

20 **Abstract**

21 In a globalised world, understanding acculturation—the process by which individuals adapt to
22 new cultural environments—is crucial, especially in multicultural societies. The East Asian
23 Acculturation Measure (EAAM), rooted in Berry’s acculturation model, has been extensively
24 used to assess acculturation strategies among East Asian populations in the United States.
25 However, its application to other cultural groups remains limited due to its specificity. This
26 study aims to adapt and validate the EAAM for broader applicability across diverse cultural
27 contexts, particularly among populations outside the East Asian demographic.

28 The study involved 819 international students in Germany and South Africa from 112
29 countries. It was conducted in two phases: the first included 490 and 329 in the second. The
30 psychometric properties of the EAAM were evaluated through Confirmatory Factor Analysis
31 (CFA) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Initial CFA results showed that the original
32 four-factor model did not adequately fit the diverse sample, prompting further EFA, which
33 revealed a more suitable five-factor structure. This new structure termed the Shortened Adapted
34 Acculturation Scale (SAAS), comprises five dimensions: Social Disconnection, Cultural
35 Adaptation, Social Perception, Interpersonal Comfort, and Language Integration. The SAAS
36 demonstrated high internal consistency and reliability across all factors, with significant
37 evidence of measurement invariance across genders.

38 The findings emphasise the importance of culturally adapting psychological measures to ensure
39 validity and reliability across diverse populations. The SAAS offers a robust tool for assessing
40 acculturation beyond East Asian contexts, providing valuable insights into the complexities of
41 cultural adaptation. The study’s outcomes contribute significantly to the field of cross-cultural
42 psychology and highlight the need for continued research on acculturation processes in an
43 increasingly diverse world.

44
45 **Keywords:** acculturation; East Asian Acculturation Measure; cross-cultural validation;
46 measurement invariance; cultural adaptation; psychological assessment; global applicability

50 **Introduction**

51 In today’s globalised world, understanding the processes of acculturation—how individuals
52 adapt to new cultural environments—is increasingly critical. Accurate measurement of
53 acculturation is essential for capturing the complexities of cultural adaptation, particularly in
54 multicultural societies where diverse cultural groups interact. These measurements are crucial
55 for academic research and developing culturally sensitive interventions that support
56 individuals’ psychological and social well-being across different cultural contexts (Sousa &
57 Rojjanasrirat, 2011). Recent advancements in acculturation research emphasise the importance
58 of reliable and valid measures applicable across various cultural settings, ensuring that they
59 effectively capture the complexities of cultural adaptation (Park et al., 2021).

60 The East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM) was initially developed to assess the
61 acculturation patterns of East Asian immigrants in the United States, based on Berry’s
62 acculturation model, which categorises acculturation strategies into assimilation, separation,
63 integration, and marginalisation (Berry, 2001). While the EAAM has been a valuable tool in

64 understanding acculturation among East Asian populations, its design reflects cultural and
65 social dynamics unique to East Asians, limiting its effectiveness when applied to other cultural
66 groups, such as those in South Asia, Africa, or Latin America (Chung et al., 2004). This cultural
67 specificity presents significant challenges for researchers and practitioners using the EAAM in
68 more diverse populations (Okazaki, 1998; Ramírez et al., 2005).

69 To overcome these limitations, there is a clear need to adapt and validate the EAAM for broader
70 cultural applicability. Such adaptation ensures that the scale accurately captures the
71 acculturation processes of individuals from diverse backgrounds, considering the distinct
72 social, linguistic, and cultural dynamics they encounter. Recent efforts to adapt acculturation
73 measures, such as the development of the Acculturation and Resilience Scale (AARS),
74 underline the importance of incorporating cultural specificity to enhance the validity and
75 reliability of these tools across different cultural groups (Khawaja et al., 2014). Moreover, the
76 adaptation of scales such as the Brief Sociocultural Adaptation Scale (BSAS) and the Brief
77 Psychological Adaptation Scale (BPAS) for use in different linguistic and cultural contexts
78 demonstrates the necessity of modifying existing measures to reflect the diverse experiences
79 of global populations (Ohki & Vachkov, 2022).

80 This follow-up study is essential in evolving the EAAM into a versatile and culturally sensitive
81 tool that can be reliably used across diverse cultural contexts. By adapting the scale, this
82 research aims to equip researchers and practitioners with a robust instrument for assessing
83 acculturation, thereby enhancing our understanding of how different cultural groups navigate
84 the complexities of cultural adaptation. The study will focus on adapting the EAAM for use in
85 non-East Asian cultural contexts, ensuring it accurately captures acculturation processes in
86 diverse groups such as South Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Additionally, it will evaluate
87 the psychometric properties of the adapted scale across various cultural contexts to establish
88 measurement invariance across genders, ensuring that the scale measures acculturation
89 consistently and comparably across different groups (Zea et al., 2003). This is crucial as recent
90 studies have highlighted the importance of ensuring that acculturation measures are reliable
91 and valid across different cultural and linguistic contexts (Demes & Geeraert, 2014).

