



Biculturalism Unpacked: Components, Measurement, Individual Differences, and Outcomes

Angela-MinhTu D. Nguyen* and Verónica Benet-Martínez*
University of California, Riverside

Abstract

Cultural contact due to migration, globalization, travel, and the resulting cultural diversity, has led to growing numbers of bicultural individuals, which demands further research on this group. In this article, we introduce the concept of biculturalism and provide the foundation necessary for understanding literature on this topic, beginning research in this area, and recognizing biculturalism in everyday life. In unpacking the construct of biculturalism, we first define it along with its components and related constructs (e.g. acculturation strategies). Second, we compare and discuss various ways of measuring biculturalism (e.g. unidimensional versus bidimensional models). Third, we organize and summarize the limited literature on individual differences in bicultural identity, focusing on the construct of Bicultural Identity Integration (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). Lastly, we review the possible outcomes resulting from biculturalism.

I think of myself not as a unified cultural being but as a communion of different cultural beings. Due to the fact that I have spent time in different cultural environments, I have developed several cultural identities that diverge and converge according to the need of the moment. (Sparrow, 2000, 190)

Most agree that our society is increasingly diverse and multicultural, but who is bicultural? Would a European American who eats Mexican food, speaks Spanish, and is married to a Mexican American be considered bicultural? What about an African American individual born and raised in the USA? Is he or she bicultural? In this article, we argue that there is more than one definition of biculturalism by reviewing the various definitions of biculturalism and presenting biculturalism within the context of acculturation. Because there is also more than one way to operationalize biculturalism, we compare and contrast the various methods of measuring it. Furthermore, we argue that there is more than one way to be bicultural and subsequently discuss variations among bicultural individuals, particularly the construct of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII). Finally, we argue for the potential benefits of biculturalism.

Biculturalism Defined

There are many definitions of biculturalism, ranging from general (i.e. based on demographic characteristics) to psychologically specific conceptualizations (e.g. cultural identifications or orientations). Loosely defined, bicultural individuals may be immigrants, refugees, sojourners (e.g. international students, expatriates), indigenous people, ethnic minorities, those in interethnic relationships, and mixed-ethnic individuals (Berry, 2003; Padilla, 1994). Generally speaking, a large percentage of Americans may be considered bicultural (US Census Bureau, 2005). For example, 12% of the US population is foreign born, 33% nonwhite, and 19% speak a language other than English at home. Aside from the foreign-born population, there is a large number of US-born ethnic and cultural minorities (e.g. children and grandchildren of immigrants) for whom identification and involvement with their ethnic cultures, in addition to mainstream US culture, is the norm (Phinney, 1996). In addition, other Americans, such as those who have lived abroad, may also be bicultural.

Psychologically, there is no commonly agreed definition of biculturalism. Loosely speaking, bicultural individuals are those whose self-label (e.g. 'I am bicultural') or group self-categorization (e.g. 'I am American' and 'I am Chinese'; 'I am Chinese American') reflects their cultural dualism. More strictly defined, bicultural individuals are those who have been exposed to and have internalized two cultures (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002). Biculturalism also entails the synthesis of cultural norms from two groups into one behavioral repertoire (Rotheram-Borus, 1993), or the ability to switch between cultural schemas, norms, and behaviors in response to cultural cues (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). In this article, we use the strict psychological definition of biculturalism. Moreover, our discussion of biculturalism focuses on ethnic cultures, although the term 'biculturalism' can be used to refer to any pair of two cultures (e.g. professional cultures, geographic cultures, generational cultures).

