

Bicultural bilinguals

International Journal of Bilingualism
2015, Vol. 19(5) 572–586
© The Author(s) 2014
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1367006914526297
ijb.sagepub.com



François Grosjean

University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland

Abstract

Although the terms “bicultural” and “bilingual” are often seen together in the same text, there is very little work that attempts to encompass them into one reality, bicultural bilinguals. This paper takes up a number of themes that pertain to bicultural bilinguals, most notably how they are described in the literature, how they become both bilingual and bicultural, and how their languages and cultures wax and wane over time. Other aspects discussed are their linguistic and cultural behaviour as bicultural bilinguals, how they identify themselves both linguistically and culturally, as well as their personality as bicultural bilinguals. An effort is made whenever possible to bridge the gap between the two components that make up bicultural bilinguals – the linguistic and the cultural – and to show how the questions that interest linguists when studying bilinguals can be taken up and adapted by researchers examining cultural issues, and vice versa.

Keywords

Bilingual, bilingualism, bicultural, biculturalism, bicultural bilinguals, becoming bicultural bilingual, wax and wane of languages and cultures, acting bilingually and biculturally, identity of bicultural bilinguals, personality of bicultural bilinguals

Introduction

When bicultural bilinguals are evoked, two underlying fields of research, bilingualism and biculturalism, come to the front. Research on bilingualism has now attained a level of recognition that is quite impressive but the extent of biculturalism research has not yet reached this level, even though the amount of work dedicated to this relatively new field is on the increase.

Although the terms “bicultural” and “bilingual” are often seen together in the same text, there is very little work that attempts to encompass them into one reality, bicultural bilinguals. This comes in part from the fact that the two components of the concept belong to quite different academic fields. Bilingualism is studied primarily by linguists, psycholinguists, cognitive psychologists and sociolinguists, whereas biculturalism is researched by social and cross-cultural psychologists, as well as personality researchers. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of scholars competent in several, or all, of these domains at once or, at the very least, who collaborate with those in other domains in order to study this interdisciplinary topic.

Corresponding author:

François Grosjean, Université de Neuchâtel, Avenue du Premier-Mars 26, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
Email: francois.grosjean@unine.ch

In this paper, we will restrict ourselves to bicultural bilinguals only. Since the pioneering paper by Soffieti (1960), more than 50 years ago, it is clear that individuals can be not only bicultural and bilingual, but also bicultural and monolingual, monocultural and bilingual, as well as monocultural and monolingual. Thus, contrary to a widely held belief, biculturalism and bilingualism are not necessarily coextensive. Many people are bilingual without being bicultural, such as members of diglossic communities, inhabitants of countries with lingua francas or different school languages, foreign language learners who then use their second language regularly, etc. Conversely, some people are bicultural without being bilingual. This is the case of speakers of a language who move to a different country where the same language is used, or of members of a minority culture who no longer know the minority language but who retain other aspects of the culture.

In what follows, we will take up a number of themes that pertain to bicultural bilinguals, most notably how such people are described in the literature, how they become bicultural bilinguals as well as the wax and wane of their languages and cultures. We will also study their linguistic and cultural behaviour as bicultural bilinguals, how they identify themselves both linguistically and culturally, as well as their personality as bicultural bilinguals. Because the literature most often studies the components that make up bicultural bilinguals separately – the linguistic component and the cultural component – we will continue doing so in this paper even though it is the bicultural bilingual as a whole who is of interest to us. An effort will be made whenever possible to bridge the gap between the two components and to show how the questions that interest linguists when studying bilinguals can be taken up and adapted by researchers examining cultural issues, and vice versa.

Describing bicultural bilinguals

The linguistic component

On the linguistic level, there is a common myth that bilinguals have equal and perfect knowledge of their languages (Grosjean, 2010, 2013). Some add that bilinguals must have acquired their languages as children and some others add that they should not have an accent in any of them. These are the “real”, the “pure”, the “balanced”, the “perfect” bilinguals. What is unfortunate is that some linguists in the last century espoused this view and proposed definitions of bilingualism that put the emphasis on fluency. Thus, Bloomfield (1933) wrote that bilingualism was the native-like control of two languages. In fact, the majority of bilinguals simply do not resemble these rare bilinguals. If one were to count as bilingual those who pass as monolinguals in each language, one would be left with no label for the vast majority of people who use two or more languages regularly but who do not have native-like fluency in each language.

Defining bilinguals in terms of just language fluency is problematic and so, for more than 50 years now, researchers have opted for language use as the main criterion. Thus, Weinreich (1968) and Mackey (1962) define bilingualism as the alternate use of two (or more) languages and, similarly, Grosjean (1982, 2010) states that bilinguals are those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives. This view encompasses people who live with two or more languages, ranging from the migrant worker who speaks the host country’s language, and who may not read and write it, all the way to the professional interpreter who is totally fluent in two languages.