92 Furthermore, the study will modify scale items to increase cultural sensitivity and specificity,
93 addressing cultural diversity that may affect the accuracy of acculturation measurement by
94 integrating culturally relevant behaviours, attitudes, and experiences into the scale (Cruz et al.,
95 2000). The research will also investigate the relationship between acculturation strategies and
96 stress related to acculturation in various cultural settings to provide insights into how different
97 acculturation strategies impact well-being across different cultural contexts (Vedder et al.,

98 2007). Recent findings suggest how employed acculturation strategies can significantly
99 influence psychological outcomes, making this investigation particularly relevant (Park et al.,
100 2021).

101 By addressing these objectives, this study will contribute significantly to the field of
102 acculturation research, offering a robust tool for assessing acculturation across diverse
103 populations and enhancing our global understanding of cultural adaptation processes. The
104 outcomes of this study can potentially revolutionise how we approach acculturation, providing
105 valuable insights crucial for developing effective cross-cultural interventions and advancing
106 the theoretical understanding of acculturation.

107

108 **Method**

109 *Study 1: Testing of the Psychometric model of the EAAM*

110 *Participants*

111 Study 1 participants comprised 490 university students from 112 nationalities in Germany and
112 South Africa, whose ages ranged between 18 and 54 (mean age = 26.07 years; SD = 4.38). Two
113 hundred ninety-seven (60.7%) were males, and one hundred ninety-two (39.2%) were females.

114

115 **Measures**

116 *Instrument Section for the East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM)*

117 The East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM) is a 29-item self-report measure by Berry
118 (2001) to measure the acculturation patterns of participants. The EAAM is a multidimensional
119 aspect of acculturation [assimilation (8 items), separation (7 items), integration (5), and
120 marginalisation (9 items)] among East Asian immigrants. Each item in the EAAM is rated on
121 a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The total
122 score for each subscale is calculated by summing the relevant item scores, with some items
123 reverse-scored as appropriate.

124

125 **Procedure**

126 The study adopted a cross-sectional design targeting international students at German
127 universities to assess acculturative strategies. Eligible participants included international
128 students currently enrolled in German universities, aged 18 or older, who had lived in Germany
129 for at least six months. Recruitment was conducted via university email lists, social media, and
130 campus posters, from 31 July 2023 to 30 March, 2024. Participants accessed the survey through

131 a QR code or direct link. The survey, hosted on SoSci Survey and expected to take 15 to 20
132 minutes, collected data on demographics and acculturative strategies.

133 Informed consent was obtained electronically (written), and participants were assured
134 confidentiality and their right to withdraw. The Friedrich Schiller University Jena Ethics
135 Committee (FSV 23/049) and North-West University BaSSREC (NWU-01085-22-S7-01)
136 granted ethical approval, and the study adhered to strict ethical guidelines. Data were
137 anonymised, and the study was classified as low-risk. Measures were implemented to address
138 any potential psychological discomfort, including providing counselling resources if needed.

139

140 **Data Analysis**

141 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used for data analysis. We tested the original four-
142 factor structural model. A large class of omnibus tests for overall fit was evaluated with
143 multiple indices, as recommended by Hu and Bentler (1998). The fit of CFA models was
144 determined with chi-square, the critical ratio (X^2/df ; Bollen, 1989), the root mean squared error
145 of approximation (RMSEA), the root mean square residual (RMR), the standardised root mean
146 squared residual (SRMR), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the goodness of fit index (GFI).
147 However, different cut-off scores have been used to determine how well a model fits the data,
148 and RMSEA of ≤ 0.06 is generally assumed to reflect an excellent fit to the data (Hu & Bentler,
149 1999), with scores between 0.06 and 0.08 indicating acceptable fits (Siedlecki, 2007). The
150 RMR and the SRMR are particularly sensitive to misspecified factor covariance. Factor
151 covariance. The RMR should be less than 0.05 to show a good fit, and SRMR of < 0.08 indicates
152 the discrepancy between the data and the hypothesised model. Larger values indicate better fit,
153 and CFI and GFI values of 0.90 or larger generally indicate acceptable model fit (Hu & Bentler,
154 1999). The model fit of the CFA was estimated using AMOS Graphics (version 29).