Biculturalism and Acculturation

Biculturalism and acculturation are tightly intertwined, with biculturalism being one of four ways to acculturate; therefore, we review the development of acculturation theory and the definition of biculturalism from an acculturation standpoint before delving further into our discussion of biculturalism. Traditional views of acculturation (the process of learning or adapting to a new culture) asserted that to acculturate means to assimilate – rejecting one's ethnic culture and adopting the dominant culture. In other words, acculturation originally was conceptualized as a unidimensional, one-directional, and irreversible process of moving toward the new mainstream culture and away from the original ethnic culture (Trimble, 2003). However, a wealth of acculturation studies conducted in the last

25 years (see Sam & Berry, 2006, for a review), supports acculturation as a bidimensional, two-directional, multidomain complex process, in which assimilation into the mainstream culture is not the only way to acculturate. In other words, equating acculturation with assimilation is simply flawed.

The bidimensional model of acculturation is based on the premise that acculturating individuals have to deal with two central issues (Berry, 1990): (i) the extent to which they are motivated or allowed to retain identification and involvement with the culture of origin, now the nonmajority, ethnic culture; and (ii) the extent to which they are motivated or allowed to identify and participate in the mainstream, dominant culture. The negotiation of these two central issues results in four distinct acculturation positions: assimilation (involvement and identification with the dominant culture only), integration (involvement and identification with both cultures, that is biculturalism), separation (involvement and identification with the ethnic culture only), or marginalization (lack of involvement and identification with either; however, there is little theoretical or empirical support for this strategy [Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; del Pilar & Udasco, 2004; Rudmin, 2003]). There is now robust evidence supporting the psychometric validity of this bidirectional model of acculturation and its advantages over unidimensional models in predicting a wide array of outcomes (Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001; Ryder, Allen, & Paulhus, 2000). Further evidence for the idea that individuals can simultaneously hold two or more cultural orientations is provided by recent sociocognitive experimental work showing that bicultural individuals move between their two cultural orientations by engaging in cultural frame switching (i.e. adapting and performing behaviors in response to the cultural context; Hong et al., 2000).

Note that the acculturation perspective does not presuppose that bicultural individuals internalize and use their two cultures globally and uniformly. Acculturation changes can take place in many different domains of life: language use or preference, social affiliation, communication style, cultural identity and pride, and cultural knowledge, beliefs, and values (Zane & Mak, 2003); and acculturation changes in some of these domains may occur independently of changes in other components. For instance, a Jewish American bicultural individual may endorse Anglo-American culture behaviorally and linguistically and yet be very Jewish (ethnic culture) in terms of her or his values, attitudes, and identity. Similarly, a Mexican American bicultural individual can behave in ways that are predominantly Mexican (e.g. speak mostly Spanish, live in a largely Mexican neighborhood), and yet display great pride and attitudinal attachment with American culture.

Measuring Biculturalism

In order to understand and conduct research on biculturalism, it is necessary to know the various ways in which biculturalism is operationalized and

measured, namely, unidimensional scales, bidimensional scales (median-split, addition, multiplication, and subtraction methods), direct measures of acculturation strategies, cultural identification question(s), and demographic questions. An exhaustive review of the available instruments and theoretical and psychometric issues involved in measuring biculturalism (and acculturation) is beyond the scope of this paper (see Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006; Zane & Mak, 2003, for excellent reviews). Accordingly, we provide instead a practical and brief summary of the available approaches and their pros and cons.

Early attempts at measuring biculturalism relied on bipolar, single-dimension scales that explicitly or implicitly reflected a unidirectional view of acculturation. In this framework, low scores or the starting point of the scale typically reflected separation, and high scores or the other end of the scale reflected assimilation, with biculturalism being tapped by middle scores or the midpoint of the scale (e.g. Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980; Rotheram-Borus, 1990; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987). These unidimensional scales should be avoided because they equate involvement and identification with one culture to a lack of involvement and identification with the other culture. In addition, these scales confound biculturalism and marginalization. For example, a scale item may be 'who do you associate with?' and the response choices may be labeled with 1, *mostly individuals from the ethnic culture*; 2, *individuals from both the ethnic and dominant cultures equally*; 3, *mostly individuals from the dominant culture*. A bicultural individual would select '2' because he or she has many friends from both cultures, but a marginalized individual may also select '2' because his or her lack of socialization with members from each culture is similar.

