superiority as Muslims.

For perceived egalitarian socialization, we found support for a positive association with connectedness with mainstream society (H4) leading to a more negative attitude toward the use of violence and less willingness to use it. We also found support for the hypothesis on a path from perceived egalitarian socialization to a lower sense of in-group superiority as Muslims and then to a less favorable attitude toward violent in-group defense and the use of such violence (H5). Finally, the hypothesized path from perceived egalitarian socialization to a lower sense of collective relative deprivation (H6) was not supported by the final model.

In sum, there were pathways from all three ethnic socialization types via collective identity factors to willingness to use violence

to defend the ethnic or religious in-group, although the pathways showed some deviations from those initially hypothesized. Table 2 presents the estimates of the total indirect effects of all three ethnic socialization types on willingness to use violence via all pathways in the final model.

As Table 2 shows, all three socialization types have a significant, albeit modest, indirect effect on willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. In total, the paths from perceived ethnic socialization types accounted for a little more than 5% of the variance in understanding of the use of violence for in-group defense and for nearly 6% of the variance in willingness to use violence for in-group defense. Cultural socialization accounted for 2.5%, bias and mistrust 2%, and perceived egalitarianism 1.2% of the variation in willingness to use violence for in-group defense. Not all indirect paths from socialization to violence to defend the in-group were statistically significant. As the effect sizes were low, most of the shorter paths were statistically significant. The final model explained 17% of the variance in understanding the use of violence and 45% of youths' own willingness to use violence to defend the ethnic or religious in-group. As expected, a positive attitude toward violent in-group defense by others was a strong predictor of willingness to use violence and explained 13.4% ($p < .001$). However, in-group superiority was also a strong predictor. Feelings of in-group superiority as Muslims play a pivotal role in the model, mediating almost all other paths to willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. The total (direct and indirect) effect of this variable accounted for 11.4% ($p < .001$) of the variance in willingness to use violence.

Discussion

Previous studies have shown there are many routes to radicalization and the use of ethnic and religious violence (Moghaddam, 2005). In this study, we examined the relation between perceived parental ethnic socialization and willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. We looked at a sample of children of Turkish Muslim immigrants to the Netherlands. In line with our hypotheses, we found that perceived parental ethnic socialization (i.e., cultural socialization, egalitarianism, bias/mistrust) is indirectly related to attitudes toward violence in defense of the in-group by others as well as willingness to use such violence via its relationship with collective identity factors (in-group connectedness, collective deprivation, religious superiority, connectedness with mainstream society).

These results fit with social learning theory that presumes children learn their views (and concomitant motives, rationalizations, and attitudes) by observing the behavior, expressions, and emotions of close family members, notably their parents. More specifically, our study, focusing on ethnic socialization, showed that youth who perceive that their parents express that individuals are equal regardless of their ethnicity (egalitarianism) also have less favorable attitudes toward the use of violence to defend the in-group. These findings are in line with the results by Hughes et al. (2006) and Hughes et al. (2008) that showed there is similarity in egalitarianism between parents and their children. Furthermore, we found that children who feel that their parents raise awareness of discrimination or teach them that other ethnic groups cannot be trusted have a more positive stance toward ethnic and religion-based violence. These youth appear to believe that their parents

Table 2

Total Indirect Effects (With Bootstrap Confidence Interval [5000 Iterations]) of Ethnic Socialization Types on the Willingness to Use Violence for Defense of the In-Group Standardized Coefficients