155 The analysis showed that the four-factor model did not yield a good fit. An exploratory factor
156 analysis was therefore further conducted to explore possible alternative models. Based on the
157 data we obtained from participants in Study 1, we tested the factor structure to ascertain the
158 EAAM's underlying dimensionality. We used principal axis factoring (PAF) with the items'
159 oblique rotation to adapt to the EAAM. To determine its measurement model, AMOS version
160 29 was used (Brannick, 1995; Hurley et al., 1997; Williams, 1995). A collection of tests for
161 overall fit was evaluated with multiple indices, as recommended by Hu and Bentler (1998).

162

163 **Result**

164 A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to test the four factors of the EAAM.
165 The 4-factor model produced a chi-square value of $\chi^2(224) = 1371.74$, $p < .001$. The fit indices
166 were: Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = .06, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)
167 = .85, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .87, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = .88, Comparative Fit
168 Index (CFI) = .89, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .082. All the
169 fit indices like SRMR, NFI, and CFI were below the acceptable ranges of .90 and above, and
170 the RMSEA exceeds the commonly accepted threshold of 0.08, indicating that the model does
171 not adequately fit the data (see Table 1). Therefore, an exploratory factor analysis was
172 conducted to identify possible factors that fit the data.

173


174 **Table 1. The confirmatory factor analysis of the EAAM**

Model description	chi-square	DF	SRMR	GFI	NFI	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA
4-FACTOR	1371.74	224	.06	.85	.87	.88	.89	.082

175 Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the root mean square residual (RMR),
176 the standardised root mean squared residual (SRMR), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the
177 Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)

178

179 Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) using the original 29 items. The result of the PAF revealed five
180 factors, with 18 items loading on five factors. The other eleven items had lower loadings or
181 cross-loaded on two or more factors and were removed. This process helped in reducing item
182 redundancy. The criteria for loading is a minimum of 0.3 on only one factor. The PAF
183 generated five factors explaining 51.88% of the variance for the complete set of variables. An
184 analysis of the Kaiser–Meyer Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy suggested that the
185 calibration sample was suitable for PAF (KMO = 0.86) with the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity
186 significant ($\chi^2 = 8600.87$; $df = 406$; $p < 0.001$). Four items loaded on factor one explained
187 20.84% of the total variance, four items loaded on factor two explained 14.78% of the variance,
188 factor three had four items too, which explained 7.12% variance, the fourth factor with three
189 items explained 5.87%, and fifth factor with three items explained 3.96% of the total variance.
190 The scree plot further reveals the analysis components' breaking point. The eigenvalue is
191 plotted against the number of components included in the analysis. Figure 1 shows that the
192 eigenvalue was above 1.00 only among the first five factors.



193

194 Figure 1. Scree plot for the Five-factor SAAS

195

196 **Method**

197 **Study 2: validation and measurement invariance SAAS**

198 *Participants*

199 Study 2 participants comprised 329 university students from 112 nationalities in Germany and
200 South Africa, aged between 16 and 54 (mean age = 24.04 years; SD = 6.08). One hundred and
201 sixty-six (50.5%) were females, and one hundred and sixty-two (49.5%) were males.

202

203 **Measures**

204 *Instrument Section for the Shortened Adapted Acculturative Strategy (SAAS)*

205 The SAAS is an 18-item self-report measure adapted from the EAAM by Berry (2001) that
206 measures the acculturative strategy of participants. The SAAS is a multidimensional aspect of
207 acculturation [Social Disconnection/social alienation/marginalisation (4-items), Cultural
208 adaptation/social integration (4-items), Cross-cultural social dynamic/cultural affiliation/social
209 perception (4-items), Relationship Preference/interpersonal comfort (3-items) and Cultural
210 expression & Language proficiency/cultural identity & Language dynamic (3-items)] among a
211 general population. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly
212 disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Examples of items modified: “I get along better with [*country*
213 *of residence*] than people from my country,” and “Most of my friends at work/school are
214 [*country of residence*].” The total score for each subscale is calculated by summing the relevant
215 item scores.

216

217 *Acculturative Stress Scale for International Students (ASSIS)*

218 The Acculturative Stress Scale for International Students (ASSIS) is a 36-item self-report scale
219 developed by Sandhu and Asrabadi (1994). It was utilised to measure the acculturative stress
220 experienced by international students. It was explicitly designed to assess the psychological
221 challenges that international students face as they adjust to a new cultural environment. The
222 ASSIS addresses a broad range of stressors that contribute to acculturative stress, making it a
223 comprehensive tool for understanding the unique experiences of this population. The ASSIS
224 comprised six primary factors representing different dimensions of acculturative stress
225 [Perceived Discrimination (8 items), Homesickness (4 items), Perceived Hate (5 items), Fear
226 (4 items), Stress Due to Change/Culture Shock (3 items), Guilt (2 items). Each item is rated on
227 a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher
228 scores indicating greater levels of acculturative stress.

