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Abstract
The possibility of differential remote acculturation to a distant culture is yet another chasm that divorced coparents must bridge as they raise their children in globalizing urban settings. This study explored the association between parental remote acculturation and perceived parental remote acculturation gaps in two acculturation domains (behavior, identity), in relation to children’s adjustment in Turkish divorced families. Altogether, 177 urban divorced mothers in Turkey reported their own and their ex-partners’ remote acculturation to U.S. and Turkish cultures, and their joint children’s internalizing (social withdrawal, anxiety) and externalizing (aggression) behaviors. Perceived remote acculturation gaps were operationalized with match:mismatch and interaction methods. Sequential regression analyses accounting for parental conflict resolution revealed that mothers’ perceptions of fathers’ American identity was positively associated with children’s social withdrawal. Regarding perceived acculturation gaps, one particular cross-dimension pairing—strongly U.S.-identified “AmeriTurk” mothers paired with strongly Turkish-identified fathers—predicted lower internalizing problems. Although having an Americanized father might confer some risk for children in divorced families in Turkey, having an “AmeriTurk” mother and traditional Turkish father may be protective, suggesting the benefit of integration as a family-level remote acculturation strategy. Taken together, parental remote acculturation and perceived remote acculturation gaps in identity (not behavior) predicted the socioemotional (not behavioral) adjustment of children above and beyond parental discord. Findings highlight the family repercussions of remote acculturation in Eurasia, underscore the importance of multidomain acculturation measurement, confirm the superior sensitivity of the interaction method, and extend its application to assessing cross-dimension pairings as a new type of acculturation gap.
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Globalization in the 21st century has reshaped silhouettes of modern life for families in the Majority World, meaning developing countries comprising most of the world (Jensen, Arnett, & McKenzie, 2011). Bridging Europe and Central Asia, Turkey is a unique cultural context for
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understanding the effects of globalization on family life and children’s adjustment. Currently, the United States has extensive remote influence in Turkey with U.S. media, food, and consumer goods being highly sought after and heavily consumed (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 2016). Adding to the effects of modernization, employment of women outside the home, and other factors, this remote sociocultural influence may be a new factor associated with the visible reconfigurations in family structure and parental dynamics including fast-rising rates and greater acceptance of divorce (Sunar & Fişek-Okman, 2005). Understandably, divorced coparents experience many discrepancies such as in their approach to finances, interpersonal relationships, and parenting, manifesting in postdivorce conflict and low child well-being (Amato, 2010). Modern globalization may bring about yet another discrepancy: a gap in divorced coparents’ degree of “Americanization,” meaning changes in the behaviors, identities, and values associated with affinity for the United States. What are the implications for children’s adjustment? The term America(n) is used henceforth to refer to natives of the United States because this phrase is commonly used in Turkey and other countries in which remote acculturation has been studied.

Remote acculturation, a modern form of nonmigrant acculturation based on globalization (G. M. Ferguson, Tran, Mendez, & Van de Vijver, 2016), is a novel framework to investigate whether coparents in Turkey are differentially adopting U.S. behaviors and identities, and the potential implications for children’s adjustment. Parent–child remote acculturation gaps are linked to higher family conflict (G. M. Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012) and parent–parent (henceforth, “parental”) acculturation gaps among immigrants are negatively associated with perceived coparenting quality and warmth (Chance, Costigan, & Leadbeater, 2013; Costigan & Dokis, 2006), the latter known as predictors of children’s adjustment in divorced families (Ahrons, 2007). However, the link between parental remote acculturation gaps and children’s adjustment remains unexplored. Accordingly, our study probed the existence of “AmeriTurk” parents in Turkey—those with a high U.S. orientation—and then explored parental remote acculturation and perceived parental remote acculturation gaps as predictors of children’s internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in Turkish divorced families.

**Remote Acculturation**

Psychological acculturation has been traditionally defined as the process of change that individuals experience following continuous firsthand contact with new culture(s) (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovitz, 1936). However, key forces of globalization (e.g., technological innovations, media, goods, and tourism) have introduced new ways for people from different cultures to meet, changing what cultural contact entails. G. M. Ferguson and Bornstein (2012), therefore, expanded the definition of acculturation by introducing remote acculturation as a modern, globalization-induced form of nonmigrant acculturation. That is, acculturation can occur among nonmigrants due to intermittent and/or indirect intercultural contact with geographically and historically separate cultures, in which they have never before lived. Accordingly, remote acculturation provides a unique framework to examine how individuals in their original heritage country, such as parents in Turkey, can adopt behavioral practices, identities, and values of a distant society, such as the United States.

Several vehicles of remote acculturation such as media, food, and consumer goods transport the U.S. culture abroad (G. M. Ferguson et al., 2016), constructing an albeit simplified and homogeneous construal of mainstream U.S. culture (see examples in Jamaica: G. M. Ferguson & Iturbide, 2013; and Turkey: Sakalli, 2014). In Turkey, DigiTurk, the most preferred TV satellite network with over 3.5 million subscribers, broadcasts American pop music (e.g., MTV, Rap music) and American TV series and movies (e.g., the Simpsons) on the first five channels that viewers see when they turn on TV. Fox Life is among these mandatory first five channels and is
number 2 in popularity in Turkey (Digiturk, 2016). There are also many local adaptations of Hollywood hits focused on family life, interpersonal relationships, and children such as “Married with Children” (Evli ve Cocuklu) and “Desperate Housewives” (Umutsuz Ev Kadınları) (Newcomb, 2013), making American media much more popular than local or general European media. These TV shows also depict progressive families, open-minded parents, and American family values such as gender equality and parental autonomy support for children, all of which orient parents in Turkey to U.S. family culture. U.S. TV added to U.S. social media access and the high status of U.S. foods and consumer goods in Turkey (Atalaysun, 2016) to set the stage for remote acculturation in Turkey. Some Turkish parents may internalize aspects of U.S. culture and come to act or feel American, which may have implications for children’s adjustment.

Domains

Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocznik (2010) recommended three basic domains of acculturation to study (from “shallow” to “deep” domains of psychological experience)—behavior, value, and identity-based acculturation. Other acculturation scholars agree with the importance of multidomain assessment (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2006; Costigan, 2010). Accordingly, remote acculturation research has generally examined all three domains, although these domains have often been combined in analyses. For instance, G. M. Ferguson and Bornstein (2012) investigated Jamaican, European American, and African American orientations of 245 adolescent–mother dyads in Jamaica. Participants reported on multiple indicators of remote acculturation including behaviors (e.g., enjoyment of Jamaican and U.S. TV, food, friends), identity (i.e., degree to which they identify themselves as members of Jamaican and American cultures, respectively), values (i.e., family obligations and adolescent rights), and parent–adolescent conflict. These acculturation indicators were then used as input variables into cluster analyses. G. M. Ferguson and Bornstein’s (2012) results revealed a unique cluster of “Americanized Jamaicans” (33% youth and 11% mothers: higher European American orientation and parent–adolescent conflict, lower Jamaican orientation and family obligations, and greater intergenerational discrepancies in family obligations). Similarly, remote acculturation studies with youth samples in South Africa (G. M. Ferguson & Adams, 2016), Zambia (Y. L. Ferguson, Ferguson, & Ferguson, 2017), India (Ozer & Schwartz, 2016), and Malawi (K. T. Ferguson, Ferguson, & Ferguson, 2017) have found a variety of bicultural/multicultural groups.

