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As the seventh in the series, this annual review of research on Asian American psychology focused on the 332 articles that were identified by PsycINFO as being published in 2015 and that met the inclusion criteria established by prior reviews. Consistent with prior annual reviews, these articles were coded for 4 domain themes: study topic, methodology, participant characteristics (i.e., ethnicity), and age range/developmental period of the sample. In addition to presenting a brief summary of our coding results, we also present a more detailed synthesis and evaluation of empirical work centered around the distinctive status of Asian Americans as members of cultural, immigrant, and minority groups. Trends and patterns in the field and concrete suggestions for future research are discussed throughout the review. A discussion of limitations of our review is also provided.
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Over the last several decades, the study of Asian Americans has exponentially grown in both number and scope. As reported in the inaugural annual review of research on Asian American psychology for the *Asian American Journal of Psychology* (AAJP; Kim, Wong, & Maffini, 2010), there were zero PsycINFO citations using the search term “Asian American” with a publication year before 1970. Our own PsycINFO search of peer-reviewed articles on “Asian Americans” revealed only 45 citations from 1970–1979 and 180 in the 1980s. Over a fourfold increase was found in the 1990s, with 817 citations from 1990–1999. Scholarship doubled at the turn of the century with 1,825 citations from 2000–2009. The number of citations found within the period of 2010 to 2016 (to date, with a search conducted in May, 2016) has already exceeded the prior decade with 2,063 hits.

Recognizing the need for a scholarly resource devoted to the study of Asian Americans in the face of such growth in empirical work, the first issue of the AAJP was introduced in 2009. Over its short period of circulation thus far, the scholarly impact of the AAJP has ranged from 1.39 to 1.75, which is comparable to long-established journals such as *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* (CDEMP) and *Families, Systems, and Health*. Currently, the AAJP is also ranked 4th of 15 ethnic studies category journals (Kim, 2016). With such professional repute, the AAJP is well-poised to provide a yearly review of the state of the research on Asian Americans.

AAJPs tradition of annual reviews was inspired, in part, by Leong and Okazaki’s (2009) seminal article on the history of Asian American psychology published in CDEMP. Before the more recent upsurge in Asian American research, reviews were conducted about every decade. This practice seemed reasonable because the overall scholarship targeting Asian Americans was still relatively scarce. However, there is now great utility in not only having a venue to disseminate annual reviews, but in also conducting reviews more often due to the sheer amount of work that is being produced. The overarching goal of these annual reviews, as originally described by Kim et al. (2010), is to provide a forum whereby theory and research can be critically summarized, consolidated, and synthesized to guide future research, which is especially crucial as the size of the empirical literature on Asian Americans continually increases. The benefit of such reviews can also be seen in their highlighting of emerging areas, limitations in the field, and opportunities to fill literature gaps and drive new research directions.

As members of the steering committee of the Society for Research in Child Development Asian Caucus, we welcome the
opportunity to present the 7th article in the series, in which we review empirical articles published in 2015. The Asian Caucus is an interdisciplinary organization whose affiliates are dedicated to the positive development and well-being of Asian children, families, and communities. Our mission is to support the career development of Asian researchers and to promote research with Asian Americans that reflects cultural and ethnic sensitivity, development in context, and diversity across Asian subgroups. The Asian Caucus was launched in 2007, roughly corresponding with the increased ethnic diversity in the field and the boom in focused research and scholarship targeting Asian Americans.

As in the tradition of prior annual reviews, we begin by discussing general trends in article topics and content, as well as study methodology and sample characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, age). We then follow the recommendations of prior reviews and, rather than providing descriptive summaries of this year’s research, we hope to engage readers with a synthesis of the literature organized around three broad areas of scholarship that reflect the uniqueness of the Asian American population itself. More specifically, historically, as well as in current contexts of development, Asian Americans must navigate their simultaneous social statuses as members of a cultural group, an immigrant group, and an ethnic minority group. In order to fully understand the social and psychological experiences of Asian Americans, it is important to study and recognize how these statuses intersect and influence the daily lives of Asian Americans.

As a cultural group, Asian Americans have many diverse options with which to identify—national origin, broader pan-ethnic culture, incorporating “American” in their conceptualizations. Culture is also highly individualized and imbued with personal meaning, representing very broad processes or ones that are quite specific. With this backdrop in mind, we highlight articles that speak to Asian Americans as a unique cultural group, which naturally address issues of acculturation, generation, cultural identity, and correlates of individuals’ cultural values, ideologies, and behaviors.