Because one cannot do away with language fluency as a factor, that is, which languages bilinguals know and to what degree of proficiency, Grosjean (2010) developed a grid that takes into account both fluency and use. As depicted in Figure 1, language use is presented along the vertical axis (Never used to Daily use) and language fluency along the horizontal axis (Low fluency to High fluency). Based on these two factors (measured objectively or

Language use	Daily					
	Never					
		Low		High		
		Language fluency				

Figure 1. A grid that allows one to depict a bilingual in terms of language use and language fluency. The bilingual's languages are placed in the cells that correspond to their level of fluency and their frequency of use.

based on self-reports), the bilingual's two or more languages are placed in the appropriate cells of the grid. Separate grids can also be used for each of the bilingual's four language competencies (speaking, listening, writing, reading) and several grids can be used to represent a bilingual's language history.

Closely linked to language use and language fluency is the Complementarity Principle proposed by Grosjean (1997, 2010). It states that bilinguals usually acquire and use their languages for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people. Different aspects of life often require different languages. Some languages will cover many domains of life, others less, and some will cover domains along with another language (or other languages). Rare will be the bilinguals who will have all domains of life covered by all their languages. This principle impacts on various factors. The first is fluency, since if a language is spoken in a reduced number of domains and with a limited number of people, then it will not be developed as much as a language used in more domains and with more people. A second impact concerns language dominance. It is recognized in the field of bilingualism that many bilinguals are dominant in a language (globally or by domain), as opposed to "balanced". Dominance is difficult to define and is based not only on language fluency and on language use, but also on how the languages are distributed across domains of life. Bilinguals can be globally dominant in a language but may be dominant in the other language for specific domains. A third impact of the Complementarity Principle concerns translation. Unless bilinguals have domains covered with two languages or have acquired the language they are translating into (the target language) in a manner that puts the emphasis on translation equivalents, hence building a bridge between their languages, they may find themselves without the resources to produce a good translation.

Can one find the equivalents of language fluency, language use and maybe even of the Complementarity Principle in the way biculturals are described? This is partly the case, as we will see below.

The bicultural component

Although there are few definitions of the bicultural person, among those that exist one finds the same dichotomy between fluency (cultural competence or knowledge) and use (interacting in two or more cultures). For example, Luna, Ringberg, and Peracchio (2008) appear to put the emphasis on the equivalence of fluency when they write that biculturals have two distinct and *complete sets* (our italics) of knowledge structures, one for each culture. On the other hand, 30 years before, Grosjean (1983; see also 2008) put more emphasis on use. He characterized biculturals by at least three traits. Firstly, they take part, to varying degrees, in the life of two or more cultures. Secondly, they adapt, at least in part, their attitudes, behaviours, values, languages, etc., to these cultures. Thirdly, they combine and blend aspects of the cultures involved. Certain characteristics (attitudes, beliefs, values, behaviours, etc.) come from the one or the other culture, whereas other characteristics are blends based on these cultures. In this latter case, it becomes difficult to determine the cultural origin of a particular characteristic since it contains aspects of both cultures. We should note here that it is rare that the two cultures have the same importance in the life of the bicultural. One culture often plays a larger role than the other. One can therefore speak of “cultural dominance” just as one speaks of “language dominance” in bilinguals.

What is fascinating is that Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2007), quite independently, define biculturals in a manner similar to Grosjean. According to them, biculturals are those who have been exposed to and have internalized two cultures (this is quite close to Grosjean’s first characteristic). They add that biculturalism also entails the synthesis of cultural norms from two groups into one behavioural repertoire (this is quite similar to Grosjean’s third characteristic). In addition, they state that biculturalism entails the ability to switch between cultural schemas, norms and behaviours in response to cultural cues (see Grosjean’s second characteristic). Although neither Grosjean nor Nguyen and Benet-Martinez mention explicitly a cultural equivalent of the Complementarity Principle in biculturalism, it is not excluded from their definitions.

Of course, the bilingual and bicultural components in bicultural bilinguals also have their specificities (Grosjean, 2008). The one that is clearly apparent on the bicultural side is the combining and blending of features of the cultures involved. We observe in biculturals an aspect that is adaptable and controllable (it allows them to adapt to the situation, context, etc.) and an aspect that is more static; here, the blend of features from the two cultures is always present and cannot be adapted to given situations. This is important as it means that not all behaviours, beliefs and attitudes can be modified according to the cultural situation the bicultural person is in. The blend phenomenon is far less obvious in the linguistic component of bicultural bilinguals. Although combining languages in the form of code-switches and borrowing is frequent, as we will see later, the actual blending of languages is far rarer in individual bilinguals. It takes place over generations in groups of speakers (see the literature on pidginization and creolization), but more rarely in individuals.