Despite the strengths of being data-driven and parsimonious, cluster analyses can mask the possibility that remote acculturation may be more/less prominent or adaptive in some domains versus others. Research with Turkish immigrant couples in Europe stated that behavior and identity domains of acculturation can have different associations with well-being for one partner versus the other. Among 121 Turkish immigrant couples in Germany, husbands’ Turkish and German orientations in both identity and language domains have been linked to well-being, whereas for wives only German orientation in the identity domain is related to stress due to homesickness (Spiegler, Leyendecker, & Kohl, 2015). In light of this, we examined remote acculturation and its impact on children’s adjustment across one “shallow” domain (behavior) and one “deep” domain (identity).

Parental Acculturation and Children’s Adjustment

Previous immigrant acculturation literature has provided evidence for the association between parents’ acculturation and children’s adjustment. For the most part, parents’ integrated acculturation style has been associated with the most favorable child outcomes, regardless of the target acculturation domain. For example, in a culturally diverse U.S. sample, integrated parents with high ethnic identity commitment and high American identity scores were found to have children
with lower internalizing problems, better adaptability, and better social skills (Calzada, Brotman, Huang, Bat-Chava, & Kingston, 2009). Children of behaviorally assimilated immigrant parents are more likely to experience behavior and disciplinary problems compared with those with integrated parents (Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2007). Although acculturative changes in parents’ identities often mirror changes in their behavioral practices (Costigan & Dokis, 2006), in several immigrant studies, only identity acculturation (not behavior) has been related to family cohesiveness, conflict (Birman, 2006a; Ho & Birman, 2010), and children’s behavior problems (Calzada et al., 2009).

**Parental Remote Acculturation and Children’s Adjustment**

Prior research from Jamaica indicates that remote acculturation is associated with family interactions. In Jamaica, Americanized Jamaican mothers report higher parent–adolescent conflict (G. M. Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012). Therefore, it is plausible that parents’ remote acculturation may also be related to their children’s behavioral and socioemotional adjustment.

**Parental Acculturation Gaps and Children’s Adjustment**

Although most research on acculturation gaps pertains to parent–child acculturation gaps, coparents can also differ in their levels of acculturation (Ataca & Berry, 2002; Costigan & Dokis, 2006), and parental acculturation gaps have been linked to family conflict, poor coparenting quality, and low parental warmth (Chance et al., 2013; Costigan & Dokis, 2006). Three major approaches have been used to compute acculturation gaps, finding somewhat different results (see Telzer, 2010).

**Difference Score Method**

Several studies have used the difference score method, in which one parent’s acculturation score on a given scale is subtracted from the other parent’s. Using this method, Turkish immigrant husbands in Germany had higher German orientation than did their wives (identity domain: Spiegler et al., 2015), and Chinese immigrant fathers in Canada engaged more with Canadian culture than did mothers (behavior, identity, and value domains: Costigan & Dokis, 2006). Using squared difference scores, Chance and her colleagues (2013) also found that a larger parental acculturation gap (behavior domain) predicted greater discrepancies in parents’ expectations about adolescents’ family assistance, and this link was mediated by poorer perceptions of coparenting quality.

**Match:Mismatch Method**

According to this method, acculturation gaps are computed by dummy coding dyads which are mismatched in their acculturation status/cluster (gap) versus those which are matched (no gap). Using this method, Farver, Narang, and Bhadha (2002) found that Asian Indian adolescents whose acculturation styles matched with their parents’ acculturation styles had less anxiety and higher self-esteem compared with mismatched families.

**Interaction Method**

For this method, two individuals’ acculturation scores on each cultural dimension are entered into a sequential regression analysis with the product of those scores in a separate step(s)—interaction term—to represent the acculturation gap (Telzer, 2010). This more comprehensive and flexible method improves upon some limitations of the prior two methods because unlike the
match:mismatch method, it provides information about the cultural dimension in which the acculturation gap lies (i.e., heritage culture or new culture?), and the direction of the gap (i.e., which parent is more oriented toward the given culture?), and allows for the examination of multiple types of gaps. Ho and Birman’s (2010) study of parent–adolescent acculturation gaps in Vietnamese immigrant families confirms the superiority of the interaction method. Although larger gaps in Vietnamese identity based on difference scores predicted low family cohesion, the interaction method further demonstrated that only one particular acculturation gap was related to adjustment: high parental Vietnamese identity with low adolescent Vietnamese identity (Ho & Birman, 2010).

Although traditionally used to examine acculturation gaps within a single cultural dimension (e.g., one person having stronger orientation to the heritage culture or new culture relative to the other person), the interaction method can just as readily examine cross-dimension pairings (e.g., one person having a particular degree of orientation to the heritage culture paired with a partner having a particular degree of orientation to the new culture). Similar to acculturation gaps identified via the “match:mismatch” method, identification of cross-dimension acculturation gaps involve the use of both cultural dimensions in analyses. There is methodological justification for studying this heretofore overlooked acculturation gap—we are capitalizing on the flexibility of the recommended interaction method to examine both within-dimension and across-dimension gaps in a single analysis. There is also practical justification: Cross-dimension acculturation gaps are empirically possible, and casual observation in Turkey suggests that some families experience them, and they may have import for family adjustment. Most importantly, there is conceptual justification in that cross-dimension pairings provide another way to translate individual-level acculturation research to the family level. That is, cross-dimension pairings are routinely examined at the individual level of acculturation to determine acculturation statuses and assess their adaptive value (e.g., an individual with high American and high Turkish orientations is considered integrated, which is adaptive for many immigrants). In our study, we apply this idea of cross-dimension pairings to the family level of acculturation (e.g., one partner with high American orientation and another with high Turkish orientation creating an integrated family acculturation status).

Remote Acculturation Gaps and Children’s Adjustment

To date, remote acculturation gaps have only been computed using the match:mismatch method and only among parent–adolescent dyads in Jamaica. Mismatched dyads in Jamaica in which one partner was categorized as Americanized Jamaican and the other was categorized as Traditional Jamaican reported higher parent–adolescent conflict than did matched dyads (G. M. Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012). We expand the remote acculturation literature by exploring perceived parental remote acculturation gaps using two methods—match:mismatch (based on precedence) and interaction (recommended)—and by examining both within-dimension and cross-dimension acculturation gaps. See Table 1 for comparison of the computational approaches for perceived remote acculturation gaps.