Perceived parental ethnic socialization	Total indirect effect	
	Std. effect	95% CI
Cultural socialization	.16***	[.07, .25]
→ in-group superiority → use of violence	.04	[-.10, .09]
→ in-group connectedness → use of violence	.08*	[.02, .14]
→ in-group superiority → attitude violence → use of violence	.02	[-.00, .05]
→ in-group connectedness → in-group superiority → use of violence	.02†	[-.00, .03]
→ in-group connectedness → in-group superiority → attitude to violence → use of violence	.01	[-.00, .02]
→ in-group superiority → mainstream connectedness → attitude to violence → use of violence	.00	[-.00, .01]
→ in-group connectedness → in-group superiority → mainstream connectedness → attitude to violence → use of violence	.00	[-.00, .00]
Bias/Mistrust socialization	.14***	[.06, .23]
→ in-group superiority → use of violence	.07*	[.01, .13]
→ in-group superiority → attitude violence → use of violence	.03*	[.00, .06]
→ mainstream connectedness → attitude violence → use of violence	.02	[-.01, .05]
→ collective deprivation → in-group superiority → use of violence	.01	[-.01, .03]
→ collective deprivation → in-group superiority → attitude violence → use of violence	.01	[-.00, .01]
→ in-group superiority → mainstream connectedness → attitude to violence → use of violence	.01	[-.00, .01]
→ collective deprivation → in-group superiority → mainstream connectedness → attitude violence → use of violence	.00	[-.00, .00]
Egalitarian socialization	-.11**	[-.17, -.05]
→ in-group superiority → use of violence	-.06*	[-.11, -.01]
→ in-group superiority → attitude violence → use of violence	-.03†	[-.06, .00]
→ mainstream connectedness → attitude to violence → use of violence	-.02	[-.04, .01]
→ in-group superiority → mainstream connectedness → attitude to violence → use of violence	-.01	[-.01, .00]

Note. Std. = standardized; CI = confidence interval. Standardized coefficients. Robust maximum likelihood estimation, $N = 133$.

Two-tailed tests, † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

transmit feelings of rejection by the majority society, as well as the propensity to mistrust, which previous studies have indicated are important risk factors in generating understanding of ethno-religious violence (Doosje et al., 2012, 2103; Stroink, 2007).

Cultural socialization is often seen as a prerequisite for the healthy development of youth's self-concept (Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997). In contrast, the present study indicates that in the case of Turkish-Dutch youth, youth who reported more cultural socialization also reported a collective identity that makes them more likely to have favorable attitudes toward using violence. This relation found for Turkish-Dutch youth might be a consequence of a political climate in which Muslims are constantly negatively portrayed (Ghorashi, 2010).

Furthermore, whether young Turkish-Dutch felt connected to mainstream society was significantly related to their attitudes toward and willingness to use violence for in-group defense. This is in line with studies by Doosje et al. (2012, 2013), which reported a significant path to violence through social disconnectedness. However, the relationship we found was weaker than in Doosje et al.'s (2013) study. This may be because social disconnection is a concept much more closely related to alienation (underpinned in literature on ethnic or religious violence as the precipitating factor); whereas the indicator we used (connectedness with mainstream society) has a wider scope.

The relations we found between perceived parental socialization and collective identity factors are broadly in line with previous studies on parental transmission of minority group identity and norms on interethnic relations (e.g., Carol, 2014; Güngör et al., 2011). However, the analyses also revealed several nonhypothesized paths. We had hypothesized that the effect of connectedness with the in-group on perceived superiority as Muslims would be moderated by a sense of collective deprivation. However, the analyses showed an unmoderated path. This might be because the relation is moderated by perceived group threat instead of by collective deprivation. We did not measure perceived group threat in our study. Perceived group threat may also explain the direct path found from in-group connectedness to willingness to use violence. This is also what Doosje et al. (2013) found in their study.

We had hypothesized that cultural socialization would lead only to a stronger in-group connectedness. However, we also found a weak positive relation with perceived superiority as Muslims. This suggests that perceived parental messages about the importance of the ethnic culture, including religion, not only may give youngsters a positive self-image of their group but can also generate pride and even a sense of superiority. However, it is possible that this relation is specific to the context under study: a climate that is rather hostile to Muslim migrant groups. The societal context may also explain the positive relation between bias/mistrust socialization and perceived superiority as Muslims and the negative relation between connectedness with mainstream society and perceived superiority as Muslims. Islamophobia may trigger "fighting back" in defense of one's in-group (Stroink, 2007).

The study has several limitations. First, several factors that may play a role in the relationship between parental socialization and violence to defend the in-group could not be taken into account. These factors include socioeconomic position and the degree of ethnic diversity of the schools. Furthermore, the model should be extended to include personal experiences of discrimination and

perceived group threat in addition to perceptions of collective relative deprivation as additional factors that can lead to (dis)connection from mainstream society (Ghorashi, 2010). The residual correlation between cultural socialization and willingness to use violence may suggest such an omitted mediator variable. Another factor that should be added to future models is the role of age. The size and low variation in age in our sample did not allow us to examine the effects of this variable. However, it would be interesting to explore how the effects of parenting may vary in relation to the age of the children.