Other criteria have been put forward to define the bicultural person (Grosjean, 2008) and it is worth going through them to see if some of them have their linguistic counterparts when referring to bilinguals. One relates to cultural identity and the fact that one should be able to identify fully with both cultures to be termed bicultural. In fact, as we will see later on in this paper, many biculturals only identify with the one or the other culture, or sometimes do not identify with either, even though they are bicultural according to the characteristics given above. A second criterion is

accepting one's bicultural status, that is, that one is bicultural only if one acknowledges that this is indeed the case. However, one often meets people who are indeed bicultural but who do not recognize their biculturalism. It should be noted that something similar is found on the linguistic side of things. People may recognize using two or more languages in their everyday lives but may not accept to be labelled bilingual. A third criterion is the manner in which a person has become bicultural. Some maintain that one must have grown up with both cultures to be defined as bicultural when, in fact, one can become bicultural at different moments in life, as we will see below. A similar requirement can be found in certain parts of the world regarding bilingualism. For example, both in France and Switzerland, bilinguals are perceived as those who are fluent in their languages (the language use aspect is not mentioned as often by the lay person) and, in addition, they must also who have grown up bilingual. This is unfortunate, of course, as one can become bilingual at any stage of one's life.

A fourth criterion concerns how well one knows the two cultures. Some maintain that one must know them perfectly to be called bicultural. However, this is in fact rarely the case, just as knowing two languages perfectly is quite rare. Most biculturals have a cultural dominance due to the fact that they have greater contact with, and spend more time in, one culture than in the other, but this in no way makes them less bicultural. Among other criteria mentioned we find the following: feeling at ease in both cultures (it is unfortunately not always the case); being recognized as bicultural (this is even rarer); being accepted fully by the two cultures in question, etc. All of these criteria are questionable, which explains why they have not been added to the defining characteristics proposed by Grosjean and Nguyen and Benet-Martinez. This said, some researchers have included some of them in the past when describing bicultural competence (e.g. LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993).

A final word needs to be said concerning people who know and use more than two languages in their everyday lives and who also belong to more than two cultures. What has been said so far has put the stress on the "bi" in bilingualism and biculturalism, when in fact there are many people who use more than two languages in their everyday lives that themselves take place in more than two cultures. This has been recognized for the linguistic component not only by the most common definition used currently, that is, bilinguals are those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives, but also by common labels such as "trilingual", "quadrilingual" and even "plurilingual" or "multilingual". As concerns the cultural component, this author (see, for example, Grosjean, 2010) has always been careful to include more than two cultures in his description of the bicultural person contrary to other researchers, who have usually spoken of just two cultures. This is the case for Luna et al. (2008), who refer to "two distinct and complete sets of knowledge structures" as well as Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2007), who state that biculturals have been exposed to and have internalized two cultures, and who refer to the cultural norms of two groups. Clearly, definitions of biculturalism will have to leave open the fact that some people do indeed take part in the life of more than two cultures and that they adapt to each of these cultures, as well as combine and blend aspects of several cultures.

Becoming a bicultural bilingual

The linguistic component

It is interesting to ask why more than half of the world's population is bilingual. Several reasons come to mind as suggested by Grosjean (2010, 2013). Firstly, there are many more languages (some 7000 according to Gordon, 2005) than there are countries (193 in 2011). Some countries house numerous languages and this leads to language contact between the inhabitants, and hence

bilingualism. Most countries with many languages have one or two languages of communication (lingua francas) that people use along with their more local language. A second reason, which goes back to the origins of mankind, is that people have always travelled for trade, commerce, business, employment, religion, politics, conflicts and so on. In the majority of cases, migrants acquire the language of the host country and hence become bilingual; there are also many cases where the original inhabitants adopt the new language (see, for example, American Indians in North America). Another important reason for the extent of bilingualism is education and culture. Many students pursue their studies in a region or country with another language and hence become bilingual. Other events, such as intermarriage, professional opportunities – diplomacy, business, foreign journalism, language teaching and so on – lead to the development of language contact.

What has just been said explains why one can become bilingual at any time during one's life (Grosjean, 2010, 2013). Some children acquire two languages simultaneously but they are far rarer than children who acquire their languages successively. In fact, the majority of child bilinguals start monolingually. They first acquire a home language and then, usually when they start going to school, they learn a second language, most often the majority language. Literally millions of children throughout the world have become bilingual in this manner. Then, depending on the country, they may start learning a third (and even a fourth) language as a school subject. Older children and young adolescents may also become bilingual. This will happen when they move to another linguistic region or to another country and start to be schooled in their new language. There is no upper age limit for acquiring a new language and then continuing one's life with two or more languages. Nor is there any limit in the fluency that one can attain in the new language, with the exception of pronunciation skills. The main factor that leads to the acquisition and development of a language is the need for that language – the need to interact with others, to study or work, to take part in social activities and so on. If the need for a language is present, then language acquisition will usually take place. This is as true of children as it is of adults. Other factors must also be present: enough language input and use; the help of family, friends, colleagues and the community in general; formal language learning for some; and positive attitudes towards the language in question, as well as towards bilingualism.