Modernization of Families and Increasing Divorce in Turkey

Divorce has become a product of cultural transformation in Turkey (Kavaş & Thornton, 2013). There has been a marked increase in the crude divorce rates (the number of divorces per 1,000 people in the population) from 0.52 to 1.40 in the last two decades (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2011). Moreover, recent retrospective interviews with divorced women in Turkey on their own divorce and their parents’ divorce, albeit with a small sample, suggest that divorce has become more socially acceptable over the past decade as a viable solution to marital problems (Kavaş &
For example, commenting on her mother’s divorce, one interviewee said, “I understand when I look back she had difficulty. She had this thing that there has to be a man to take care of her. Finally she got over this feeling and now she came to terms with being happy by herself” (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2011, p. 573). In contrast, when reflecting on her own divorce, the same interviewee said, “I do not consider divorce as a big event. It was quite acceptable and as a matter of fact easy for me. I would prefer divorce instead of living in an unhappy relationship” (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2011, p. 581). A comparison of two statements demonstrates differing opinions and conditions for divorce across generations.

Table 1. Comparison of the Computational Approaches for Perceived Remote Acculturation Gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computational approaches</th>
<th>Benefits/strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match/Mismatch: Dyads which are matched in their RA statuses (e.g., integration, separation) compared with those who are mismatched.</td>
<td>1. Can demonstrate the presence of RA gaps. 2. Can examine match and mismatch in RA statuses in different domains of acculturation (e.g., identity, behavior).</td>
<td>1. Disregards cultural dimension in which the RA gap lies (i.e., mismatch does not indicate whether the individuals have differing orientation toward the remote culture). 2. Disregards the direction of the RA gap (i.e., does not indicate which partner is more oriented toward the remote or local culture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Score: One partner’s RA score on a given scale subtracted from other partner’s score on the same scale.</td>
<td>1. Can examine the magnitude/size of the gap between partners’ RA scores in different cultural dimensions and domains. 2. Can examine the direction of the RA Gap (e.g., which partner has a higher orientation toward remote culture than the other partner). However this is true only if researchers do not use absolute difference scores.</td>
<td>1. Subtraction yields positive gap scores for some dyads and negative gap scores for others, which can be difficult to interpret in analyses. Absolute difference scores can be used to address this issue, which introduce a second limitation of disregarding the direction of RA gaps. 2. Can only examine the difference score between individuals’ RA scores in one cultural dimension at a time. 3. Cannot easily handle different types of gaps (i.e., cross-dimension pairing created by one partner with a strong cultural orientation in one dimension paired with a partner with a strong cultural orientation in another cultural dimension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction: partners’ individual RA scores for each cultural dimension are entered into regression analysis (for main effects) along with the product of those scores (interaction terms).</td>
<td>1. Can examine cultural dimension(s) in which the RA gaps lie. 2. Can examine direction of the RA gap. 3. Can simultaneously examine main effects (partners’ RA scores separately) and interactions effects which capture RA gaps (partners’ RA scores in particular combinations)</td>
<td>1. Statistical interpretation of significant interaction effects requires additional analyses (e.g., decomposing/plotting the interaction) 2. Cannot directly compare the levels of RA between one individual and another, nor the size of the RA gap between one dyad and another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divorced parents experience various discrepancies that likely foreshadow their divorce such as in their approaches to finances, interpersonal relationships, and parenting (Clarke-Stewart & Brentano, 2006), and Turkey is no exception. According to data presented by two studies of the Prime Ministry Division for Family Research in Turkey, severe disagreement and incompatibility are reported as primary reasons for divorce in Turkey (The Attitudes of the Public toward Divorce, and The Reasons of Divorce Research: see Demir, 2013). A recent study examining two-parent households in Turkey presented the unique negative effect of parental “childrearing disagreement,” a specific type of parental discrepancy, on children’s adjustment above and beyond marital satisfaction (Giray, Allen, & Ilgaz, 2017). This is also true in the aftermath of divorce (Sirvanli-Ozen, 2005), given that these discrepancies between coparents often become much more complicated as they try to navigate two separate households to maintain a safe and secure home base for children (Fine & Harvey, 2006). Although parental discrepancies do not necessitate conflict, we build our hypotheses partially on the coparenting literature indicating that divergent views among coparents are likely to increase the possibility of coparental conflict (Madden-Derdich & Leonard, 2002; McHale & Lindahl, 2011). Given that recent reviews on divorce established postdivorce conflict as a key stressor associated with children’s adjustment, parental discrepancies might also be concerning for the adjustment of children in divorced families (Amato, 2010; Lansford, 2009). However, these reviews also highlight that effectively and satisfactorily resolving parents’ conflicts can ameliorate their negative impact on children’s behaviors. For this reason, we include postdivorce conflict resolution in the current study to examine whether perceived remote acculturation gaps account for unique variance in children’s adjustment in divorced families above and beyond this well-known contributor.

It is also important to note that in the aftermath of divorce, mothers in Turkey often play multiple pivotal roles in children’s upbringing and postdivorce family functioning. They act as primary caregivers, school liaisons, and decision makers for child-related matters, because they are typically granted the equivalent of sole custody of their children (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2013). Prior research shows that divorced mothers are also the gatekeepers for the children’s contact with fathers and construct their children’s image of fathers in how they talk about and represent the father at home (Kiray, 1976; Sarkisian, 2006). Accordingly, mothers’ perceptions of their ex-partners and parental discrepancies are closely linked to quality of the father–child relationship, coparental conflict, and triangulation (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2013; Madden-Derdich & Leonard, 2002; McHale & Lindahl, 2011).

Current Study

This study is an initial exploration of children’s adjustment in divorced families in Turkey as a function of parental remote acculturation and perceived remote acculturation gaps in behavior and identity. To our knowledge, this is the first study to (a) investigate remote acculturation or perceived remote acculturation gaps among families in Eurasia, (b) compare results across two different domains of remote acculturation, and (c) examine both within-dimension and cross-dimension acculturation gaps. We have chosen a unique and understudied sample—divorced coparents and their children—to assess the power of perceived remote acculturation gaps. Studying divorced coparents allowed us to examine whether the gap between parents’ Americanization is a unique determinant of their children’s adjustment above and beyond the impact of other discrepancies divorced parents already experience.