Second, this study used ethnicity to measure in-group connectedness and religion to measure in-group superiority. Although there is a significant overlap between ethnic and religious identification among Turkish-Dutch youth, the difference between the measurements of in-group connectedness and in-group superiority may have affected the estimates of their relation with each other and with willingness to use violence to defend the in-group. Future research should aim to distinguish between ethnic and religious identities in the measures of identification and the motivation to use violence.

A third limitation is the low number of items we used for several concepts in this study. This may have led to lower reliability of the measurement that, in turn, may have led to an underestimation of the strength of the correlations in the model.

Fourth, this study focused on children's perception of parental socialization, instead of parents' actual socialization practices. Although our reasons for doing so were related to social learning theory, critics might claim we should have measured parental socialization through parental reports as well. However, the path model in which the paths run from collective identity factors to socialization types (i.e., a model of projection) has a considerably worse fit than the model with paths from socialization types to collective identity factors. This lends support to our argument that perceived parental socialization affects collective identity, instead of vice versa. Future studies that include socialization practices as reported by parents could further examine our argument. In addition, it would be relevant to distinguish between mothers' and fathers' viewpoints, as they may differ in their ethnic socialization messages (Pels, 2006). Furthermore, as parents may change their socialization approach in response to the attitudes and behavior of their children, a longitudinal approach would be the optimal design. A longitudinal approach is furthermore desirable as the processes that lead youth to a favorable attitude toward violent in-group defense are dynamic. The cross-sectional nature of this study limits our ability to make strong claims about the causal relations among ethnic socialization, collective identity factors, and violent in-group defense.

A fifth limitation, related to the generalizability of our findings, is the modest sample size. Although we used several robustness checks, including power-adjusted modification indices, a comparison of alternative models, and the calculation of bootstrapped confidence intervals of the indirect effects, the modest size of the sample might have led to an over- or underestimation of the size of the relationships between ethnic socialization types and attitudes toward violence to defend the in-group.

Today, preventing the violent radicalization of youth is a crucial challenge for many societies. Examples of violent radical youth are not limited to Turkish-Dutch youth or to immigrant youth (see, for instance, Ghorashi, 2010, on radicalization among Moroccan-

Dutch youth or Van San, Sieckelinck, & De Winter, 2010, or Doosje et al., 2012, for examples of violent Dutch native radicalized youth). Our findings suggest that for immigrant youth one of the factors that may encourage or inhibit a path to becoming prepared to use violence to defend the in-group is the messages they perceive they receive from their parents. Although the study showed that the overall effect size of ethnic socialization type on propensity to show an understanding of or willingness to use violence is small, the results, nevertheless, suggest that parents, and the wider communities, should be made aware of the potential impact of educating children to distrust the other and should be supported in communicating and reflecting with children on the complicated task of positioning themselves in the context of increased polarization and stigmatization.