With the increased adoption of the bidimensional model of acculturation came an increase in the number of bidimensional scales, where involvement with ethnic and dominant cultures is measured in two separate multi-item scales. With this method, biculturalism can be operationalized in different ways. Typically, bicultural individuals are those who have scores above the median on both cultural orientations (e.g. Phinney, 1992; Ryder et al., 2000; Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000; Ward & Kennedy, 1994). This typological approach allows researchers to differentiate bicultural individuals from other acculturating types (assimilated, separated, or marginalized) but does not provide a biculturalism score. Another nontypological way of operationalizing biculturalism when using bidimensional scales is to add the two cultural orientation subscale scores, so that low and high scores represent low and high level of biculturalism, respectively (e.g. Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). Alternatively, a multiplication method can be used, whereby scores on the two cultural orientations are combined into an interaction term (Birman, 1998). One caveat of these last two methods is the difficulty in differentiating between individuals who have medium scores on both scales and those who score very high on one scale and low on the other. Lastly, some researchers have used a method where scores on the two cultural orientation

scales are subtracted from another, so that scores close to zero denote biculturalism (Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980). This approach is not recommended because, like unidimensional measurement, it makes bicultural and marginalized individuals indistinguishable from each other.

Whereas the bidimensional acculturation scales described above measure the degrees of involvement with mainstream and ethnic culture that underlie the bicultural acculturation strategy, some researchers prefer to measure the acculturation strategies directly (e.g. Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). These instruments typically include four scales with statements capturing favorable attitudes toward the integration (biculturalism), assimilation, separation, and marginalization strategies. Because each individual receives a score on each of these acculturation strategies, a bicultural individual would be someone whose highest score is on the integration subscale. This widely used approach has some advantages over traditional acculturation scales (e.g. it allows us to measure the construct of biculturalism *attitudes* directly) but it suffers from some nontrivial psychometric limitations (e.g. low score reliabilities, lack of scale independence; see Kang, 2006; Rudmin, 2003; Zane & Mak, 2003, for reviews). However, at least one instrument that measures acculturation strategies directly (Unger et al., 2002) does so by assessing acculturation-related behaviors, rather than attitudes toward acculturation, and with acculturation strategies as response options, rather than as individual statements to which participants respond. Although this eight-item instrument also suffers from lack of scale independence, it has yielded acceptably reliable scores.

When time or reading levels are compromised, researchers may choose to measure biculturalism with one or two questions. For instance, bicultural individuals can be those who self-identify with a hyphenated label (e.g. Persian American) rather than an ethnic (e.g. Persian) or a national (e.g. American) label, those who endorse the label 'bicultural' (versus 'monocultural'), or those who score above the midpoint on two single items stating 'I feel/am US American' and 'I feel/am Chinese' (e.g. Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). Lastly, we should warn against the common practice of using demographic variables such as generational status, US residence, or language preference, as a proxy for psychological acculturation (e.g. Buriel, Calzada, & Vasquez, 1982). As mentioned earlier, bicultural involvement and identification can occur at different rates for different life domains, for different individuals, and for different cultural groups, and demographic variables seem to be poor to modest predictors of these changes (Olmedo, 1979; Phinney, 2003; Schwartz, Pantin, Sullivan, Prado, & Szapocznik, 2006).

Variations in Bicultural Identity

Being bicultural makes me feel special and confused. Special because it adds to my identity: I enjoy my Indian culture, I feel that it is rich in tradition,

morality, and beauty; Confused because I have been in many situations where I feel being both cultures isn't an option. My cultures have very different views on things like dating and marriage. I feel like you have to choose one or the other.