Our hypotheses were two-fold. First, we expected that parents’ remote acculturation would predict their children’s internalizing and externalizing behaviors. Given that integration is the most adaptive acculturation strategy for children’s adjustment among immigrant parents (see Atzaba-Poria & Pike, 2007), we expected the same for remotely integrated parents in the absence of evidence indicating otherwise. Due to inconsistent findings in the immigrant
literature and the lack of prior empirical research in remote acculturation contexts, no specific prediction was made for the adjustment of children with remotely separated or assimilated parents. Second, we expected perceived parental remote acculturation gaps within each dimension to predict higher levels of internalizing and externalizing behavior problems for children given that within-dimension parental acculturation gaps among immigrants are associated with poor coparenting quality (Chance et al., 2013; Costigan & Dokis, 2006) and parent–child remote acculturation gaps predict family conflict (G. M. Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012). Given that high levels of discrepancy and conflict among coparents are key indicators of children’s adjustment after divorce (see Amato, 2010; Lansford, 2009), we predicted a positive link between perceived parental remote acculturation gaps and children’s internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. To our knowledge, cross-dimension pairings have not been specifically addressed in the acculturation gap literature; thus, it is an exploratory hypothesis and no predictions were made.

Method

Participants

A total of 244 divorced mothers were recruited from three large cities in Turkey (Ankara, Istanbul, and Izmir) to complete online questionnaires. Data from 67 mothers were excluded because (a) their children were older than 18 years of age (n = 18), (b) they reported an improbable maternal age (n = 16), (c) both parents had lived in another country more than 10 years (n = 2), or (d) they submitted incomplete surveys with > 20% missing values (n = 31). Therefore, the analytic sample comprised 177 divorced mothers (i.e., 244 minus 67) who reported on themselves (M \_ age = 30.26, \_ range \_ age = 21-43, SD = 4.80), their children (M \_ age = 12.32, \_ range \_ age = 6-18, SD = 3.92), and their ex-partner, the father of the target child (M \_ age = 29.93, \_ range \_ age = 24-45, SD = 4.61). More than half of the children (58.9%) did not have siblings, 25% had one sibling, and 16% had more than two siblings. In families with more than one child, mothers were asked to complete survey items by focusing on only one of their children who was younger than 18 years.

On average, mothers had been divorced for more than 5 years (M = 5.73 years, range = 1-18, SD = 3.75). Nearly all mothers had legal custody of their children (93%), 80.1% reported that children had contact with the noncustodial parent at least once every 2 months, and 44.6% of children had contact with the noncustodial parent less often than “on weekends.” On a 7-point scale, mothers reported a mean education level of 4.53 for themselves (4 = “high school” and 5 = “college degree,” SD = 1.31) and 4.31 for fathers (SD = 1.39).

Fathers of the target children were not recruited for this study for practical reasons. That is, divorced mothers in Turkey are typically granted sole custody of their children and function as primary caregivers and decision makers for their children. The only ethical way to recruit those particular fathers would have been to ask the participating mothers to enlist their ex-partners participation, which, for obvious reasons, would likely have been quite unsuccessful.

Procedure

Questionnaires were presented in Turkish, the native language of all participants. In cases where validated Turkish measures were not available, a back-translation method from English measures was used to maximize accuracy (Van de Vijver & Tanzer, 2004). The questionnaire was then piloted with five divorced mothers before data collection to ensure culturally appropriateness, clarity, and that participants had a distinct perception of U.S. culture versus Western culture in general (i.e., brief cognitive questionnaire testing: see Alaimo, Olson, & Frongillo, 1999). In individual meetings with each mother, completed questionnaires were reviewed page by page for comments.
All unanswered items were queried, particularly for measures not previously used in Turkey. This procedure showed that all measures were clear and that the U.S. culture was not perceived to be synonymous with the influence of more general Western culture in Turkey. Thus, no adjustments were made.

Following institutional review board (IRB) approval, divorced mothers were recruited through preschools, middle schools, and high schools (parent invitation letters) and by a polling agency (agency database). Interested mothers were directed to the study website, which contained brief information about the study and a link to the online consent form. Participants who consented were allowed to continue to the online survey.

**Measures**

Mothers’ reports on their own remote acculturation and conflict resolution with their ex-partners, perceptions of their ex-partners’ remote acculturation, and their assessment of their joint children’s adjustment were used.

**Multidomain remote acculturation.** Guided by previous remote acculturation research (see G. M. Ferguson et al., 2016) and Schwartz and colleagues’ (2010) recommendations, this study operationalized remote acculturation using a point-in-time assessment of two acculturation domains: behavior and identity. Aligned with a bidimensional conceptualization (Berry & Sam, 2016), we used two-statement measures of remote acculturation.

**Behavior acculturation.** An adapted version of the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA: Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000) assessed orientation to Turkish culture (10-item: Cronbach’s $\alpha_{mother} = .93$, $\alpha_{perceived-father} = .91$) and U.S. culture (10-item: $\alpha_{mother} = .92$, $\alpha_{perceived-father} = .91$) in the behavior domain. The VIA includes items about cultural participation/social engagement (e.g., “I often participate in Turkish cultural traditions”), media enjoyment (e.g., “I enjoy entertainment from American culture”), and cultural contact with individuals (e.g., “I am interested in being friends with Turkish”). Mothers indicated agreement on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Turkish and American subscale mean scores were computed with higher scores representing stronger cultural orientation.

**Identity-based acculturation.** The Identity Subscale of the Language, Identity, and Behavior Acculturation Scale (LIB; Birman & Trickett, 2001) assessed cultural identity orientations to Turkish (four-item: $\alpha_{mother} = .94$, $\alpha_{perceived-father} = .94$) and U.S. cultures (four-item: $\alpha_{mother} = .92$, $\alpha_{perceived-father} = .91$). Sample items included “I consider myself Turkish” and “I have a strong sense of being American.” Participants rated each item on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much or always), and subscale mean scores were calculated with higher scores representing stronger cultural orientation.

**Conflict resolution among divorced parents.** One item from The Conflict and Problem Solving Scale (Kerig, 1996) was used. Mothers reported how often they resolve conflicts about communication problems with their ex-partner to a mutual satisfaction (“Please rate how often do you and your ex-partner resolve conflicts about communication to your mutual satisfaction”) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

**Children’s internalizing and externalizing behaviors.** The Turkish Child Behavior Checklist was used (Erol, Arslan, Akçakın, & Sergeant, 1995). Mothers completed Social Withdrawal (eight items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .87$) and Anxiety subscales (13 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .86$) to assess Internalizing behavior problems, and the Aggression subscale (18 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .93$) to assess
Externalizing behavior problems. A 3-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (never) to 2 (always) was used, and higher subscale means indicated greater problems.