229

230 **Procedure**

231 A cross-sectional design was also adopted for the second study. It focused on international
232 students at South African universities to assess SAAS and acculturative stress. All
233 participants were international students enrolled in South African universities, aged 18 or
234 older, and residents of South Africa for at least six months. Participants were purposively
235 sampled.


236 Recruitment was conducted through university email lists, social media, and campus posters,
237 with the survey accessible via a QR code or direct link. The survey, conducted on SoSci
238 Survey and expected to take 20 to 25 minutes, gathered data on demographics, acculturative
239 strategies, and stress. Informed consent was obtained electronically, ensuring participants'
240 confidentiality and their right to withdraw. The study received ethical approval, as stated in
241 study one.

242 **Data Analysis**

243 We tested the new SAAS five-factor structural model. The fit of CFA models was determined
244 with chi-square, the critical ratio (X^2/df ; Bollen, 1989), the root mean squared error of
245 approximation (RMSEA), the root mean square residual (RMR), the standardised root mean

246 squared residual (SRMR), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the goodness of fit index (GFI).
 247 However, different cut-off scores have been used to determine how well a model fits the data,
 248 and RMSEA of ≤ 0.06 is generally assumed to reflect an excellent fit to the data (Hu & Bentler,
 249 1999), with scores between 0.06 and 0.08 indicating acceptable fits (Siedlecki, 2007). The
 250 RMR and the SRMR are particularly sensitive to misspecified factor covariance. Factor
 251 covariance. The RMR should be less than 0.05 to show a good fit, and SRMR of < 0.08 indicates
 252 the discrepancy between the data and the hypothesised model. Larger values indicate better fit,
 253 and CFI and GFI values of 0.90 or larger generally indicate acceptable model fit (Hu & Bentler,
 254 1999). The model fit of the CFA was estimated using AMOS Graphics (version 29).

255
 256
 257
 258



268
 269 **Figure 2. Five-dimensional model for the five subscales of the SAAS**

270

271 ***Multiple-Group CFA of Invariance Across Gender***

272 Measurement invariance examines whether the assessment of latent constructs is consistent
 273 across different groups, as discussed by Cheung and Rensvold (2002) and Kline (2015). This

274 process involves evaluating three critical levels of invariance: configural, metric, and scalar.
275 Configural invariance tests whether the same factor structure is applicable across groups,
276 indicating that the observed variables represent the same pattern of latent constructs in different
277 populations. If configural invariance is supported, it suggests that the basic model holds across
278 groups. However, it does not imply that the relationships between latent constructs and
279 observed variables are identical across those groups (Abrams et al., 2013; Vandenberg &
280 Lance, 2000).
281 Metric invariance is examined next to ensure the constructs have the same meaning across
282 groups. This level of invariance assesses whether the factor loadings are equivalent, meaning
283 that the constructs are interpreted similarly across different populations. Without metric
284 invariance, comparing latent means across groups is invalid because the constructs may be
285 understood differently (Kline, 2015; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).
286 Finally, scalar invariance is tested to determine whether the intercepts of the observed variables
287 are consistent across groups. This is necessary for comparing latent means, as it ensures that
288 the groups have the same baseline level for the latent constructs. If scalar invariance holds, it
289 suggests that differences in means reflect true differences in the latent constructs rather than
290 differences in measurement (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). The results of these tests for
291 measurement invariance are presented in Table 4.

292

293 **Result**

294 ***Confirmatory Factor analysis of the SAAS five-factor model***

295 A five-dimensional model of the scale was tested. Each item was constrained to load on the
296 hypothesised dimension. The factor analysis of the data yielded goodness-of-fit indices that
297 support the five-dimensional structure of the adapted scale. The Chi-square goodness-of-fit
298 was significant, with $\chi^2 = 638.95$; $df = 260$; $p = 0.001$. Furthermore, the other fit indices were
299 all within acceptable limits, with GFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.92, NNFI = 0.91, and RMSEA = 0.061.
300 Recent guidelines suggest the use of the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI or TLI), Comparative
301 Fit Index (CFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) for evaluating
302 model fit. Current standards recommend that NNFI and CFI values above 0.95 indicate a good
303 model fit, and RMSEA values below 0.06 are considered acceptable (Kline, 2015; Hair et al.,
304 2020; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Thus, we considered our model as acceptable. We examined the
305 internal consistency indices of the dimensions (see Figure 2 and Table 2).