The cultural component

Are things much different when one examines the reasons that lead to biculturalism? Not really. People become bicultural because they are in contact with two (or more) cultures and have to live, in part at least, with these cultures. This can take place in early childhood (e.g. a child is born within a bicultural family or has daily contact with two cultures from birth) and can continue throughout life, just like people becoming bilingual. Hence, we find children who belong to a cultural minority who come into contact with a second culture in school, adolescents anchored in a culture who pursue their studies in another culture, adults who emigrate to another country for various reasons (economical, political, religious, etc.) and even second- and third-generation immigrants who rediscover their home culture after having grown up in the majority culture. (See Nguyen and Benet-Martinez (2007), for a list very similar to this one.)

It is interesting to note that researchers working on bilingualism have probably spent more time examining how children become bilingual rather than how adults do so (see, for example, Yip & Matthews, 2007), whereas those working on biculturalism have concentrated on acculturation in adult migrants and in their children. Literally thousands of studies have described the future migrants' idealization of the culture they wish to emigrate to, and they have listed the adaptation stages that migrants experience in their new society: culture shock, isolation, turning in on oneself, but also over-adaptation at times, more or less rapid acculturation according to the size and

concentration of the migrant group and the presence of children, the “host” society’s attitude toward the group, etc. The literature also mentions the migrants’ idealization of their home country, their way of talking about it, the “return shock” they experience when they see that the reality does not match their dreams, and a more or less permanent acceptance of their migratory status, sometimes accompanied by a reasoning that they are doing so “for the sake of the children who were born here”.

It is only recently that biculturalism has started to be seen as a natural consequence of migration. For a long time, one evoked the passage from one monoculturalism in the first culture to a form of monoculturalism in the new culture. Migrants were not viewed as people who tended to blend and synthesize aspects of their two or more cultures, but rather as those who no longer belonged to culture A and had not yet become members of culture B. Depending on who was studying the phenomenon, the solutions advocated were integration or assimilation into the new culture, or a return to the original culture, but rarely the intertwining of two cultures in the form of biculturalism as discussed here.

Becoming both bilingual and bicultural: Synchrony and asynchrony

As seen above, people can become bilingual and bicultural at any time during their lives. Sometimes both components develop at the same time (the person becomes bilingual *and* bicultural over the same time span), but there are also other possibilities that one must not overlook. For example, a person can acquire two languages first and only after some years start becoming bicultural. A case in point can be found in diglossic societies where two languages or two varieties of a language are employed by people, each language having a very precise domain of use. The example of Swiss German and German in the German part of Switzerland is a case in point. Very early on, Swiss German children, whose mother tongue is Swiss German, start acquiring German, which becomes the main school language over the years. By their adolescence, they are bilingual in the two varieties, which are mutually incomprehensible but, unless they have a German parent, they remain monocultural. The vagaries of life may lead some of them to go and live in Germany or Austria and, with time, they will become bicultural, but many years after having become bilingual.

The opposite may also happen, that is starting off bicultural and only later becoming bilingual. For example, a Jewish family in France may be monolingual in French although bicultural in most aspects of life. After a number of years, one of the children, having become an adult, may decide to migrate to Israel and with time he or she will become bilingual in French and Hebrew.

Thus, just as one can be bicultural without being bilingual, and bilingual without being bicultural, as stated in the Introduction, one must leave open the possibility that the development of each component of the bicultural bilingual person may take place at different times, even if, for many, the two often go hand in hand.

The wax and wane of languages and cultures in bicultural bilinguals

The linguistic component

An individual’s language history can be quite complex (Grosjean, 2010, discusses this and gives an example of such a case). This can be due to repeated immigration but also to other life events that may change the relative importance of the bilingual’s languages – events such as starting school and learning to read and write in one or several languages, getting a job, settling down with a spouse or losing a close family member with whom a language was used exclusively. Bilingualism

is very much a dynamic process in which new situations, new interlocutors and new language functions will involve new linguistic needs (see the Complementarity Principle above). Typically there are periods of stability, of different durations, and then periods of language reorganization during which an existing language may be strengthened, another one may lose its importance, yet another may be acquired, and so forth. As a consequence, the bilingual's language dominance can change and, at some point, the first language may no longer be the stronger language. Many bilinguals start their lives with one language as the dominant language but, after a transition period, they replace it with their other language.

Major events in a bilingual's life may also be the start of language forgetting (also called language loss or language attrition; see Grosjean, 2010). It is a phenomenon that is probably as common as language learning and yet it has received far less attention. It begins when the domains of use of a language are considerably reduced, if not simply absent, and it can extend over many years. Those who are in this extended process of forgetting a language are called "dormant bilinguals". Because they no longer feel sure about their knowledge of the language and they do not want to make too many mistakes, they may well avoid using it. In addition, they are often quite conscious of the state of their language forgetting and some may even feel guilty about it.