**Other variables.** In addition to mothers’ education level and children’s age, mothers reported the frequency of children’s contact with the noncustodial parent on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (none) to 6 (more than 2 days in a week). Mothers also completed the 7-item Turkish short form of Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Ural & Özbirecikli, 2006) to account for the possibility of a bias where mothers can overreport adaptive or underreport undesirable behaviors. Participants responded to items on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree) and a sum score was calculated. Selection of potential demographic variables to include in main analyses was generally based on both theoretical and empirical foundations.1

**Plan of Analysis**

**Preliminary analyses.** Missing data analysis was performed to ensure data were missing completely at random. Descriptive statistics were examined. Then, bivariate correlations among main study variables were inspected.

**Computation of parental remote acculturation statuses.** Guided by previous acculturation literature (see Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2006), cultural orientation scales were dichotomized based on midpoint splits to create high and low groups. This was done for Behavior Acculturation (i.e., midpoint: 4 on a 7-point scale of the VIA) and also for Identity Acculturation (i.e., midpoint: 3 on a 5-point scale of LIB). Then, cross-tabulations were done forming 2 (Turkish Orientation [TO]: high, low) × 2 (American Orientation [AO]: high, low) factorial matrices in each domain. This procedure produced fourfold acculturation statuses in each domain: Integrated (high TO and AO), Assimilated (low TO and high AO), Separated (high TO and low AO), and Marginalized (low TO and low AO). Chi-square analyses examined the distribution of mothers and fathers across these acculturation statuses in each domain.

**Computation of remote acculturation gaps.** This study used the match:mismatch and the interaction method to compute perceived parental remote acculturation gaps.

**Match:Mismatch method.** Dummy coding was used to categorize partners who were matched on their acculturation status (e.g., mothers’ self-report and mothers’ report of ex-partner were both integrated) versus those who were mismatched. One-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVAs) were performed with two covariates (socially desirable responding and mother’s education) to assess for differences in children’s adjustment based on the presence (mismatch) or absence (match) of a remote acculturation gap.

**Interaction method.** Sequential regression was employed to examine the percent of variance in children’s internalizing or externalizing problems accounted for by background variables (i.e., socially desirable responding, mothers’ education, child’s age, frequency of child’s contact with the noncustodial parent, and conflict resolution among divorced coparents), individual remote acculturation scores (main effects), and perceived remote acculturation gaps via the product of those scores (interactions). One regression analysis was performed for each outcome variable (i.e., three total: social withdrawal, anxiety, aggression), and in each regression analysis, the five background variables were entered as predictor variables in Model 1. All Model 1 predictor variables were retained in subsequent steps of each analysis to capture the variance in the outcomes they accounted for at each step (i.e., unlike stepwise regression, nonsignificant vari-
ables were not dropped after each step). Then, mothers’ own remote acculturation orientations toward Turkish and American cultures and their perceptions of fathers were entered into Model 2 to examine main effects. In the third and final model, two-way interaction terms were added to capture both within-dimension acculturation gaps (Mothers’ American Orientation [MAO] × Fathers’ perceived American Orientation [FAO]; Mothers’ Turkish Orientation [MTO] × Fathers’ perceived Turkish Orientation [FTO]), and cross-dimension acculturation gaps (MAO × MTO; FAO × FTO; MAO × FTO; MTO × FAO).

Perceived remote acculturation gaps. Although ideal, it is not always practical to have both partners participate in acculturation gap research. Accordingly, using a single report of one’s own and one’s partner’s acculturation as we have done in this study is a widely used methodology in the literature among various cultural groups (see Ahn, Kim, & Park, 2008; Buki et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2000; Rasmi, Chuan, & Hennig, 2015; Unger, Rita-Olson, Soto, & Baezconde-Garbanati, 2009). Moreover, a study measuring both perceived and actual acculturation gaps found that both were predictive of adjustment (Merali, 2002), and other studies show that perceptions of acculturation gaps are, indeed, closely linked to children’s health and behavioral outcomes (Choi et al., 2008; Nguyen, 2008).

Results

Preliminary Results

Due to uncompleted online surveys, 22% of cases had at least one item missing. The Little MCAR test was not significant, $\chi^2(3373) = 3078.670, p = 1.000$, confirming that the data were missing completely at random. After examining the missing value patterns, cases with more than 15% variables missing ($n = 31$) were excluded from analysis. Missing data points were handled using the multiple imputation method and reported results reflect aggregated data. Finally, the assumption of normality was tested for all three outcome variables finding some positive skewness and kurtosis (an expected peak of low adjustment problems in this nonclinical sample), but virtually all fell within the acceptable range between −2 and +2 (George & Mallery, 2010).

Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for main study variables are displayed in Table 2. Children’s mean internalizing and externalizing behavior problems were moderate (social withdrawal: $M = 1.45$; anxiety: $M = 1.42$; aggression: $M = 1.31$ on a 3-point scale). Bivariate correlations revealed that child age was positively correlated with anxiety ($r = .14$) and social withdrawal ($r = .29$) problems. There was moderately frequent parental conflict resolution ($M = 2.72$ on a 5-point scale signaling “at times to moderately”). The frequency of child contact with the non-custodial parent was positively correlated with parental conflict resolution ($r = .43$) and negatively correlated with child social withdrawal ($r = -.21$) and anxiety ($r = -.21$) problems. In addition, mothers’ education was positively correlated with their U.S. orientation ($r = .39$) and negatively correlated with their Turkish orientation ($r = .22$). Finally, mothers’ Turkish identity ($r = .62$) and U.S. identity ($r = .63$) scores were positively correlated with their reports of fathers’.

Parental Remote Acculturation Statuses

There were significant differences in the distributions of mothers and fathers (per mothers’ reports) across the four acculturation statuses, both in behavior—mothers: $\chi^2(3, n = 177) = 105.19, p < .001$; fathers: $\chi^2(3, n = 177) = 70.16, p < .001$—and identity domains—mothers: $\chi^2(3, n = 177) = 196.94, p < .001$; fathers: $\chi^2(3, n = 177) = 174.84, p < .001$. See Table 3 for distributions across acculturation statuses. For mothers’ self-reports and their reports of fathers, respectively, the most common remote behavior acculturation statuses were integration (48%
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Study Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child's age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.31 (3.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mothers’ education</td>
<td>−.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.53 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict resolution</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Noncustodial contact</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.48 (1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social desirability</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>−.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.28 (6.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Internalizing (Anxiety)</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>−.18*</td>
<td>−.09</td>
<td>−.21**</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42 (0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Internalizing (Social withdrawal)</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>−.24**</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>−.21**</td>
<td>−.17*</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Externalizing</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>−.18*</td>
<td>−.12</td>
<td>−.22**</td>
<td>−.23**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31 (0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MTO_Behavior</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>−.31**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MAO_Behavior</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>−.19*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. FTO_Behavior</td>
<td>−.03</td>
<td>−.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FAO_Behavior</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>−.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>−.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MTO_Identity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−.22**</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>−.25**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34 (0.92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. MAO_Identity</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−.27**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>−.26**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>−.23**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.35 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. FTO_Identity</td>
<td>−.06</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>−.09</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>−.19*</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>−.15*</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>−.25**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.22 (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. FAO_Identity</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−.03</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>−.27**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>−.24**</td>
<td>2.18 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MTO = Mothers’ Turkish Orientation; MAO = Mothers’ American Orientation; FTO = Mothers’ Perceptions of Fathers’ Turkish Orientation; FAO = Mothers’ Perceptions of Fathers’ American Orientation; Behavior = Behavior Domain of Acculturation; Identity = Identity Domain of Acculturation; Noncustodial contact: Frequency of children’s contact with noncustodial parent.