References

- Abbas, T. (2012). The symbiotic relationship between Islamophobia and radicalization. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 5, 345–358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2012.723448>
- Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996). Parental and peer influences on children's racial attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 371–383. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(96\)00024-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(96)00024-7)
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Branch, C. W., & Newcombe, N. (1986). Racial attitude development among young Black children as a function of parental attitudes: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study. *Child Development*, 57, 712–721. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130348>
- Byrne, B. (2011). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carol, S. (2014). The Intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes and intergroup friendships: The role of Turkish migrant parents. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40, 1550–1571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.872557>
- Carr, A. (2006). *The handbook of child and adolescent clinical psychology: A contextual approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dagevos, J., & Huijnk, W. J. J. (2012). *Dichterbij elkaar? De sociaal-culturele positie van niet-westerse migranten in Nederland* [Closer together? The socio-cultural position of non-Western migrants in the Netherlands]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Dalgaard-Nielsen, A. (2010). Violent radicalization in Europe: What we know and what we do not know. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 33, 797–814. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2010.501423>
- Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 1270–1304. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031436>
- Doosje, E. J., Loseman, A., & Van den Bos, K. (2013). Determinants of radicalization of Islamic youth in the Netherlands: Personal uncertainty, perceived injustice and perceived group threat. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69, 586–604. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12030>
- Doosje, E. J., Van den Bos, K., Loseman, A., Feddes, A. R., & Mann, L. (2012). "My in-group is superior!" Susceptibility for radical right-wing attitudes and behaviors in Dutch youth. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 5, 253–268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2012.00099.x>
- Ersanilli, E. (2009). Identificatie van Turkse migrantenjongeren in Nederland, Frankrijk en Duitsland. [Identification of Turkish migrant youth in the Netherlands, France and Germany]. *Migrantenstudies*, 25, 42–51.
- Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2011). Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants. *West European Politics*, 34, 208–234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2011.546568>
- Geelhoed, F. (2011). *Purification and resistance: Glocal meanings of Islamic fundamentalism in the Netherlands*. (Doctoral thesis). Retrieved from <http://repub.eur.nl/res/pub/31685/Purification%20and%20Resistance%20-%20Fiore%20Geelhoed.pdf>
- Ghorashi, H. (2010). Dutchness and the migrant "other": From suppressed superiority to explicit exclusion? *Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology*, 2010, 106–111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3167/fcl.2010.560109>
- Güngör, D., Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2011). Religious identification, beliefs, and practices among Turkish Belgian and Moroccan Belgian Muslims: Intergenerational continuity and acculturative change. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 1356–1374. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022111412342>
- Hughes, D., & Johnson, D. J. (2001). Correlates in children's experiences of parents' racial socialization behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 981–995. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00981.x>
- Hughes, D., Rivas, D., Foust, M., Hagelskamp, C., Gersick, S., & Way, N. (2008). How to catch a moonbeam: A mixed-methods approach to understanding ethnic socialization in ethnically diverse families. In S. Quintana & C. McKnown (Eds.), *Handbook of race, racism, and child development* (pp. 226–277). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hughes, D., Rodriguez, J., Smith, E. P., Johnson, D. J., Stevenson, H. C., & Spicer, P. (2006). Parents' ethnic-racial socialization practices: A review of research and directions for future study. *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 747–770. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.747>
- Huijnk, W., Andriessen, I., & Sterckx, L. (2015). *Opvattingen over religieus geïnspireerd geweld en IS onder Turkse en Marokkaanse Nederlanders* [Attitudes towards religion inspired violence and IS among Turkish and Moroccan Dutch]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: SCP.
- Idema, H., & Phalet, K. (2007). Transmission of gender-role values in Turkish-German migrant families: The role of gender, intergenerational and intercultural relations. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung. Journal of Family Research*, 19, 71–105.
- Ivarsflaten, E. (2008). What unites right-wing populists in Western Europe? Re-examining grievance mobilization models in seven successful cases. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41, 3–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0010414006294168>
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.395>
- Leidner, B., Castano, E., Zaiser, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2010). Ingroup glorification, moral disengagement, and justice in the context of collective violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1115–1129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167210376391>
- Maliepaard, M., & Lubbers, M. (2013). Parental Religious Transmission after Migration: The Case of Dutch Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39, 425–442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.733862>
- Maliepaard, M., Lubbers, M., & Gijsberts, M. (2010). Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation: A study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33, 451–472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870903318169>
- Mazarr, M. J. (2004). The psychological sources of Islamic terrorism: Alienation and identity in the Arab world. *Policy Review*, 125, 39–60.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (2005). The staircase to terrorism: A psychological exploration. *American Psychologist*, 60, 161–169.
- Moors, H., Balogh, L., Van Donselaar, J., & De Graaff, B. (2009). *Polarisatie en Radicalisering in Nederland* [Polarization and Radicalization in the Netherlands]. Tilburg, The Netherlands: IVA.
- Nauck, B. (2001). Intercultural contact and intergenerational transmission in immigrant families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 159–173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032002004>