306

307 **Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis of the Five-subscales of SAAS**

Model description	chi-square	DF	SRMR	GFI	NFI	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA
5-FACTOR	638.95	260	.17	.86	.90	.91	.92	.061

308 Note: Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the root mean square residual (RMR), the
 309 standardised root mean squared residual (SRMR), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Goodness of Fit
 310 Index (GFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)
 311

312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317

Table 3. Confirmatory Structure of the Five-Dimensional Model

Factors	Items	Factor loadings	α	CR	AVE
F1	26	0.838	0.90	0.91	0.71
	27	0.789			
	28	0.931			
	29	0.797			
F2	04	0.831	0.92	0.92	0.75
	05	0.901			
	06	0.877			
	07	0.859			
F3	10	0.740	0.88	0.88	0.64
	11	0.782			
	13	0.848			
	14	0.837			
F4	18	0.814	0.89	0.89	0.73
	19	0.926			
	20	0.819			
F5	01	0.839	0.87	0.87	0.68
	02	0.768			
	03	0.868			

318 Note: F1-Social Disconnection; F2-Cultural adaptation; F3-Social perception; F4- Interpersonal comfort; F5-
 319 Language integration; α - Cronbach's alpha; CR- Composite Reliability; AVE-Average Variance Extracted.
 320

321 A measurement model evaluating the scale's psychometric properties revealed a five-factor
 322 structure (see Table 3). The analysis assessed each factor's internal consistency, reliability, and
 323 validity.

324 The first factor, social disconnection, comprised four items demonstrating strong loadings,
 325 indicating that the factor reliably captured the underlying construct. Similarly, Cultural
 326 adaptation included four items, all of which showed excellent reliability, confirming the
 327 robustness of this factor in representing the adaptation process.

328 Social perception was also identified as a factor consisting of four items, with results showing
 329 good reliability and construct validity. This factor effectively measures individuals' perceptions
 330 within social contexts.

331 Interpersonal comfort emerged as a factor comprising three items, exhibiting strong internal
 332 consistency and validating it as a reliable measure of comfort in interpersonal interactions.

333 Lastly, language integration comprises three items, each demonstrating high reliability and
 334 confirming the factor's ability to represent language skill integration accurately.

335 The results indicate that all five factors demonstrate strong internal consistency and reliability.

336 These findings suggest that the factors are valid representations of their respective constructs,
 337 capturing a substantial portion of the variance in the items. This comprehensive evaluation
 338 reaffirms the scale's reliability and validity, providing security for measuring these specific
 339 psychological constructs.

340

341 **Table 4. Discriminant validity of the SAAS**

HTMT	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
F1					
F2	0.241				
F3	0.376	0.250			
F4	0.234	0.285	0.351		
F5	0.173	0.065	0.372	0.342	

342 Note: HTMT- Hetrotrait-Monotrait Ratio; F1-Social Disconnection; F2-Cultural adaptation; F3-Social
 343 perception; F4- Interpersonal comfort; F5- Language integration

344

345 Discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) to ensure that
 346 each construct within the scale is distinct from the others (see Table 4). The analysis revealed
 347 that all HTMT values were well below the conservative threshold of 0.85, typically
 348 recommended for establishing discriminant validity.

349 The results confirm that the constructs measured by the scale are sufficiently distinct,
 350 demonstrating strong discriminant validity. This suggests that the scale effectively captures
 351 unique dimensions of the constructs under investigation, ensuring that each factor is not merely
 352 a reflection of the others but represents a separate and meaningful concept within the broader
 353 framework of the study.

354 **Table 5. Convergent between the subscales of SAAS and acculturative stress**

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Perceived discrimination (1)	23.53	8.08	--											
Homesickness (2)	12.76	3.973	.72**	--										
Perceived hate (3)	14.58	5.85	.94**	.72**	--									
Fear (4)	11.76	3.94	.88**	.69**	.81**	--								
Stress (5)	8.98	3.21	.79**	.80**	.80**	.71**	--							

Guilt (6)	5.74	2.40	.76**	.73**	.76**	.68**	.75**	--						
Miscellaneous (7)	29.39	10.34	.93**	.77**	.91**	.84**	.80**	.78**	--					
Social disconnect (8)	14.18	5.92	.25**	.11*	.25**	.24**	.14**	.17**	.29**	--				
cultural adaptation (9)	12.89	5.97	-.22**	-.29**	-.23**	-.21**	-.27**	-.22**	-.21**	.19**	--			
Social perception (10)	17.73	6.14	.23**	.26**	.22**	.26**	.26**	.23**	.24**	.33**	-.23**	--		
Interpersonal comfort (11)	14.27	4.44	-.13*	-.03	-.18**	-.09	-.12*	-.15**	-.12*	.20**	.23**	.34**	--	
Language integration (12)	14.93	4.78	.16**	.07	.13*	.13*	.12*	.05	.11*	.17**	.04	.35**	.31**	--

355 Note: * p <.05, **p<.001

356

357 A bivariate correlation analysis assessed the relationship between the subscales of the newly
358 validated scale and acculturative stress, focusing on the expected negative correlations (see
359 Table 5). The Cultural Adaptation subscale showed significant negative correlations with
360 acculturative stress factors, supporting the expected inverse relationship and indicating
361 convergent validity. However, other subscales, such as Social Disconnection and Language
362 Integration, showed weak positive correlations, contrary to the hypothesised negative
363 relationship. These results suggest that while Cultural Adaptation aligns with theoretical
364 expectations, the other subscales do not consistently demonstrate the anticipated negative
365 relationship with acculturative stress, indicating that further investigation may be needed.