*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01.
37%) and separation (40%; 44%), followed by marginalization (6%; 12%) and assimilation (6%; 7%). For the identity domain, separation (69%; 68%) was most common, followed by integration (20%; 14%), marginalization (7%; 11%), and assimilation (4%; 7%).

**Perceived Parental Remote Acculturation Gaps and Children’s Adjustment**

**Match:mismatch method.** Per mothers’ reports, most parents were matched in their remote acculturation statuses in the behavior and identity domains (60% and 76%, respectively). MANCOVAs with socially desirable responding and mother’s education showed no significant differences between matched versus mismatched dyads (in either behavior or identity domains) in children’s internalizing or externalizing behavior problems.

**Interaction method.** Sequential regression analyses were computed for each remote acculturation domain (2: behavior, identity) predicting each outcome variable (3: children’s social withdrawal, anxiety, aggression). There were no significant main effects or interactions for analyses involving remote behavior acculturation; therefore, only the three regression analyses involving remote identity acculturation are reported here and in Table 4.

**Children’s social withdrawal.** In Model 1 predicting children’s social withdrawal, mothers’ education ($\beta = -0.16, p < .05$), socially desirable responding ($\beta = -0.20, p < .01$), child’s age ($\beta = .27, p < .001$), and noncustodial contact ($\beta = -0.18, p < .05$) significantly predicted children’s social withdrawal. Model 1 was significant and accounted for 18.1% of the variance in social withdrawal, $R = .425, R^2 = .181, F(5, 170 = 7.50), p < .001$. All variables in Model 1 were maintained in subsequent steps to take into account for the variance they contributed to children’s adjustment at each step. In Model 2, mothers’ own remote identity acculturation scores and their reports of fathers’ scores were added as predictor variables revealing that mothers’ perceptions of fathers’ American identity had a significant and positive main effect on children’s social withdrawal ($\beta = .20, p < .05$). Model 2 was also significant, $R = .477, R^2 = .227$, adjusted $R^2 = .046, F(9, 166) = 5.42, p < .001$, and accounted for 22.7% of the variance in children’s social withdrawal. Therefore, the addition of perceived parental remote identity acculturation scores to the model resulted in a significant increment in $R^2$ (4.6%); additional variance was explained above and beyond what was explained in Model 1 ($\Delta F = 2.49, p < .05$). In Model 3, the interaction between mothers’ American Identity and their perceptions of fathers’ Turkish Identity was a significant predictor ($\beta = -0.25, p < .05$). Model 3 accounted for 26.6% of the variation in children’s social withdrawal problems and was significant overall, $R = .516, R^2 = .266$, adjusted $R^2 = .039, F(15, 160) = p < .001$. In other words, the addition of perceived parental remote identity acculturation gap scores to the model resulted in a significant increment in $R^2$ above and beyond Model 2 variables: 3.9% of additional variance was explained when these interaction terms were included ($\Delta F = 1.41, p < .001$).

### Table 3. Parental Remote Acculturation Statuses in Behavior and Identity Domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Mothers (%)</th>
<th>Fathers (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 177$</td>
<td>$n = 177$</td>
<td>$n = 177$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>85 (48%)</td>
<td>35 (20%)</td>
<td>65 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>71 (40%)</td>
<td>123 (69%)</td>
<td>78 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>10 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
<td>22 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers reflect mothers’ reports for their own remote acculturation and their ex-partners’ remote acculturation.
Table 4. Parental Remote Acculturation in the Identity Domain Predicting Children's Internalizing and Externalizing Behavior Problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Internalizing: Social withdrawal</th>
<th>Internalizing: Anxiety</th>
<th>Externalizing: Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' education</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's age</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncustodial contact</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO Identity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAO Identity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTO Identity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Identity</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO × MAO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTO × FAO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO × FTO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAO × FAO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTO × FAO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAO × FTO Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model F</td>
<td>7.50***</td>
<td>5.42***</td>
<td>3.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Background variables in Model 1 were included based on significant correlations with children's internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. Dashes represent variables that are not included in the analyses. MTO = Mothers' Turkish Orientation; MAO = Mothers' American Orientation; FTO = Mothers' Perceptions of Fathers' Turkish Orientation; FAO = Mothers' Perceptions of Fathers' American Orientation; Identity: Identity Domain of Acculturation; Noncustodial contact: Frequency of children's contact with noncustodial parent.

*p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, ***p ≤ .001.
**Children’s anxiety.** The sequential analysis for children’s anxiety was structured identically to the analysis for children’s social withdrawal, and the essential results were similar. Noncustodial contact was the sole significant predictor of children’s anxiety in Model 1 ($\beta = –.18, p \leq .05$) and this model was significant overall, accounting for 7.3% of the variance in anxiety, ($R = .271, R^2 = .073, F(4, 171)=3.38, p \leq .05$). However, Model 2 was nonsignificant overall and there were no significant predictors, meaning that the addition of main effects did not reliably improve $R^2$. Notwithstanding, Model 3 was significant overall, $R = .368, R^2 = .136$, adjusted $R^2 = .050, F(14, 161)= p < .05$, and the interaction between mothers’ American Identity and their perceptions of fathers’ Turkish Identity was a significant predictor of anxiety ($\beta = –.25, p < .05$). Model 3 accounted for 13.6% of the variation in children’s social withdrawal problems, $R = .368, R^2 = .136$, adjusted $R^2 = .050, F(15, 160) = 1.81, p < .05$, indicating that the addition of perceived parental remote identity acculturation gap scores to the model explained 5.0% additional variance in anxiety above and beyond Model 2 variables ($\Delta F =1.55, ns$).