– 19-year-old second-generation Indian American
(Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005, 1016)

Most acculturation studies have operationalized biculturalism as a uniform construct, overlooking individual variations in the way bicultural identity is negotiated and organized; that is, until recently, when several researchers explored differences among bicultural individuals (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997), which paved the way for a deeper understanding of bicultural individuals. The customary assessment of biculturalism in terms of a single score (or set of scores) on scales measuring acculturation levels or strategies seems insufficient for capturing fundamental individual differences in the experiences and meanings associated with bicultural identity (Padilla, 2006). As the above quote attests, biculturalism can be associated with feelings of pride, uniqueness, and a rich sense of community and history, while also bringing to mind identity confusion, dual expectations, and value clashes (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). An important issue, then, is how bicultural individuals experience and organize their different, and sometimes opposing, cultural orientations; furthermore, there is a need to examine how particular personality dispositions, contextual pressures, and acculturation and demographic variables impact the process of bicultural identity formation and the meanings associated with this experience (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005).

Early conceptual attempts at exploring variations in bicultural identity proposed multiple categories of bicultural individuals. LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) described two biculturalism modes: alternation and fusion. Alternating bicultural individuals switch their behaviors in response to situational cultural demands, whereas fused bicultural individuals are oriented to a third emerging culture that is distinct from each of their two cultures (e.g. Chicano culture). Birman (1994) expanded on the framework of LaFromboise et al. (1993) to describe four types of bicultural individuals: blended (i.e. fused), instrumental (individuals behaviorally oriented to both cultures but identified with neither), integrated (individuals behaviorally oriented to both cultures but identified with only their ethnic culture), and explorers (behaviorally oriented to the dominant culture but identified with only their ethnic culture). (Although Birman proposed that other types of biculturals were possible [e.g. individuals behaviorally oriented to both cultures but identified with only the dominant culture, individuals behaviorally oriented to and identified with both cultures], she did not go into detail about them.) Phinney and Devich-Navarro's (1997) qualitative study sought to empirically test the conceptual models of biculturalism of Berry (1990), LaFromboise et al. (1993), and Birman (1994). This study found two bicultural types, which, like in the study of LaFromboise et al. (1993), were also labeled blended (those who felt positively about both

cultures and did not feel conflicted) and alternating (those who also identified with both cultures but saw conflict between them).

These researchers are credited with calling attention to bicultural individuals and for advancing this area of research; however, a conceptual limitation of the bicultural types of LaFromboise et al. (1993) and Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997) is their confounding of identity and behavioral markers. Specifically, whereas the labels 'blended' and 'fused' refer to identity-related aspects of the bicultural experience (e.g. seeing oneself as Asian American or Chicano), the label 'alternating' refers to the behavioral domain, that is, the ability to engage in cultural frame switching (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). Naturally, individuals' subjective experience of their identity and their behavior/competencies do not have to map onto each other (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). For instance, in terms of sexual orientation cultures, a bisexual individual may feel that her or his identity reflects a harmonious integration of heterosexual and homosexual orientations (i.e. blending or fusion) while at the same time she or he displays different behavioral repertoires when interacting with heterosexual and homosexual peers or contexts (i.e. alternation). Thus, the labels 'blended' and 'alternating' do not seem to tap different types of bicultural individuals but rather different components of the bicultural experience.

After an extensive review and synthesis of the empirical and qualitative acculturation and biculturalism literature, Benet-Martínez et al. (2002) proposed the theoretical construct of BII as a framework for investigating individual differences in bicultural identity organization. BII captures the degree to which 'biculturals perceive their mainstream and ethnic cultural identities as compatible and integrated vs. oppositional and difficult to integrate' (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002, 9). As an individual difference variable, BII thus focuses on bicultural individuals' subjective perceptions of managing dual cultural identities (i.e. how much their dual cultural identities intersect or overlap). Theoretically, BII may relate to similar constructs, such as nonoppositional versus oppositional identity (Ogbu, 1993) and identity synthesis versus confusion (Schwartz, 2006), but these relationships still need to be explored empirically.