366

367 **Measurement invariance**

368 A series of nested models were tested to evaluate the scale's measurement invariance across
369 genders (see Table 6). The Configural invariance (Model 1), serving as the baseline model,
370 yielded a chi-square value of $\chi^2(260) = 638.95$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.92, Gamma
371 Hat = 0.91, and McDonald's Non-Centrality Index (Mc NCI) = 0.63. These results indicate a
372 good fit, suggesting that the same factor structure is valid across both male and female groups.
373 Metric invariance (Model 2) was tested by constraining the factor loadings to be equal across
374 genders. The fit indices for this model were $\chi^2(273) = 661.29$, CFI = 0.92, Gamma Hat = 0.90,
375 and Mc NCI = 0.62. The chi-square difference test comparing the configural and metric models
376 yielded $\Delta\chi^2(13) = 22.34$, $p = 0.06$. Although the chi-square difference approached significance,
377 the changes in CFI ($\Delta\text{CFI} = 0.002$), Gamma Hat ($\Delta\text{Gamma Hat} = 0.01$), and Mc NCI (ΔMc
378 $\text{NCI} = 0.01$) were minimal, supporting metric invariance. This indicates that the factor loadings
379 are equivalent across genders, meaning the construct has the same meaning for both men and
380 women.

381 Scalar invariance (Model 3) was assessed by further constraining the item intercepts to be equal
382 across genders. This model produced a chi-square value of $\chi^2(283) = 669.93$, CFI = 0.92,
383 Gamma Hat = 0.90, and Mc NCI = 0.62. The chi-square difference between the metric and
384 scalar models was $\Delta\chi^2(10) = 8.64$, $p = 0.57$, which was not statistically significant.
385 Additionally, changes in CFI ($\Delta\text{CFI} = 0.00$), Gamma Hat ($\Delta\text{Gamma Hat} = 0.002$), and Mc NCI

386 ($\Delta Mc\ NCI = 0.001$) were negligible, indicating that scalar invariance is supported. This
 387 suggests that the item intercepts are consistent across genders, allowing for comparing latent
 388 means between men and women.

389 The results indicate that the scale demonstrates configural, metric, and scalar invariance across
 390 gender. This implies that the factor structure, factor loadings, and item intercepts are consistent
 391 for both male and female groups, making meaningful comparisons of latent means between
 392 genders. Although the chi-square difference for the metric invariance test was close to
 393 significance ($p = 0.06$), the minimal changes in other fit indices (CFI, Gamma Hat, and Mc
 394 NCI) suggest that metric invariance holds. The support for scalar invariance confirms that
 395 differences in latent means between genders can be interpreted as true differences rather than
 396 measurement artefacts.

397 **Table 6. Results of tests for measurement invariance across genders**

Model	Model description	chi-square	df	CFI	gamma hat	Mc NCI	Δ chi-square	Δ df	sig.	Δ CFI	Δ Mc NCI	Δ gamma hat
1	Configural invariance	638.95	260	0.92	0.91	0.63	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Metric invariance	661.29	273	0.92	0.90	0.62	22.34	13	0.06	0.002	0.01	0.01
3	Scalar invariance	669.93	283	0.92	0.90	0.62	8.64	10	0.57	0.00	0.001	0.002

398 Notes: McDonald's Non-Centrality Index -(Mc NCI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI)

399 **Table 7. Examining latent mean differences between gender**

Factors	Total	Male (SD)	Female (SD)	t-test
Social disconnect	14.18(5.92)	14.22(5.97)	14.12(5.89)	-0.157
cultural adaptation	12.89(5.97)	13.23(6.11)	12.59(5.84)	-1.014
Social perception	17.73(6.14)	17.71(6.07)	17.71(6.11)	0.002
Interpersonal comfort	14.27(4.44)	14.13(4.29)	14.39(4.60)	0.546
Language integration	14.93(4.78)	14.72(4.86)	15.09(4.71)	0.736

400

401 An independent samples t-test was conducted to explore gender differences across five
 402 psychological factors: Social Disconnection, Cultural Adaptation, Social Perception,
 403 Interpersonal Comfort, and Language Integration (see Table 7). The analysis revealed no
 404 significant differences between males and females on any of the factors. Both genders exhibited
 405 similar scores for each factor, indicating that gender does not significantly influence these
 406 constructs in this sample. This suggests that the psychological traits measured by these factors
 407 are consistent across genders.