Asian American development is also embedded in issues of migration, which includes generational and documentation status, premigration circumstances and subsequent social mobility in the United States, acculturation and cultural adjustment processes, and transnationalism. In our review, we discuss important themes to consider in light of the potentially stressful immigration circumstances of Asian Americans and pay particular attention to highlighting research that has focused on Asian Americans as an immigrant group.

The cultural and community contexts of Asian American development have been historically embedded among elements of oppression, racism, and discrimination, and Asian Americans remain members of a minority group despite their exponential increase in population size. These experiences have ranged from historical policies banning immigration to perceived discrimination experiences to being stereotyped as a model minority to modern-day microaggressions. Our review pays particular attention to the empirical articles that build on the understanding of how different forms of racism continue to affect Asian Americans today.

Notably, the contexts and consequences of these statuses—cultural, immigrant, and minority—have been recently discussed in light of developmental science through a series of articles recently released by Child Development. In this Special Section on Asian American Child Development, an introduction to key issues (Tseng et al., 2016), historical analysis (Kiang et al., 2016), theoretical model (Mistry et al., 2016), and best practices in conducting research with Asian Americans (Yoshikawa et al., 2016) are provided. We draw on the concepts presented in these articles as a framework for our discussion, and refer to them throughout our review.

Taken together, our hope is that a discussion and commentary centered on the themes of Asian Americans as cultural, immigrant, and minority group members will allow and inspire readers to identify trends, challenges, and opportunities to develop meaningful research directions that will fill existing gaps and continue to build scholarship and knowledge. To facilitate this, we include concrete recommendations for future directions and outline key issues to consider in future research. We conclude our analysis with a more general discussion of limitations of an annual review and suggestions for future reviews, incorporating broader ideas of how to move this young, burgeoning field forward even further.

Method

Initial Search

Following procedures established by prior annual reviews, we identified articles published between January through December of 2015 using the EBSCO host platform and the online database PsycINFO. Hence, our focus was on research published in predominately psychological journals. We used the exact search term “Asian American” in the “All Text” category and “2015” was typed into the “Year of Publication” category. We also refined the search to only peer-reviewed journals. Articles that were published in print or through advanced online publication were included. This search was first conducted on December 16, 2015 and resulted in 321 articles. As implemented by Juan et al. (2012), and also followed by Yeh et al. (2013); Wei, Carrera, and Li (2014), and Kim et al. (2015), we conducted additional searches using terms that reflect specific Asian American ethnic groups (e.g., Chinese American, Filipino American, and South Asian American). As done in more recent reviews starting with Yeh et al. (2013), we also incorporated search terms such as “Pacific Islander,” “Samoaan,” and “Hawaiian.” Our approach in searching for specific subgroups yielded an additional 298 articles for a total of 619 articles to code for possible inclusion from our initial search of the literature. On February 9 and April 15 of 2016, we conducted identical searches for new articles catalogued in the database which resulted in an additional 325 to consider for inclusion. We also introduced additional search terms including “immigrant” and “refugee” (e.g., South Asian immigrant, Chinese immigrant, and Hmong refugee) and uncovered 105 unique citations to consider for inclusion in our review. As recommended by Kim et al. (2015), we decided to forego the secondary author search that some prior reviews have done, due to the amount of effort for little gain in identifying additional, unique articles.

Notably, our literature search was limited to the access provided by the online platform that was available to us, namely, EBSCO. As Kim et al. (2015) discussed, there could be differences in the articles uncovered depending on the particular search engine that is used (e.g., EBSCO vs. ProQuest vs. OvidSP). We did find some inconsistencies when we attempted to replicate the searches of...
prior reviews. For instance, our search for articles resembled Kim et al.’s (2010), but underestimated the results from later reviews in the series. In consultation with one of the reference librarians in the first author’s university, it is likely that these differences were due, in part, to differences in how various search engines conduct the actual search. For instance, EBSCO PsycINFO uses a Boolean phrase search to identify multiple-word phrases together. In OvidSP, however, a search for “Asian American” would find the two words separately as well as together, which could produce more results, but with many that might not be relevant. Our sense is that EBSCO is likely the most specific and on-target with the goals of the annual review, but possible underinclusion of articles is noted as a limitation.