The cultural component

Even though less studied than the wax and wane of bilingualism, the evolution of a person's biculturalism is just as interesting and just as frequent. For the very same reasons as those mentioned above (repeated immigration, starting school, getting a job, settling down with a spouse, losing a family member, etc.), a person's biculturalism may evolve over time. The person's cultural dominance may change with the possibility that the first culture may no longer be the stronger culture after many years in another cultural environment. In addition, cultural forgetting (culture loss or attrition) may start taking place. As with language, this takes place when contact with one of the cultures is considerably reduced, if not quite simply absent, and takes place for a long stretch of time. In this case, and going back to the characteristics of the bicultural person presented at the start of this paper, biculturals adapt less well their attitudes, behaviour, values, etc., to the weaker culture, and the blends of the two cultures are more and more in favour of the now-dominant culture. Specifics of culture loss within a bicultural person over time is a domain that needs to be studied in the years to come.

Acting bilingually and biculturally

The linguistic component

In their everyday lives, bilinguals find themselves at various points along a situational continuum that induce different language modes (Grosjean, 1994, 2001). At one end of the continuum, bilinguals are in a totally monolingual mode in that they are speaking (or writing) to monolinguals of one – or the other – of the languages that they know. At the other end of the continuum, bilinguals find themselves in a bilingual language mode in that they are communicating with bilinguals who share their two (or more) languages and with whom they normally intertwine their languages (i.e. code-switch and borrow; see below). For convenience, we will refer to the two end points of the continuum when speaking of the monolingual or the bilingual language modes, but we should keep in mind that these are end points and that intermediary modes do exist.

In the monolingual mode, bilinguals adopt the language of the monolingual interlocutor(s) and deactivate their other language(s). Bilinguals who manage to do this totally and, in addition, who

speak the other language fluently and have no foreign accent in it, will often “pass” as monolinguals. In fact, deactivation of the other language is rarely total as is clearly seen in the interferences bilinguals produce (these are also known as between-language deviations). An interference is a speaker-specific deviation from the language being spoken due to the influence of the other “deactivated” language (see, for example, Grosjean, 2012; Odlin, 1989). Interferences can occur at all levels of language (phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic) and in all modalities (spoken, written or sign). They are of two kinds: static interferences that reflect permanent traces of one language on the other (such as a permanent accent, the meaning extensions of particular words, specific syntactic structures, etc.) and dynamic interferences, which are the ephemeral intrusions of the other language (as in the case of the accidental slip on the stress pattern of a word due to the stress rules of the other language, the momentary use of a syntactic structure taken from the language not being spoken, etc.).

When one of the bilingual’s languages is mastered only to a certain level of proficiency, deviations due to the person’s interlanguage (also known as within-language deviations) will also occur. These include overgeneralizations (for example, taking irregular verbs and treating them as if they were regular), simplifications (dropping pluralization and tense markers, omitting function words, simplifying the syntax, etc.) as well as hypercorrections and the avoidance of certain words and expressions. Between- and within-language deviations are clearly observable when bilinguals are in a monolingual language mode, but they also occur in the bilingual language mode (see below). It should be noted finally that both types of deviations, although sometimes quite apparent (such as a foreign accent), usually do not interfere with communication.

In the bilingual mode, bilinguals interact with one another. First they adopt a language to use together, what is known as the “base language” (also the “host” or “matrix” language). This process is called “language choice” and is governed by a number of factors: the interlocutors involved, the situation of the interaction, the content of the discourse and the function of the interaction. Language choice is a well-learned behaviour, but it is also a very complex phenomenon that only becomes apparent when it breaks down. Usually, bilinguals go through their daily interactions with other bilinguals quite unaware of the many psychological and sociolinguistic factors that interact to help choose one language over another.

Once a base language has been chosen, bilinguals can bring in the other language (the “guest” or “embedded” language) in various ways. One of these ways is to code-switch, that is to shift completely to the other language for a word, a phrase, a sentence. Sociolinguists have concentrated on when and why switching takes place in the social context. Reasons that have been put forward are to fill a linguistic need, to continue the last language used, to quote someone, to specify the addressee, to exclude someone from the conversation, to qualify a message, to specify speaker involvement, to mark group identity, to convey emotion, to change the role of the speaker, etc. Linguists, on the other hand, have sought to study the types of code-switches that occur (single words, phrases, clauses, sentences, etc.) as well as the linguistic constraints that govern their appearance. Although there is still considerable controversy over this latter aspect (Are constraints universal or language specific? How broad can a constraint be?), it is now clear that switching is not simply a haphazard behaviour due to some form of “semilingualism” but that it is, instead, a well-governed process used as a communicative strategy to convey linguistic and social information.

The other way bilinguals can bring in the other, less activated, language is to borrow a word or short expression from that language and to adapt it morphologically (and often phonologically) into the base language. Thus, unlike code-switching, which is the juxtaposition of two languages, borrowing is the integration of one language into another. Most often both the form and the content of a word are borrowed (to produce what has been called a loanword or more simply a borrowing).

A second type of borrowing, called a loanshift, consists in either taking a word in the base language and extending its meaning to correspond to that of a word in the other language, or rearranging words in the base language along a pattern provided by the other language and thus creating a new meaning.