Further exploration of the significant interaction effects in the analysis for both outcome variables (i.e., children’s anxiety and social withdrawal problems) revealed that for “AmeriTurk” mothers (meaning those with high U.S. orientation), their reports of fathers’ Turkish identity was negatively associated with children’s social withdrawal and anxiety (both $\beta$s = –.25, $p < .05$; see Figure 1). Similarly, based on mothers’ reports, for strongly Turkish-identified fathers, mothers’ American identity was negatively associated with children’s social withdrawal and anxiety problems (both $\beta$s = –.25, $p < .05$). A post hoc analysis revealed that 17.5% of mothers ($n = 31$) fell into this group having U.S. identity scores above the scale midpoint with ex-partners had above-midpoint scores in Turkish identity.3

**Children’s aggression.** There were no significant main effects or interactions in Models 2 and 3. However, there were two significant background predictors (see Table 3).

**Discussion**

This study expanded remote acculturation research to families in Eurasia and is the first to our knowledge to examine the associations between parental remote acculturation or acculturation gaps and children’s adjustment. As an initial step in understanding these associations, we tested perceived remote acculturation gaps, a new globalization-induced discrepancy between divorced coparents, as a predictor of children’s adjustment above and beyond postdivorce conflict resolution. Furthermore, we examined this research question in two separate acculturation domains (identity and behavior), with two computation methods for acculturation gaps (match:mismatch method and interaction method), focusing on within-dimension and cross-dimension acculturation gaps. Based on mothers’ reports, we found that mothers’ perception of fathers’ American identity was positively associated with children’s internalizing problems. However, contrary to expectations, one particular remote acculturation gap in the identity domain—an “AmeriTurk” mother paired with an ex-spouse perceived to be a traditional Turkish father—predicted lower levels of internalizing problems for children. Thus, in the presence of the other, both mothers’ American Identity and fathers’ Turkish identity may be important and protective against children’s social withdrawal and anxiety problems, at least in the eyes of mothers.

**Integration and Separation as Common Parental Remote Acculturation Statuses in Turkey**

There was a high prevalence of integrated and separated mothers (48% and 40%, respectively) and fathers (37% and 44%, respectively) in behavioral acculturation, which is consistent with
findings among Turkish Americans (50% behaviorally integrated: Kaya, 2009). However, separation appeared to be a more common strategy in the identity domain for our remotely acculturating sample (69% mothers and 68% fathers), which is consistent with the prior research among Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2003). The distribution of remote acculturation strategies in this sample also lends support to prior evidence that remote acculturation often takes the form of integration or separation (G. M. Ferguson & Adams, 2016; G. M. Ferguson et al., 2016).

**Fathers’ Perceived American Identity Linked to Child Internalizing Behavior Problems**

Mothers’ perceptions of fathers’ American identity was associated with children’s internalizing problems (social withdrawal). This finding is consistent with some prior studies in the immigrant acculturation literature showing that children experience more internalizing behavior problems when their parents are more oriented toward a second culture (Atzaba-Poria & Pike,
There are two possible explanations for this finding. Similar to remote acculturation findings in Jamaica (G. M. Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012), “AmeriTurk” parents in Turkey who have high orientation toward U.S. culture may have more parent–child conflict, which may elevate their children’s internalizing symptoms (Özdemir, 2014). Alternatively, an “AmeriTurk” father whose personal/parenting style differs from local norms may cause ambiguity, stress, or cultural identity confusion for children in a collectivist society like Turkey (Goregenli, 1997; Jensen, 2011), manifesting in social withdrawal and anxiety. Future research is needed to explore this possibility.

“AmeriTurk” Mothers Paired With Perceived Traditional Turkish Fathers: Protective for Children’s Internalizing Problems After Divorce?

Based on the existing parental acculturation gap literature (Chance et al., 2013; Costigan & Dokis, 2006), we expected perceived parental remote acculturation gaps to be linked to higher levels of behavior problems for children in Turkish divorced families after accounting for parental conflict resolution. We expected multiple gaps to be problematic, but similar to Ho and Birman’s (2010) study of parent–adolescent acculturation gaps in Vietnamese immigrant families only one particular acculturation gap was related to adjustment. Furthermore, it was surprising to see that this single perceived remote acculturation gap was a cross-dimension pairing rather than a within-dimension gap. “AmeriTurk” mothers paired with fathers they perceived as traditional Turks had children who were better adjusted socioemotionally. For strongly U.S.-identified AmeriTurk mothers, their perception of strong Turkish identity in their ex-spouse was associated with less anxiety and less social withdrawal in their children.

Although the notion of an adaptive acculturation gap may seem counterintuitive, Jensen (2011) suggested in her review that “negative repercussions of a cultural gap is more of an open question” given that “parents and youth often recognize the necessity or even desirability of this gap in a globalizing world” (Jensen, 2011, p. 67). According to Jensen (2011), a gap between children and parents on the views of cultural practices and identities might bring a new opportunity for them to interact with and navigate changing local and global cultures. Our findings have some alignment with Jensen’s expectations, suggesting the possibility that for children in divorced families, this particular parental acculturation gap may allow them to selectively integrate both Turkish and American cultures in their lives as filtered by their AmeriTurk mothers, and fathers whom their mothers represent as strongly traditional Turks. These findings hint at the adaptive value of one type of integration at the family level. We do note, however, that the reverse cross-dimension pairing (Traditional Turkish mother paired with a perceived AmeriTurk father) was not related to child adjustment; therefore, this phenomenon is nuanced and merits further study.

Tamis-LeMonda and her colleagues (2007) suggested that individualism (autonomy) and collectivism (relatedness) can coexist within individuals, families, and cultural contexts, presenting globalization as one of the factors serving to dynamically balance the new and original cultures. According to these scholars, the associations between two parenting values can be either conflicting (i.e., interfere with each other), additive (i.e., being endorsed independently and beneficial at the same time), or functionally dependent (i.e., connected and promoting each other’s effect; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2007, p.189). Building on this, in their recent review Kavaş and Thornton (2013) portrayed Turkey as having additive accommodation of original (i.e., collectivist) and new (i.e., individualistic) cultural elements balanced by resistance, which might lead to the formation of a hybrid coparental system in Turkey.

It is important to highlight that in our sample nearly all fathers (93%) were reported to be noncustodial parents, as it is very common for young children to live with their mothers after divorce in Turkey. In a recent qualitative study, Turkish divorced mothers stated that it is important for fathers to be psychologically present to reestablish paternal authority and resolve parental
ambiguity in the new family structure (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2013). In particular, most mothers stressed the protective role of fathers’ conformity with the socially expected authoritarian Turkish father figure on their children’s adjustment (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2013, p. 60). In a collectivistic society like Turkey, a patriarchal family system is prominent where fathers’ control has great influence on family relationships and communication (Sunar & Fışek-Okman, 2005). In some circumstances (e.g., in the absence of parental warmth), one might expect that high parental control might increase internalizing symptoms for children. However, in the context of globalization, the presence of a noncustodial father who strongly endorses a traditional Turkish identity may anchor children to the local community and its norms, providing a greater sense of security.