408

409 **Discussion**

410 The present study sought to adapt and validate the East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM)
411 for broader applicability across diverse cultural contexts, specifically targeting populations
412 outside the original East Asian focus. This was achieved through psychometric evaluations,
413 including Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and
414 assessments of measurement invariance across gender. The findings of this study provide
415 critical insights into the effectiveness and limitations of the adapted acculturation measure, now
416 termed the Shortened Adapted Acculturation Scale (SAAS).

417

418 The initial CFA results indicated that the original four-factor model of the EAAM did not
419 adequately fit the data when applied to a diverse sample comprising 87 nationalities. Despite
420 some fit indices (e.g., SRMR, NFI, and CFI) falling within acceptable ranges, the RMSEA
421 exceeded the commonly accepted threshold, signalling a misfit in the model's structure. This
422 finding underscores the challenges of applying a culturally specific measure, designed initially
423 for East Asian populations, to a broader and more diverse population. These results align with
424 previous research, highlighting the importance of culturally adapting psychological measures
425 to ensure validity and reliability across different cultural groups (Demes & Geeraert, 2014).

426

427 To address the limitations observed in the CFA, an EFA was conducted, which revealed a five-
428 factor structure that better represented the acculturation processes across the diverse sample.
429 This new structure consisted of five distinct factors: Social Disconnection, Cultural Adaptation,
430 Social Perception, Interpersonal Comfort, and Language Integration. The emergence of these
431 factors reflects the complex nature of acculturation in multicultural contexts, where individuals
432 navigate various social and cultural dynamics that the original four-factor model may not fully
433 capture.

434 The five factors identified in the EFA collectively explained 51.88% of the variance, with
435 strong loadings on each factor, indicating that the new structure provides a more accurate and
436 comprehensive measurement of acculturation across diverse cultural groups. This finding
437 supports the notion that acculturation is a multifaceted process that varies significantly across
438 cultural contexts (Khawaja et al., 2014). Social Disconnection and Language Integration
439 factors, in particular, highlight individuals' unique challenges as they attempt to reconcile their
440 cultural identities with those of the host culture. This theme has been noted in other studies
441 focusing on acculturation and adaptation (Vedder et al., 2007).

442

443 The internal consistency indices for the five factors were all strong, suggesting that the adapted
444 scale reliably measures distinct aspects of the acculturation process. The high reliability of
445 factors such as Social Disconnection and Cultural Adaptation indicates that these dimensions
446 are robust constructs within the broader acculturation framework. The discriminant validity
447 analysis further supported the scale's validity, which showed that the constructs measured by
448 the SAAS are sufficiently distinct from one another. This is a crucial finding, as it ensures that
449 the scale captures the unique dimensions of acculturation without conflating them with related
450 but separate constructs.

451
452 The multiple-group CFA conducted to assess measurement invariance across genders provided
453 additional evidence for the robustness of the adapted scale. The results indicated that the SAAS
454 demonstrated configural, metric, and scalar invariance across male and female participants.
455 This suggests that the scale's factor structure, factor loadings, and item intercepts are consistent
456 across genders, making meaningful comparisons of acculturation experiences between men
457 and women. The support for measurement invariance is significant in ensuring that the scale
458 can be used reliably in diverse populations without introducing gender bias. Cross-cultural
459 research often raises this concern (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002).

460

461 **Implications for Research and Practice**

462 The successful adaptation and validation of the EAAM into the SAAS have significant
463 implications for research and practice. For researchers, the SAAS provides a robust tool for
464 assessing acculturation across diverse populations, enabling more accurate and culturally
465 sensitive studies of how individuals navigate the complexities of cultural adaptation. The
466 scale's ability to measure distinct aspects of acculturation, such as social disconnection and
467 language integration, offers valuable insights into the specific challenges individuals from
468 different cultural backgrounds face.

469 For practitioners, particularly those working in multicultural settings, the SAAS can inform the
470 development of interventions to support individuals in their acculturation process. By
471 identifying specific areas where individuals may struggle, such as social disconnection or
472 cultural adaptation, practitioners can tailor interventions to address these challenges, thereby
473 enhancing the effectiveness of their support.

474

475 **Limitations and Future Directions**

476 While this study presents significant advancements in adapting and validating the EAAM for
477 broader cultural contexts, several limitations should be noted. First, although the sample was
478 diverse and representative of the target population, the focus on university students may limit
479 the generalizability of the findings to other demographic groups. Acculturation processes vary
480 significantly across age groups, socio-economic statuses, and educational levels. Therefore,
481 future research should aim to validate the SAAS across a broader range of populations,
482 including older adults, working professionals, and individuals with varying educational
483 backgrounds, to capture the full spectrum of acculturation experiences.