- Pantucci, R. (2011). What have we learned about lone wolves from Anders Behring Breivik? *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 5, 5–6. Retrieved from <http://www.terrorismanalysts.com/pt/index.php/pot/article/view/what-we-have-learned>
- Pels, T. V. M. (2006). North Africans: Child rearing in Moroccan families. In M. Deković, T. V. M. Pels, & S. Model (Eds.), *Child rearing in six ethnic families: The multi-cultural Dutch experience* (pp. 59–99). Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press.
- Pels, T., & de Ruyter, D. J. (2012). The influence of education and socialization on radicalization. An exploration of theoretical presumptions and empirical research. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 41, 311–325. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10566-011-9155-5>
- Phalet, K., & Schönplugg, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission of collectivism and achievement values in two acculturation contexts. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 186–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032002006>
- Phinney, J. S., Ferguson, D. L., & Tate, J. D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development*, 68, 955–969. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1132044>
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 336–353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4
- Sageman, M. (2008). *Leaderless Jihad: Terror networks in the twenty-first century*. Philadelphia, PA: Penn Press.
- Saris, W. E., Satorra, A., & van der Veld, W. M. (2009). Testing structural equation models or detection of misspecifications? *Structural Equation Modeling*, 16, 561–582. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705510903203433>
- Savelkoul, M., Scheepers, P., van der Veld, W., & Hagendoorn, L. (2012). Comparing levels of anti-Muslim attitudes across Western countries. *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 46, 1617–1624. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9470-9>
- Schiffauer, W. (1999). *Islamism in the diaspora: The fascination of political Islam among second generation German Turks*. Oxford, United Kingdom: ESRC Working Paper.
- Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). The meaning and consequences of perceived discrimination in disadvantaged and privileged social groups. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12, 167–199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14792772143000058>
- Slootman, M., & Tillie, J. (2006). *Processes of radicalization: Why some Amsterdam Muslims become radicals*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam.
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., & Bialosiewicz, S. (2012). Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 203–232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1088868311430825>
- Statistics Netherlands. (2012). *Enrollment of secondary school students according to ethnicity*. Retrieved from <http://statline.cbs.nl/>
- Stevens, G. W. J. M., Pels, T. V. M., Vollebergh, W. A. M., & Crijnen, A. (2004). Patterns of psychological acculturation in adult and adolescent Moroccan immigrants living in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 689–704. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022104270111>
- Stevenson, H. C. (1995). Relationship of adolescent perceptions of racial socialization to racial identity. *The Journal of Black Psychology*, 21, 49–70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00957984950211005>
- Stroink, M. L. (2007). Processes and preconditions underlying terrorism in second-generation immigrants. *Peace and Conflict*, 13, 293–312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10781910701471322>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Treiman, D. J. (2009). *Quantitative data analysis: Doing social research to test ideas*. Chichester England: Wiley.
- Tropp, L. R., Erkut, S., Coll, C. G., Alarcon, O., & Garcia, H. A. V. (1999). Psychological acculturation: Development of a new measure for Puerto Ricans on the U.S. mainland. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 59, 351–367.
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1058–1069. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.6.1058>
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2004). Ethnic identity among Mexican-origin adolescents living in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26, 36–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0739986303262143>
- van Bergen, D. D., Feddes, A. R., Doosje, B., & Pels, T. V. M. (2015). Collective identity factors and the attitude toward violence in defense of ethnicity or religion among Muslim youth of Turkish and Moroccan Descent. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 47, 89–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.026>
- Van San, M., Sieckelinck, S., & De Winter, M. (2010). *Idealen op drift. Een pedagogische kijk op radicaliserende jongeren* [Ideals adrift: A pedagogical view of radicalizing youth]. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Boom/Lemma.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2014). Minority identity and host national identification among immigrants. In C. De Dreu (Ed.), *Social conflict within and between groups* (pp. 55–75). London, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2007). National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1448–1462. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167207304276>
- Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2009). Muslim immigrants and religious group feelings: Self-identification and attitudes among Sunni and Alevi Turkish-Dutch. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32, 1121–1142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870802379312>
- Vidino, L. (2007). The Hofstad group: The new face of terrorist networks in Europe. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 30, 579–592. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10576100701385933>

(Appendix follows)