Recent studies on BII are beginning to elucidate the relationships between BII and behavioral, cognitive, and other psychological variables. For example, BII has been found to moderate the process of cultural frame switching, such that individuals high on BII typically respond to cultural cues with culturally appropriate behaviors, whereas individuals low on BII do not (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Cheng, Lee, & Benet-Martínez, 2006). In addition, BII has been linked to bicultural individuals' social network structure (i.e. individuals high on BII include more host-culture friends and a more richly interconnected set of host-culture friends in their social network; Mok, Morris, Benet-Martínez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007), different levels of cognitive complexity (i.e. individuals low on BII had more cognitively complex representations of culture; Benet-Martínez,

Lee, & Leu, 2006), and adjustment (i.e. individuals high on BII tend to be better adjusted; Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Bond, forthcoming). It is worth noting that these studies show that bicultural individuals high and low on BII identify with both mainstream and ethnic cultures and endorse Berry's integration strategy equally, but differ in their ability to create a synergistic, integrated cultural identity.

A recent study shows that BII is not a unitary construct but instead it encompasses two different and psychometrically independent components (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005): (i) cultural distance (versus overlap) – the degree of dissociation or compartmentalization versus overlap perceived between the two cultural orientations (e.g. 'I see myself as a Chinese in the USA' versus 'I am a Chinese American'); and (ii) cultural conflict (versus harmony) – the degree of tension or clash versus harmony perceived between the two cultures (e.g. 'I feel trapped between the two cultures' versus 'I do not see conflict between the Chinese and American ways of doing things'). The emphasis here is on subjective (i.e. the perception of) cultural distance and conflict because, as was found in a study of over 7,000 acculturating adolescents in 13 countries, objective cultural differences did not relate to adjustment (Berry et al., 2006; see Appendix I for scale items and table 2 in Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005, for the factor structure of the scale).

Moreover, cultural distance and conflict are each associated with different sets of personality, performance-related, and contextual antecedents (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). Specifically, as indicated by path analyses, cultural distance is predicted by having a close-minded disposition, lower levels of cultural competence (particularly with regard to the mainstream culture), experiencing strains in the linguistic domain (e.g. being self-conscious about one's accent), and living in a community that is not culturally diverse. Cultural conflict, on the other hand, is largely predicted by having a neurotic disposition, experiencing discrimination, and having strained intercultural relations (e.g. being told that one's behavior is 'too American' or 'ethnic'). In summary, cultural distance is particularly linked to performance-related personal and contextual challenges (e.g. cognitive rigidity, low linguistic fluency, culturally limited surroundings), while cultural conflict stems from strains that are largely intra- and interpersonal in nature (e.g. nervousness, social prejudice, and rejection).

Biculturalism Outcomes

What impact, if any, does biculturalism have on a bicultural individual's life and on the larger society? Although there is not yet a straightforward answer to this million-dollar question, recent research suggests that when biculturalism is measured appropriately (i.e. bidimensionally), it is correlated with positive outcomes, such as greater well-being.

The issue of whether biculturalism is beneficial is often theoretically and empirically debated. While many researchers contend that biculturalism,

as compared to other acculturation strategies, is the most ideal, leading to greater benefits in all areas of life (e.g. Berry, 1997; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001), others argue that it is maladaptive, leading to stress, isolation, etc., because bicultural individuals constantly experience pressures to be more or less like the dominant or their ethnic culture (e.g. Rudmin, 2003; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). While some researchers have found positive links between biculturalism and adjustment (e.g. Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; Ward & Kennedy, 1994), others have found no link or a negative one (e.g. Burnam, Hough, Karno, Escobar, & Telles, 1987; Rotheram-Borus, 1990). In other words, findings have been mixed with regard to the direction and magnitude of these associations (Myers & Rodriguez, 2003; Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991).