The cultural component

As proposed by Grosjean (1983, 2008), it is possible to some extent to adapt the language mode concept to account for how biculturals behave in their everyday lives. It has not been done so far so what follows is just a brief discussion of a phenomenon that would need extended research. Thus, biculturals may find themselves at various points along a situational continuum that requires different types of behaviours and attitudes depending on the situation. At one end they are in a monocultural mode, since they are with monoculturals or with biculturals with whom they share only one culture. In this situation they must deactivate as best they can their other culture(s). At the other end of the continuum they are with other biculturals who share their cultures. With them, they will use a base culture to interact in (the behaviours, attitudes, beliefs of one culture) and they will bring in the other culture(s), in the form of cultural switches and borrowings, when they choose to. It is important to stress here that movement along the situational continuum, and the behavioural and attitudinal consequences that follow, may at times be voluntary and conscious, whereas at other times they are automatic and unconscious.

Concerning the monocultural mode, biculturals in this mode attempt to apply the motto, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do". If their knowledge of the culture in question is sufficient (a bit like having sufficient knowledge of the language that has to be used), and they manage to deactivate, at least to a large degree, their other culture(s), then they can behave appropriately through script and frame modification or switching (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2007). Thus, many biculturals will know how to adapt to such situations as welcoming monocultural acquaintances at home, holding a meeting at work, dealing with relatives who belong to just one culture, doing business with the local administration, dressing according to the context and so on. However, because of the blending component in biculturalism (see above), certain behaviours, attitudes and feelings may not be totally adapted to a situation and may instead be a mixture of the person's two (or more) cultures. This form of static cultural interference is a differentiating factor between bilingualism and biculturalism: bilinguals can usually deactivate one language and use the other exclusively in particular situations, whereas biculturals cannot always deactivate certain traits of their other culture when in a monocultural environment. Examples can be found in greeting behaviours, body language, eye contact, the amount of space to leave between yourself and the other, what to talk about (in some cultures, for example, you do not talk about salaries with people you do not know), how much to tip and so on.

At the other end of the continuum, biculturals are with other biculturals like themselves with whom they use a cultural base within which to interact (the behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, etc., of one culture) – the equivalent of language choice on the linguistic side of things. They then bring in the other culture in the form of cultural switches and borrowings when they choose to do so. This can correspond to a shift in behaviour, for example, from the base behaviour chosen for the interaction to the behaviour usually used within the other culture, sometimes simply to mark their belonging to both cultures. These are precious moments, when the bicultural person can relax and not have to worry about getting things right each time. Bicultural bilinguals often state that their good friends (or their "dream" partners) are people like them, with whom they can be totally relaxed about going back and forth between their languages and cultures.

Identity in bicultural bilinguals

Identity has been a central part in biculturalism research (see, for example, Benet-Martinez and Haritatos, 2005, and Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002, among others). Because of this, it could have been introduced at the start of this paper but it was important to discuss other aspects common to both the linguistic and the cultural components of bicultural bilinguals before coming to this issue. It was important to note, as was done at the beginning of this paper, that identity is not a central defining characteristic of biculturalism. An additional motive was to show clearly that identity is to a large extent independent of such aspects as becoming bilingual and bicultural, the wax and wane of bilingualism and biculturalism, the behaviour of bicultural bilinguals, etc. In what follows, and contrary to the other sections in this paper, we will begin with the cultural component, as identity plays a more important role in biculturalism than it does in bilingualism.

The cultural component

As Grosjean (2008) writes, a bicultural person may have to go through a long, and sometimes trying, process to be able to reach the point of saying, "I am bicultural, a member of culture A and of culture B" (or even of cultures A, B and C). This process takes into account the perception of members of the cultures involved, and integrates a number of different factors. Among these we find kinship, language, physical appearance, nationality, education, attitudes, etc. The outcome is in the form of a double categorization by others which can produce similar results (X is judged to belong solely to culture A or to culture B) or contradictory results (X is categorized as a member of culture A by members of culture B and as a member of culture B by members of culture A). Not only is this latter categorization contradictory, but it is often absolute in the sense that cultures do not readily accept that a person can be part of their culture and also part of another culture. The attitude is either "You are A" or "You are B" but rarely "You are both A and B".

Faced with this double, sometimes contradictory, categorization, biculturals have to reach a decision as to their own cultural identity. To do this they take into account the perception of the two cultures and bring in other factors, such as their personal history, their identity needs, their knowledge of the languages and cultures involved, and as Benet-Martinez (2014) adds, their own coping skills, tolerance for ambiguity (versus rigidity) and other individual factors. The outcome of this process is a decision to identify solely with culture A, to identify solely with culture B, to identify with neither culture A nor culture B, or to identify with both culture A and culture B. (These categories share some similarities with Berry's (1990) acculturation positions: assimilation, integration, separation and marginalization). Of course, the optimal solution for biculturals is to opt for the fourth alternative, that is to accept their biculturalism, but unfortunately some biculturals, influenced as they are by the categorization of the cultural groups they belong to, may choose one of the first three alternatives (A, B, neither A nor B). These solutions are seldom satisfactory as they do not truly reflect the bicultural person and they may have negative consequences later on.

