Anusandhanvallari
Vol 2026, No.1
June 2026
ISSN 2229-3388

Beyond Assimilation and Hybridity: The Case for Acculturation as a Multidimensional Framework

Krishna Priya G.[1], Prema. E.[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Sri Meenakshi Government Arts College for Women, Madurai, Tamil Nadu.
[2]Associate Professor ,PG & Research Department of English, Sri Meenakshi Government Arts College for Women (Autonomous), Madurai, Tamil Nadu.

Abstract

When people from different cultures come into sustained contact, the changes that follow are rarely simple or predictable. This paper argues that among the conceptual frameworks developed to account for these changes, acculturation offers the most analytically complete account. Assimilation reduces a complex process to a linear trajectory of absorption, while hybridity, despite its theoretical productivity, resists the kind of empirical operationalization that applied research requires. Acculturation, by contrast, integrates behavioral, psychological, social, and cultural dimensions of change within a framework that is both theoretically grounded and empirically usable. Drawing on Berry (1997, 2005), Bhabha (1994), Gordon (1964), and related scholarship, this paper makes the case for acculturation as the preferred framework for studying cultural contact in contemporary multicultural societies.

Introduction

Scholars across anthropology, sociology, psychology, and cultural studies have long debated how best to conceptualize what happens when people from different cultural backgrounds come into sustained contact. The stakes of this debate are not purely academic. The frameworks researchers use shape how policymakers think about integration, how educators design support for diverse student populations, and how clinicians understand the experiences of migrants and refugees.

Three concepts have been especially central to this conversation: assimilation, hybridity, and acculturation. Each captures something real. But they differ considerably in scope, analytical precision, and practical utility. This paper argues that acculturation is the most useful of the three, not because the others are wrong, but because acculturation is broader, more empirically tractable, and more attentive to the range of outcomes that cultural contact actually produces.

The argument proceeds in four parts. The first examines the conceptual limitations of assimilation. The second considers hybridity's contributions alongside its constraints. The third makes the positive case for acculturation as a multidimensional framework. The fourth reflects on implications for research and policy.

Part I: What Assimilation Gets Wrong

Assimilation has a long history in sociological studies of immigration, particularly in the American context. Gordon's (1964) influential model described a staged process through which immigrant groups move from cultural adaptation toward structural and ultimately identificational integration into the host society. The model was more nuanced than earlier straight-line assimilation theories, but its underlying logic remained: cultural contact tends, over time, toward the absorption of minority groups into a dominant cultural mainstream.

The empirical record complicates this picture considerably. Studies of second and third generation immigrant communities in the United States, Western Europe, and Australia consistently show that cultural maintenance across generations is common, even among groups with high levels of structural integration (Berry et al., 2006; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Bilingualism persists. Religious practices are transmitted. Cultural associations remain active. An assimilation framework has difficulty accounting for this without treating it as a transitional phase or a failure to fully assimilate, both of which misrepresent what is actually happening.

There is also a structural problem with assimilation theory that tends to get underplayed. The framework focuses almost exclusively on the adaptation of minority groups and says relatively little about how host societies change through contact with newcomers. The influence is visible in everyday life, from language and cuisine to public culture, yet assimilation theory has no real apparatus for capturing this. The conceptual traffic moves in one direction only.

Finally, assimilation carries normative baggage that is worth naming directly. It positions the dominant culture as the baseline and treats minority cultural distinctiveness as something to be overcome. This has been widely criticized, not least by scholars from the communities most affected by assimilationist policy regimes (Kymlicka, 1995). Whether or not that critique is fully accepted, it points to something real about the framework's assumptions.

Part II: Hybridity's Contributions and Its Constraints

Bhabha's (1994) concept of hybridity emerged from a very different intellectual tradition, one rooted in postcolonial literary and cultural theory rather than sociology or psychology. His argument that colonial encounters produce a third space, a site of ambivalence and negotiation where neither culture remains intact and where new cultural forms are continuously produced, was genuinely generative. It challenged essentialist accounts of culture, drew attention to the agency of colonized subjects, and provided a vocabulary for experiences that assimilation theory could not adequately describe.

The concept has been productively applied in studies of diasporic literature, postcolonial identity, and transnational cultural production. Scholars working on South Asian diasporic writing, for example, have used hybridity to analyze how authors like Salman Rushdie or Jhumpa Lahiri navigate between multiple cultural worlds in ways that produce something neither fully Indian nor fully Western (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1990).

The limitations of hybridity become apparent, however, when researchers try to move from theoretical description to systematic empirical inquiry. Hybridity is notoriously difficult to operationalize. What would it mean to measure the degree of hybridity in a given population, or to compare hybrid identities across groups? The concept resists this kind of treatment almost by design, which limits its usefulness for the kinds of large scale, comparative, or longitudinal research that inform evidence based policy.

There is also a critique worth taking seriously regarding power. Anthias (2001) argued that hybridity theory, in celebrating the creative possibilities of cultural mixing, can underplay the structural inequalities that shape who gets to mix on what terms. The experience of cultural contact looks very different for a highly educated professional migrant with secure legal status than it does for an undocumented worker in a low wage economy. Hybridity as a concept does not always have adequate tools to capture that difference.

Part III: Why Acculturation Does It Better

Acculturation was formally defined by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936) as the phenomena that result when groups of individuals from different cultures come into continuous firsthand contact, with subsequent changes in

the original cultural patterns of either or both groups. Since then the concept has been substantially developed, most influentially by Berry (1997, 2005), into a framework with genuine analytical depth.