484 Secondly, although the SAAS demonstrated strong psychometric properties, the study
485 primarily focused on the scale's structural validity without extensive exploration of its
486 predictive validity. While the structural validity offers a solid foundation, future research
487 should investigate how well the SAAS predicts relevant psychological and social outcomes,
488 such as mental health and overall well-being. Understanding these relationships will provide
489 deeper insights into the scale's practical utility and application in diverse settings.

490 Finally, while the study successfully established measurement invariance across gender, other
491 potentially relevant demographic variables, such as ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and
492 migration history, were not examined. These factors could significantly influence acculturation
493 experiences and should be considered in future research. Expanding the analysis to include
494 these variables will help ensure the SAAS is robust and applicable across various subgroups
495 within larger populations.

496

497 **Conclusion**

498 In conclusion, the adaptation and validation of the EAAM into the SAAS represents a
499 significant advancement in the measurement of acculturation across diverse cultural contexts.
500 The study's findings highlight the importance of culturally adapting psychological measures to
501 ensure validity and reliability in multicultural settings. The SAAS offers researchers and
502 practitioners a robust tool for assessing acculturation, providing insights into the complexities
503 of cultural adaptation. As globalisation continues to increase cultural diversity worldwide, the
504 need for such tools will only become more pressing, making the contributions of this study
505 timely and essential.

506

507 **Acknowledgements**

508 The authors acknowledge the support of Friedrich-Schiller University and North-West
509 University's financial contribution in funding this study.

510

511 **Conflict of Interest**

512 None declared.

513

514 **Reference**

515 Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 615–631.

516 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00231>

517 Chung, R. C., Kim, B. S. K., & Abreu, J. M. (2004). Asian American multidimensional
518 acculturation scale: Development, factor analysis, reliability, and validity. *Cultural
519 Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 10(1), 66-80.

520 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.10.1.66>

521 Cruz, F. D., Padilla, G., & Agustin, E. O. (2000). Adapting a measure of acculturation for
522 cross-cultural research. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 11(3), 191–198.

523 <https://doi.org/10.1177/104365960001100305>

524 Demes, K. A., & Geeraert, N. (2014). Measures matter: Scales for adaptation, acculturation,
525 and cultural distance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(1), 109-133.

526 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113487590>

527 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
528 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation
529 Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55.

530 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>

531 Khawaja, N. G., Moisuc, O., & Ramírez, E. (2014). Developing an acculturation and
532 resilience scale for use with culturally and linguistically diverse populations.

533 *Australian Psychologist*, 49(3), 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12052>

534 Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.).
535 Guilford Press.

536 Ohki, K., & Vachkov, I. (2022). Russian language versions of the brief scales of adaptation
537 and acculturation orientations by Demes and Geeraert: Psychometric characteristics.

538 *Консультативная психология и психотерапия*, 30(3), 27-47.

539 <https://doi.org/10.17759/cpp.2022300308>

540 Okazaki, S. (1998). Psychological assessment of Asian Americans: Research agenda for
541 cultural competency. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 70(1), 54–70.

542 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa7001_4

- 543 Park, S. H., Abdin, E., Luo, N., Subramaniam, M., Tan, L., & van Dam, R. V. (2021).
544 Adaptation and validation of a short acculturation scale in a multi-ethnic Asian
545 population. *Psychosomatics*, 3(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.3390/PSYCH3010004>
- 546 Ramírez, M., Ford, M. E., Stewart, A. L., & A. Teresi, J. (2005). Measurement issues in
547 health disparities research. *Health services research*, 40(5p2), 1640-1657.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00450.x>
- 549
- 550 Sandhu, D. S., & Asrabadi, B. R. (1994). Development of an acculturative stress scale for
551 international students: Preliminary findings. *Psychological Reports*, 75(1), 435-448.
552 <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1994.75.1.435>
- 553 Siedlecki, K. L. (2007). *Aging and cognition: The role of cognitive flexibility and working*
554 *memory in older adults' decision making and learning*. Springer.
- 555 Sousa, V. D., & Rojjanasrirat, W. (2011). Translation, adaptation, and validation of
556 instruments or scales for use in cross-cultural health care research: A clear and user-
557 friendly guideline. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 17(2), 268–274.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x>
- 559 Vedder, P., Sam, D. L., & Liebkind, K. (2007). The acculturation and adaptation of Turkish
560 adolescents in North-Western Europe. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11(3), 126-
561 136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690701454617>
- 562 Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement
563 invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational
564 research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(1), 4–70.
565 <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>
- 566 Zea, M. C., Asner-Self, K. K., Birman, D., & Buki, L. P. (2003). The abbreviated
567 multidimensional acculturation scale: Empirical validation with two Latino/Latina
568 samples. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 9(2), 107-126.
569 <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.9.2.107>