Those who choose either culture A or culture B (that is, turn away from one of their two cultures) may, with time, be dissatisfied with their decision, and those who reject both cultures (neither A nor B) will often feel uprooted, marginal or ambivalent. It is striking to note the many negative terms that are used to characterize such biculturals, terms that are sometimes adopted by biculturals themselves. In addition to those just mentioned, we find rootless, nomadic, alienated, chameleon and even traitor. These qualifiers reflect the phenomenon of double exclusion from which some biculturals suffer. They wonder if the day will come when monoculturals will accept them as they are and allow them to assume their dual identity, that is, that they belong to culture A and to culture B simultaneously, while being a synthesis of the two and having their own

specificity. With time, and sometimes after a long and arduous process, many biculturals do come to terms with their biculturalism. The lucky ones may belong to a new cultural group (see the many hyphenated groups in North America, such as Mexican Americans, Italian Americans and so on) and many others, who are isolated biculturals, will ultimately navigate with a certain degree of ease between, and within, their two or more cultures. This said, the decisional process involved in choosing a cultural identity is highly complex and, unfortunately, some people never manage to identify with the two worlds they belong to.

The linguistic component

Identity concerns are not as central on the bilingualism side of things. Admittedly, as mentioned earlier, some bilinguals who hold an older view of bilingualism, that is, it is the equal and perfect knowledge of two languages, may not label themselves as bilingual even though they use two (or more) languages in their everyday lives. When this happens, they usually choose to say that they are speakers of language A and that they also know to some extent languages B, C, etc. Some may even belittle their knowledge of all their languages, but this phenomenon is relatively rare. What is common to both the cultural and the linguistic components though is that it often takes time for bicultural bilinguals to discover and accept both their biculturalism and their bilingualism. The decision is maybe easier for the linguistic aspect, especially since the scholarly definition of bilingualism (the regular use of two or more languages) is slowly making its way into the layperson's world. Hence, one will find more and more bicultural bilinguals accepting that they are indeed bilingual but still hesitant to say that they are also bicultural. But then the latter domain is relatively new in terms of research and the findings revealed by studies have not yet had time to permeate into the outside world.

The personality of bicultural bilinguals

This last part deals with a topic that is astride bilingualism and biculturalism. It examines the question of whether bicultural bilinguals have a double, or even a split, personality. Many bilinguals report that they change their attitudes and behaviours when they change language. For example, some state that they are more aggressive and more tense in one of their languages, and more reserved and gentle in the other (Grosjean, 1982, 2010).

Ervin (1964) showed experimentally that bilinguals tell different stories in their different languages when asked to relate what they see on TAT cards, that is, cards that show pictures with an ambiguous content. It is thought that when participants describe such cards, they are projecting facets of their personality, such as their feelings, attitudes and motives. Ervin's participants were French adults who had lived in the United States for an average of 12 years. Each of them took part in two sessions six weeks apart in which they were asked to describe pictures, in one language at the first session and in the other language at the second. Ervin reported that three variables showed significant language effects: verbal aggression to peers, withdrawal-anatomy and achievement. For example, during the French-language session, a woman describing a card stated that a man wanted to leave his wife, since he had found another woman he loved more. However, in the English-language session, for the same card, she stated that he was going to go to college at night and get a better job and his wife will have helped him along. In another study, which involved Japanese American women, Ervin-Tripp (1968) gave her participants sentence beginnings that they had to complete. Here again the endings were often quite different. For example, for the sentence beginning, "When my wishes conflict with my family...", the ending in Japanese was, "it is a time of great unhappiness" but in English it was, "I do what I want". The author observed that

there was much more emotion in the Japanese responses. They involved members of the family and dealt with love, unfaithfulness and loss of loved ones, whereas the English responses showed that the relationships were formal and the people were abstract and cold.

Some 40 years later, Luna et al. (2008) conducted a number of studies that were quite similar to these earlier ones. In one study, Hispanic American bilingual women students were asked to interpret target advertisements, first in one language and then, six months later, in another. The ads contained pictures of women, and they were asked questions of the type, "What is the woman in the ad doing?", "How does she feel?" and so on. The authors found that in the Spanish sessions, informants perceived women in the ads as more self-sufficient (strong, intelligent, industrious and ambitious) as well as extroverted. In the English sessions, however, they voiced a more traditional, other-dependent and family-oriented view of the women. In a second study, the participants were given a timed categorization task that showed that the associations between the category "masculine" and the category "other-dependent", on the one hand, and the category "feminine" and the category "self-sufficient", on the other, were stronger in Spanish than in English, thereby giving converging evidence for the results of the first study.