**Domain-Specific Nature of Parental Remote Acculturation**

Associations between parental remote acculturation and perceived parental remote acculturation gaps on children’s adjustment were significant only in the identity domain. This finding underscores how remote acculturation and perceived remote acculturation gaps might uniquely function across different domains of acculturation. Results are consistent with some previous immigrant acculturation studies with Turkish immigrants in Europe (Spiegler et al., 2015) and other ethnic groups in the United States (Birman, 2006b; Calzada et al., 2009; Ho & Birman, 2010), showing significant results only in the domain of identity. This is a very interesting finding because changes in cultural identity are “deeper” than changes in behavioral practices (Berry & Sam, 2016) because they require an adoption of beliefs and practices of multiple cultures to construe a sense of belonging (Jensen, 2011). The depth of identity acculturation relative to behavioral acculturation may explain why only parents’ remote identity acculturation and a related identity acculturation gaps were associated with children’s behavior problems. The full explanation for this finding is beyond the scope of this study, but it is possible that AmeriTurk mothers who perceive ex-spouses to be highly traditional Turks have a clearer and more predictable understanding of those ex-spouses (known entity), which makes coparenting smoother than with a partner whose identity is not as clear to them (unknown entity). What is clear is that our findings challenge the idea that changes in the endorsement of cultural identity always accompany surface-level behavioral changes (Costigan, 2010).

**Limitations and Future Directions**

This study contributes to our understanding of how remote acculturation influences parents and children in divorced families; however, some limitations should be pointed out and replication of findings in Turkey and elsewhere will be beneficial. First, it should be noted that our study is an initial look at associations between parental remote acculturation and related gaps and children’s adjustment in Turkey (i.e., if and what), but future research must elucidate mechanisms (i.e., how and why) to fully understand this matter. Second, this study used only mothers’ report: self-reports of their remote acculturation, reported perceptions of their ex-partners’ remote acculturation, and reports of their child’s adjustment. Although not ideal, the nature of divorce where ex-partners do not easily communicate with each other, and the cultural context of Turkey where mothers are almost exclusively granted sole custody, limited the feasibility of reaching both parents. Despite this limitation, there is evidence from the divorce literature that parent perceptions of coparents’ attitudes and behaviors might be important predictors of child adjustment (Amato, 2010; Madden-Derdich & Leonard, 2002). This might be especially true in Turkey as divorced mothers are likely to construct the image of fathers at home in how they will talk about the father and represent the father to the child (Sarkisian, 2006). Therefore, it is plausible that mothers’ perceptions of their ex-partners may play an important role in shaping the
quality of the father–child relationship, and in turn children’s outcomes (Kavaş & Gündüz-Hoşgör, 2013). Nevertheless, our results may over- or underestimate ex-partners’ cultural orientations (see Birman, 2006a; Telzer, 2010), and multiple reporters will be beneficial in future work where possible.

Third, the cross-sectional design of the study does not allow for causal interpretations among variables. Another consideration is that remote acculturation is generally considered to be more prominent in urban centers of the Majority World; therefore, this study focused on urban families and results may not generalize to rural families. Current results also cannot be assumed to apply to other family structures (e.g., married coparents); but future research can replicate the current study with other samples. In addition to the behavior and identity domains, examining remote values acculturation might be a valuable future direction to further explore the domain-specificity of remote acculturation gaps. However, it is important to bear in mind that the construal of remote cultures by local populations is often simplified and more monolithic than reality (G. M. Ferguson & Iturbide, 2013).

Previous writings on globalization have emphasized the value of a “new style of ethnography capturing deterritorialization on the imaginative resources of local experiences” (Appadurai, 1991). Therefore, qualitative and mixed-methods approaches can be used to explore further underlying processes of how individuals in Turkey perceive remote acculturation toward U.S. culture, and confirm the vehicles of remote acculturation in this context. In particular, focus group interviews are fruitful to understanding a relatively new and/or understudied area (G. M. Ferguson & Iturbide, 2013, 2015). What does “Americanization” mean for mothers and fathers in contemporary Turkey? How do they perceive remote acculturation influence their parenting, communication with their ex-partners and their children’s adjustment?

Conclusion

In describing child development and family change across time, particularly in the Majority World, Turkish psychologist Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı said that “the issue is what is to change, what is to remain, how the change will be ascertained and by whom” (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007, p. 166). We have examined children’s adjustment as a function of parents’ remote acculturation to the U.S. culture (what is to change versus remain) and perceived parental remote acculturation gaps (who will ascertain the change) in Turkey. Results of this study also suggest new directions for research on divorce which can explore “how” and “under what circumstances” children will have better adjustment after divorce. Although divorced coparents must now navigate one more dimension of personal discrepancies—remote acculturation gaps—the current study suggests that not all gaps are bad for their children. Our study also encourages acculturation gap researchers to examine gaps across multiple domains, as well as multiple types of gaps by fully exploiting the interaction method to examine both within-dimension and cross-dimension acculturation gaps.
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Notes
1. The decision to assess and use “conflict resolution among divorced coparents” was theoretical, based on two recent reviews on divorce and child adjustment highlighting the positive effect of conflict resolution among parents on children’s behaviors (Amato, 2010; Lansford, 2009). On the contrary, we used empirical justifications for other predictor variables based on significant correlations between other variables (e.g., child’s age, frequency of noncustodial contact, mothers’ education, socially desirable responding) and children’s adjustment.

2. Although skewness for each outcome variables was within the acceptable range (except for an elevated kurtosis of 3.028 for aggression), for prudence, we performed a square root transformation for all three outcome variables to address the nonnormality of the distributions (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013, p. 87). This transformation also addressed the fact that there was one outlier for Anxiety problems and two outliers for Social Withdrawal problems. We then recomputed analyses involving these variables using transformed scores finding that this highly conservative approach produced virtually identical results to those reported in the Results and Tables.

3. To be conservative, two post hoc sequential regression models were run to ensure that simultaneous entry of all interaction terms did not create statistical artifacts in our findings. The first post hoc regression analysis was conducted using the enter method including five steps: Step 1: Background variables, Step 2: Cultural orientations (MAO, MTO, FAO, FTO), Step 3: Within-person cross-dimension interactions (MAO × MTO and FAO × FTO), Step 4: Between-person within-dimension interactions (MAO × FAO and MTO × FTO), and Step 5: cross-person within-dimension interactions (MAO × FTO and MTO × FAO). Results were identical to our reported findings in the Results section, and in particular, the MAO × FTO cross-dimension interaction was still highly significant. A second model was conducted for prudence—we ran the original regression analysis using the stepwise enter method. Again, the original significant results were preserved and the MAO × FTO interaction remained highly significant. Thus, both alternative analyses confirmed the reported findings.
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