A recent meta-analysis suggests that the above seemingly contradictory findings may be attributable to the ways in which biculturalism has been measured (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, forthcoming). Across the 40 studies examined in this meta-analysis, biculturalism was found to have a significant, *weak*, and positive relationship ($r = 0.10$) with psychological and sociocultural adjustment. However, when only studies using unidimensional scales or direct measures of acculturation strategies were included, the relationship was null, thus attenuating the overall meta-analytic results. Conversely, when only studies using bidimensional scales were used (i.e. biculturalism measured via scores above the median on both cultural orientations, the addition method, or the multiplication method), the relationship was significant, *moderate*, and positive ($r = 0.23$). In other words, biculturalism is related to better adjustment, but this relationship can only be detected when biculturalism is measured bidimensionally. Perhaps involvement with two cultures (versus being separated, assimilated, or marginalized) leads to social and cognitive flexibility (Benet-Martínez et al., 2006; Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006) and wider behavioral repertoires and competencies that buffer the bicultural individual against the psychological maladjustment (e.g. anxiety, loneliness) or sociocultural maladjustment (e.g. interpersonal conflicts, intercultural miscommunication) that can often characterize the acculturation experience (Padilla, 2006). Furthermore, this meta-analytic finding suggests that the negotiation of two cultures is not a stressful experience, as Rudmin (2003) has suggested. Rather, it may only be stressful for those less oriented to their two cultures.

Biculturalism may also have significant implications for our society (Berry, 1998). First, if biculturalism is found to be associated with better psychological adaptation, greater productivity and achievement, fewer interpersonal conflicts, etc., then public policy supporting bi- or multiculturalism might lead to greater national success and well-being (Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006). Unfortunately, in reality, most host countries continue to encourage the assimilation strategy despite the fact that acculturating individuals by and large prefer the integration strategy (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006). Second, bicultural individuals have

skills (e.g. bilingualism, cultural frame switching, intercultural sensitivity) that are crucial for success in our increasingly globalized world; thus, these individuals are ideal cultural mediators for intercultural conflicts and miscommunications within communities, nations, and internationally. Finally, an understanding of biculturalism can contribute to the understanding of intercultural relations. That is, the techniques that acculturating individuals employ to negotiate and resolve cultural differences within themselves and with others may be applied to negotiate and resolve cultural differences across individuals and groups of individuals.

Conclusion

The prevalence and importance of multiculturalism or biculturalism has been recently acknowledged by some psychologists (e.g. Hermans & Kempen, 1998; LaFromboise et al., 1993), but the phenomenon has rarely been investigated empirically; therefore, with this article, we sought to provide the foundation necessary for future research in the area. The study of multicultural identities has exciting implications for the field of psychology, and for social and personality psychology in particular, as the issue of how individuals develop a sense of community, national, cultural, ethnic, and racial group membership becomes particularly meaningful in situations of cultural clashing, mixing, and integration (Baumeister, 1986; Phinney, 1999). Furthermore, the study of bicultural identity provides social and personality researchers with another window to study individual variations in self-concept dynamics. In fact, as eloquently said by Phinney (1999, 27): ‘... increasing numbers of people find that the conflicts are not between different groups but between different cultural values, attitudes, and expectations *within themselves*’ (italics added).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported with grants from the University of California, Riverside’s Academic Senate and the Center for Ideas and Society. The authors would like to acknowledge Que-Lam Huynh for her comments on previous versions of this manuscript. The authors also thank two anonymous reviewers for their valuable input.

Short Biography

Angela-MinhTu D. Nguyen’s research lies within the areas of cultural, social/personality, and industrial/organizational psychology. She is specifically interested in acculturation, biculturalism, bilingualism, cultural frame switching, and intercultural sensitivity training. She holds a BA in Psychology from the University of San Diego and an MA in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from California State University, Long Beach. She is currently

pursuing a PhD in Social/Personality Psychology from the University of California, Riverside.