Is it possible to conclude from this evidence that there is some truth to the Czech proverb, "Learn a new language and get a new soul"? Luna et al. (2008) seem to lean that way in the first part of the title of their paper, "One individual, two identities". Grosjean (1982) proposed an alternative account keeping in mind that this can only apply, if ever, to bicultural bilinguals and not to bilinguals who are monocultural. What is seen as a change in personality is simply a shift in attitudes and behaviours corresponding to a shift in situation or context, independent of language. Basically, the bicultural bilinguals in these studies were behaving biculturally, that is, adapting to the context they were in. In fact, Ervin (1964) stated something very similar when she proposed that a shift in language is associated with a shift in social roles and emotional attitudes. She added that since each language is learned and usually employed with different persons and in different contexts (see the Complementarity Principle), the use of each language may come to be associated with a shift in a large array of behaviour.

Thus, contexts and domains trigger different attitudes, impressions and behaviours, and what is seen as a personality change due to language shift may have nothing to do with the language itself. After all, bilinguals who are monolingual also behave in this way, thereby demonstrating that it is not a switch in language that triggers behavioural and attitudinal changes. In sum, it is the environment and the interlocutors together that cause bicultural bilinguals to change attitudes, feelings and behaviours (along with language), and not their language as such. Thus, there does not seem to be a direct causal relationship between language and personality. This said, a lot needs to be done on how bicultural bilinguals behave – similarly or differently – in culture A and in culture B, in a monocultural mode and when intermixing their cultures in a bicultural mode (see above).

Conclusion

In this paper we have examined a number of themes that pertain to bicultural bilinguals, most notably how such people are described in the literature, how they become who they are, as well as the wax and wane of their languages and cultures. Other aspects discussed concern their linguistic and cultural behaviour as bicultural bilinguals, how they identify themselves both linguistically and culturally, as well as their personality as bicultural bilinguals.

The study of bicultural bilinguals from a linguistic and a cultural point of view, but also as unique entities, is a challenge for this century. Despite the fact that we are starting to understand the linguistic and the cultural components of these individuals, very little work has been done so far to describe the combined linguistic and cultural ensemble that is at the heart of who they are.

Bicultural bilinguals are not simply the sum of two (or more) different languages, or of two (or more) distinct cultures. They have their own linguistic and cultural competence that is different from that of bilinguals who are not bicultural and from that of biculturals who are not bilingual. Hopefully descriptive, experimental and theoretical studies in the future will allow us to better appraise bicultural bilinguals as they are – complete and unique linguistic and cultural beings.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Dr Veronica Benet-Martínez as well as an anonymous reviewer for their insightful comments on an earlier version of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

- Benet-Martínez, V. (2012). Multiculturalism: Cultural, personality, and social processes. In K. Deaux, & M. Snyder (Eds.), *Handbook of personality and social psychology*. Oxford, UK/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural Identity Integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, *73*, 1015–1049.
- Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame-switching in biculturals with ‘oppositional’ vs. ‘compatible’ cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*, 492–516.
- Berry, J. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives, Current theory and research in motivation, Vol. 37* (pp. 201–234). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ervin, S. (1964). Language and TAT content in bilinguals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *68*, 500–507.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1968). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 192–211). The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.
- Gordon, R. (2005; Ed.). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, 15th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1983). Quelques réflexions sur le biculturalisme. *Pluriel*, *36*, 81–91.
- Grosjean, F. (1994). Individual bilingualism. In R. Asher (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 1656–1660). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1997). The bilingual individual. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, *2*, 163–87.
- Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual’s language modes. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages: bilingual language processing* (pp. 1–22). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Grosjean, F. (2008). The bicultural person: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean (Ed.), *Studying bilinguals* (pp. 213–220). Oxford, UK/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2012). An attempt to isolate, and then differentiate, transfer and interference. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *16*, 11–21.
- Grosjean, F. (2013). Bilingualism: A short introduction. In F. Grosjean, & P. Li (Eds.), *The psycholinguistics of bilingualism* (pp. 5–25). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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.

- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395–412.
- Luna, D., Ringberg, T., & Peracchio, L. (2008). One individual, two identities: Frame switching among biculturals. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35, 279–293.
- Mackey, W. (1962). The description of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 71, 51–85.
- Nguyen, A.-M., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2007). Biculturalism unpacked: Components, measurement, individual differences, and outcomes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 101–114.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Soffietti, J. (1960). Bilingualism and biculturalism. *The Modern Language Journal*, 44, 275–277.
- Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.
- Yip, V., & Matthews, S. (2007). *The bilingual child: Early development and language contact*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Author biography

François Grosjean is Professor Emeritus of Psycholinguistics at Neuchâtel University, Switzerland. His publications on bilingualism include four books: *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism* (1982), *Studying Bilinguals* (2008), *Bilingual: Life and Reality* (2010) and *The Psycholinguistics of Bilingualism* (with Ping Li; 2013). He is a Founding Editor of the journal *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*.