Acculturation does not ask us to choose between the cultural and the psychological, between the individual and the group, between theory and evidence. It holds all of these together, and that is what makes it such a powerful framework.

3.1 Bidirectionality

One of the most important things acculturation theory gets right is something that assimilation theory almost entirely ignores: when cultures come into contact, both of them change. Berry (1997) was clear on this point. The host society is not simply a fixed destination that newcomers move toward. It is itself shaped, enriched, and transformed by the communities it comes into contact with. This is not just a theoretical point. It is visible in everyday life, from language and cuisine to public culture. Cultural contact is a two way street, and any framework that pretends otherwise is not describing the world as it actually is.

3.2 Multiple Strategies and Individual Agency

Berry's (1997) model of acculturation strategies is one of the most useful contributions to this field precisely because it treats people as agents rather than objects. Rather than assuming that everyone follows the same path, it recognizes that individuals and communities make meaningful choices about how they engage with cultural change.

Some people choose integration, holding onto their heritage culture while also engaging fully with the host society. Others choose assimilation, embracing the new culture and letting go of the old. Some prefer separation, maintaining their heritage culture while keeping their distance from the host society. And others experience marginalization, feeling disconnected from both.

Importantly, the research consistently shows that integration, maintaining both cultures rather than abandoning one for the other, is associated with the best outcomes for mental health, social wellbeing, and life satisfaction (Berry et al., 2006). This is not just an academic finding. It has real implications for how we think about immigration, education, and belonging.

3.3 Psychological Dimensions

Perhaps the most distinctive contribution of acculturation theory is its attention to what happens inside people, not just what they do, but how they feel. The concept of acculturative stress captures the psychological strain that comes with navigating between cultural worlds: the anxiety, the identity confusion, the grief of leaving one life behind and the difficulty of building another.

Research has shown that acculturative stress varies considerably depending on acculturation strategy, the degree of cultural distance between heritage and host cultures, the presence of co-ethnic community support, and the attitudes of the host society toward cultural diversity (Berry et al., 2006; Sam and Berry, 2010). This level of specificity allows researchers to identify which populations are most at risk and what kinds of support are likely to be effective. Neither assimilation nor hybridity theory offers comparable tools for this kind of analysis.

3.4 Empirical Operationalizability

Finally, and this matters enormously for researchers, acculturation can actually be measured. Scholars have developed validated tools for assessing acculturation across a range of domains: language use, social relationships, cultural values, identity, and more. The Vancouver Index of Acculturation (Ryder, Alden and Paulhus, 2000) measures heritage and mainstream cultural orientation as separate dimensions rather than as endpoints of a single continuum, which is itself a conceptual advance over earlier unidimensional measures. The Abbreviated

Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (Zea et al., 2003) was developed specifically for use with Latino populations in the United States and has been widely applied in health research.

These tools make it possible to conduct systematic, comparative, and longitudinal research on cultural adaptation in ways that hybridity theory does not readily support.

Part IV: Implications for Research and Policy

The choice of framework matters beyond the seminar room. Societies organized around assimilationist assumptions tend to produce policies that treat cultural maintenance as an obstacle to integration. Language policies that discourage heritage language use in schools, for example, have been shown in multiple national contexts to produce worse educational outcomes for minority language students, not better ones (Cummins, 2000). An acculturation framework, which treats bilingualism and bicultural competence as resources rather than problems, points toward different and generally more effective policy responses.

In public health research, acculturation frameworks have been used to understand health disparities among immigrant populations, to identify risk factors for depression and anxiety among refugees, and to design culturally adapted mental health interventions. This kind of applied work requires the conceptual precision and empirical tractability that acculturation theory provides.

Hybridity theory has made important contributions to how scholars think about identity, representation, and postcolonial experience. Those contributions should not be dismissed. But as a framework for guiding empirical research or informing evidence based policy, it is less well equipped than acculturation.

Conclusion

Assimilation, hybridity, and acculturation each capture something true about the experience of cultural contact. But they are not equivalent in their analytical reach or practical utility. Assimilation is too narrow and too directional. Hybridity is theoretically productive but empirically elusive. Acculturation integrates multiple dimensions of cultural change within a framework that is both theoretically coherent and empirically usable.

That combination matters. Research on cultural contact needs frameworks that can accommodate complexity without becoming unmeasurable, that can respect human agency without ignoring structural constraints, and that can generate findings specific enough to inform real decisions. Acculturation, as the literature currently stands, comes closest to meeting those requirements.

References

[1] Anthias, F. (2001). New hybridities, old concepts: The limits of culture. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24(4), 619–641.

[2] Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46(1), 5–34.

[3] Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29(6), 697–712.

[4] Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., Sam, D. L., and Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation across national contexts. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[5] Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The location of culture. Routledge.

[6] Cummins, J. (2000). Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Multilingual Matters.

[7] Gordon, M. M. (1964). Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins. Oxford University Press.

[8] Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), Identity: Community, culture, difference (pp. 222–237). Lawrence and Wishart.

[9] Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights. Oxford University Press.

[10] Portes, A., and Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation. University of California Press.

[11] Redfield, R., Linton, R., and Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. American Anthropologist, 38(1), 149–152.

[12] Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., and Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(1), 49–65.

[13] Sam, D. L., and Berry, J. W. (2010). Acculturation: When individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds meet. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5(4), 472–481.

[14] Zea, M. C., Asner-Self, K. K., Birman, D., and Buki, L. P. (2003). The Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9(2), 107–126.