Verónica Benet-Martínez is an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Riverside. After receiving her BS in Psychology from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, she pursued a PhD in Social-Personality Psychology at the University of California, Davis and later was a postdoctoral researcher at the University of California, Berkeley. She was on the faculty at the University of Michigan until 2003, when she returned to California to join the faculty at University of California, Riverside, where she heads the Culture and Personality laboratory. Her main research interests are (i) biculturalism: contextual and individual processes involved in the integration of two or more cultural identities; and (ii) culture and personality: identification and measurement of indigenous and universal personality constructs and cultural influences on personality.

Endnote

* Correspondence address: Department of Psychology, University of California, 900 University Ave., Riverside, CA 92521, USA. Emails: angela-minhtu.nguyen@email.ucr.edu or veronbm@ucr.edu.

References

- Arends-Tóth, J. V., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2006). Assessment of psychological acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology* (pp. 142–160). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumeister, R. (1986). *Identity: Cultural Change and the Struggle for Self*. New York: Oxford University.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, **73**, 1015–1050.
- Benet-Martínez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J. (2006). Biculturalism and cognitive complexity: Expertise in cultural representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **37**, 386–407.
- Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **33**, 492–516.
- Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 201–234). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, **46**, 5–34.
- Berry, J. W. (1998). Social psychological costs and benefits of multiculturalism: A view from Canada. *Times*, **2**, 209–233.
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 17–37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, **38**, 185–206.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). *Immigration Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Birman, D. (1994). Acculturation and human diversity in a multicultural society. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human Diversity: Perspective on People in Context* (pp. 261–284). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Birman, D. (1998). Biculturalism and perceived competence of Latino immigrant adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **26**, 335–354.
- Buriel, R., Calzada, S., & Vasquez, R. (1982). The relationship of traditional Mexican American culture to adjustment and delinquency among three generations of Mexican American male adolescents. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, **4**, 41–55.
- Burnam, M. A., Hough, R. L., Karno, M., Escobar, J. I., & Telles, C. A. (1987). Acculturation and lifetime prevalence of psychiatric disorders among Mexican Americans in Los Angeles. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, **28**, 89–102.
- Chen, S., Benet-Martínez, V., & Bond, M. H. (forthcoming). *Bicultural Identity, Language, and Psychological Adjustment in Multicultural Societies*. Hong Kong University, Manuscript under review.
- Cheng, C., Lee, F., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2006). Assimilation and contrast effects in cultural frame-switching: Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) and valence of cultural cues. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **37**, 742–760.
- Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans—II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, **17**, 275–304.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, L. C., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, **2**, 199–217.
- del Pilar, J. A., & Udasco, J. O. (2004). Deculturation: Its lack of validity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, **10**, 169–176.
- Flannery, W. P., Reise, S. P., & Yu, J. (2001). An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **27**, 1035–1045.
- Hermans, H., & Kempen, H. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous problem of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*, **53**, 1111–1120.
- Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, **55**, 709–720.
- Kang, S.-M. (2006). Measurement of acculturation, scale formats, and language competence: Their implications for adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **37**, 669–693.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, **114**, 395–412.
- Mok, A., Morris, M., Benet-Martínez, V., & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, Z. (2007). Embracing American culture: Structures of social identity and social networks among first-generation biculturals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, **38**, 629–635.
- Myers, H. F., & Rodriguez, N. (2003). Acculturation and physical health in racial and ethnic minorities. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 163–185). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (forthcoming). *Biculturalism and Adjustment: A Meta-Analysis*. University of California at Riverside, Manuscript in preparation.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1993). Differences in cultural frame of reference. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, **16**, 483–506.
- Olmedo, E. L. (1979). Acculturation: A psychometric perspective. *American Psychologist*, **34**, 1061–1070.
- Padilla, A. M. (1994). Bicultural development: A theoretical and empirical examination. In R. G. Malgady & O. Rodriguez (Eds.), *Theoretical and Conceptual Issues in Hispanic Mental Health* (pp. 20–51). Melbourne, FL: Krieger Publishing.
- Padilla, A. M. (2006). Bicultural social development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, **28**, 467–497.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, **7**, 156–176.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, **51**, 918–927.
- Phinney, J. S. (1999). An intercultural approach in psychology: Cultural contact and identity. *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, **33**, 24–31.