Appendix

Factor Loadings

Table A1

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis With Quartimin Rotation of Perceived Parental Ethnic Socialization (MPlus)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
How often have your parents . . .			
taken you to events/places (lessons/restaurants etc.) where other people are mostly of your racial/ethnic background?	-.15	.52	-.26
talked to you about people or events in the history of your ethnic group (not including school work)?	-.03	.65	.03
told you that being a member of your racial/ethnic group is an important part of who you are?	.14	.70	.04
said it is important to know about the important people and events in the history of your racial or ethnic group?	-.02	.71	.13
said to you that you should be proud to be from your racial or ethnic group?	.04	.59	.10
encouraged you to have friends of all racial and ethnic backgrounds?	-.18	.12	.37
said it is important to appreciate people of all racial or ethnic backgrounds?	-.11	.02	.59
said it is important to get along with people of all races and ethnicities?	.07	.14	.61
said it is important to appreciate people of all racial or ethnic backgrounds?	.01	.04	.81
talked to you about poor treatment against people of your racial/ethnic background?	.60	-.02	-.03
done or said things to keep you from trusting other kids who are not of your same racial/ethnic background?	.57	.16	-.20
told you that people might try to limit you because of your racial or ethnic background?	.65	.03	.16
done or said things to get you to keep your distance from other kids who are not of your same racial/ethnic background?	.60	.02	-.19
done or said things to encourage you to have friends who are the same racial/ethnic background as you?	.34	.24	.08
warned you that adults (teachers, law enforcement, store keepers, etc.) from certain racial/ethnic groups might treat you differently or unfairly because of your race or ethnicity?	.76	.02	-.08
encouraged you to watch what you say or do around members of other racial/ethnic groups?	.58	.16	-.01
talked to you about how to handle situations where you are treated unfairly because of your ethnicity or race?	.55	.11	.30
said some kids may exclude you from activities because of your race or ethnicity?	.74	-.16	.09
mentioned it is a bad idea to marry someone who is a different race or ethnicity than you are?	.32	.30	-.23
Eigenvalue	5.28	2.75	1.68
Cronbach's α	.84	.77	.69

Note. Standard errors clustered by class. Bold font indicates inclusion in scale sum-score calculation. Fit of three-factor solution: $\chi^2(101, 133) = 248.889$, $p < .001$, comparative fit index = .85, standardized root mean square residual = .05, and root mean square error of approximation = .085 (90% confidence interval [.068, .101]).

(Appendix continues)

Table A2

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis With Quartimin Rotation of In-Group and With Mainstream Society, In-Group Superiority as Muslims and Collective Relative Deprivation Generated in MPlus

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Muslims are better people than people with a different religion.	.64	.02	-.03	.12
It would be best if everyone were Muslim.	.72	.05	-.05	-.04
It upsets me when people are not proud of their Muslim religious identity.	.35	.16	-.17	.01
I feel comfortable with people of Turkish origin.	.01	.78	.05	.03
I understand people of Turkish origin.	.01	.79	.07	-.02
People of Turkish origin understand me.	.02	.84	.01	.07
I am similar to other people of Turkish origin in many ways.	.07	.82	-.62	-.09
I see myself as a Turk.	.08	.63	.12	.08
I am proud of my Turkish background.	-.20	.67	-.13	-.00
I feel comfortable with people of Dutch origin.	-.02	.01	.77	.00
I understand people of Dutch origin.	-.02	.06	.83	-.00
People of Dutch origin understand me.	.06	.02	.82	.00
I am similar to people of Dutch origin in many ways.	-.26	-.19	.47	.11
People of Dutch origin have the same ideas and values as I have.	-.07	-.07	.27	-.23
I am proud of the Netherlands.	-.10	-.08	.51	-.23
It makes me angry how people of my ethnic origin or religion are treated compared to other groups in the Netherlands.	-.17	.07	-.02	.74
People of my ethnic origin or religion don't get as many chances as other groups in the Netherlands.	.13	.04	-.04	.58
People of my origin or faith are discriminated in the Netherlands.	.29	-.12	-.03	.60
Eigenvalue	4.59	3.54	1.73	1.30
Cronbach's α	.69	.81	.88	.67

Note. Standard errors clustered by class. Bold font indicates inclusion in scale sum-score calculation. Translation from Dutch to English by first author. Fit of four-factor solution: $\chi^2(87, 133) = 138.278, p < .001$, comparative fit index = .94, standardized root mean square residual = .05, and root mean square error of approximation = .067 (90% confidence interval [.045, .087]).