- Phinney, J. S. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 63–81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J. S., & Devich-Navarro, M. (1997). Variations in bicultural identification among African American and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *7*, 3–32.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 493–510.
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*, 88–107.
- Rogler, L. H., Cortes, D. E., & Malgady, R. G. (1991). Acculturation and mental health status among Hispanics: Convergence and new directions for research. *American Psychologist*, *46*, 585–597.
- Rotheram-Borus, M. J. (1990). Adolescents' reference-group choices, self-esteem, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *59*, 1075–1081.
- Rotheram-Borus, M. J. (1993). Biculturalism among adolescents. In M. Bernal & G. P. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Formation and Transmission among Hispanics and Other Minorities* (pp. 81–102). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Rudmin, F. W. (2003). Critical history of the acculturation psychology of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. *Review of General Psychology*, *7*, 3–37.
- Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 49–65.
- Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2006). *Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwartz, S. J. (2006). Predicting identity consolation from self-construction, eudaimonistic self-discovery, and agentic personality. *Journal of Adolescence*, *29*, 777–793.
- Schwartz, S. J., Montgomery, M. J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, *49*, 1–30.
- Schwartz, S. J., Pantin, H., Sullivan, S., Prado, G., & Szapocznik, J. (2006). Nativity and years in the receiving culture as markers of acculturation in ethnic enclaves. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*, 345–353.
- Sparrow, L. M. (2000). Beyond multicultural man: Complexities of identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *24*, 173–201.
- Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *47*, 401–407.
- Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Psychological Dimensions on the Acculturation Process: Theory, Models, and Some New Findings* (pp. 139–159). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Bicultural involvement and adjustment in Hispanic American youths. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *3*, 15–47.
- Tadmor, C. T., & Tetlock, P. E. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*, 173–190.
- Trimble, J. E. (2003). Introduction: Social change and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 3–13). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tsai, J. L., Ying, Y.-W., & Lee, P. A. (2000). The meaning of 'being Chinese' and 'being American': Variation among Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *31*, 302–332.
- US Census Bureau (2005). <http://www.census.gov> (last accessed January 23, 2006).
- Unger, J. B., Gallaher, P., Shakib, S., Ritt-Olson, A., Palmer, P. H., & Johnson, C. A. (2002). The AHIMSA acculturation scale: A new measure of acculturation for adolescents in a multicultural society. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *22*, 225–251.

- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.-M. (2006). Patterns of relations between immigrants and host societies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, **30**, 637–651.
- Vivero, V. N., & Jenkins, S. R. (1999). Existential hazards of the multicultural individual: Defining and understanding ‘cultural homelessness’. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, **5**, 6–26.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1994). Acculturation strategies, psychological adjustment, and sociocultural competence during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, **18**, 329–343.
- Zane, N., & Mak, W. (2003). Major approaches to the measurement of acculturation among ethnic minority populations: A content analysis and an alternative empirical strategy. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marín (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research* (pp. 39–60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Appendix I

Bicultural Identity Integration Scale (BIIS-1)

Cultural distance

1. I am simply a Chinese who lives in North America.
2. I keep Chinese and American cultures separate.
3. I feel Chinese American (R).
4. I feel part of a combined culture (R).

Cultural conflict

5. I am conflicted between the American and Chinese ways of doing things.
 6. I feel like someone moving between two cultures.
 7. I feel caught between the Chinese and American cultures.
 8. I don't feel trapped between the Chinese and American cultures (R).
-

Note: Adapted from Benet-Martínez and Haritatos (2005). The BIIS-1 can be used with any ethnic minority culture and any host culture. To adapt this scale, substitute the ethnic minority culture for ‘Chinese’, the host culture for ‘American’, and the host country or continent for ‘North America’.