Inclusion in Review

Consistent with other AJPP reviews, we read the abstracts of the 1,146 articles that emerged from our search, as well as the full text when necessary, to determine whether they should be included in our analysis. The following criteria, originally established by Kim et al. (2010) were used: (a) publication in a peer-reviewed journal, (b) report on an empirical study (including quantitative and/or qualitative methods), and (c) a focus on Asian Americans. We used a broad definition of “Asian American” as including individuals of East, Southeast, and/or South Asian descent living in the United States (including Asian internationals and sojourners). Literature reviews and theoretical articles were excluded. A study was identified as having a focus on Asian Americans if (a) the majority of its participants were Asian American, (b) it included at least one research question focusing exclusively on Asian Americans, or (c) it included at least one research question comparing Asian Americans with another racial or ethnic group. Hence, we did not include articles in which ethnicity was used as a control variable, if research questions did not pertain to Asian Americans, if Asian Americans were aggregated with other ethnic minorities, or if articles were interested in racial or ethnic differences without specifically identifying Asian Americans as a group of interest in the research questions or hypotheses. As in other reviews (e.g., Kim et al., 2010; Okazaki, Kaseem, & Tan, 2011), we excluded articles that focused exclusively on Asian Americans residing in Canada. We also excluded articles published in non-English language journals.

A coding team composed of the first author and four research assistants (two undergraduate, two Masters-level) independently coded the articles to determine inclusion in the review. Of the articles that were initially identified, 332 met the criteria for inclusion. Reliability of coding for inclusion based on a subset of identified articles (approximately 5%) reached 93% agreement. Coding discrepancies were resolved by the first author or by group discussion and consensus. Typically, sources of disagreement were related to whether an article was truly empirical (e.g., review articles) or whether it focused on Asian Americans (e.g., erroneously including an article for inclusion if it focused on Asians, but not Asian Americans).

Domain Coding of Included Articles

Upon identifying the 332 articles for inclusion in this review (please see the Appendix for a list of included articles), we categorized each one in light of four domains: (a) topic area, (b) research design, (c) participant characteristics (i.e., ethnicity), and (d) age range/development period. The same coders who coded for articles to consider for inclusion in the review also conducted the domain coding. To establish coding reliability, all of the coding domains for a random subset of articles (approximately 10%) were coded by at least two coders. Any discrepancies were resolved by the first author or by group discussion and consensus.

In the previous year’s annual review, Kim et al. (2015) introduced a new coding domain, namely, target population of the primary topic. We appreciate their rationale in doing so given that descriptive information regarding articles that have focused on specific populations could be overshadowed by primary topic information (e.g., a study examining women and breast cancer might be assigned the primary topic of Health rather than Women, and not fully represent the scope of the field). As recommended, we did code for target population. However, given that the eight target population categories (i.e., youth, women, men, LGBTQ, adoptees, immigrants and refugees, families, and older adults) completely overlap with some of the topic area categories, we felt that presenting data from our target population codes would be somewhat redundant. For example, the same six articles that were identified as pertaining to Men and Masculinity as a topic area were also identified as having a target population of men. That said, only one of these six articles had Men and Masculinity assigned as its Primary Topic. Hence, we urge readers to examine not only the trends related to Primary Topic, but also the nonmutually exclusive topic categorizations in evaluating current research developments. We identify the eight target population categories that were coded by Kim et al. (2015) and in the current review when presenting our results regarding topic area codes.

Topic area. We coded each article’s topic area(s) by using categories established by prior reviews. Topic categories that were originated by Kim et al. (2010) were based broadly on the chapter topics listed in the second edition of the Handbook of Asian American Psychology (Leong et al., 2007) and, in subsequent reviews, some categories have been revised and added. We accumulated all prior work and coded for the following 26 topics (in alphabetical order): Acculturation and Enculturation; Adoptees; Career; Cognition; Counseling and Clinical Issues, such as help-seeking and service utilization, cultural competence of therapists, and interventions; Educational Experiences, including preschool, primary and secondary school, and higher education; Families, including parenting practices, parent–child or family relationships, cultural conflict, family therapy, and partner violence; Health and Health-Related Behaviors, which includes subtopics such as cancer screening and management, substance use, Hepatitis B, dietary habits and obesity prevention, sexual behaviors, general health status, insurance issues, health assessments, and maternal/women’s health; Identity; Immigrants and Refugees; Interpersonal Relationships; LGBTQ: Measurement and Methodology; Media; Men and Masculinity; Older Adults; Personality; Politics; Psychopathology, including depressive symptoms, suicide and suicide ideation, and other psychopathology issues; Racism; Spirituality; Stress and Coping; Violence; Women; and Youths. A category of Miscellaneous was used for articles that did not fall neatly into any existing themes.

Prior reviews have varied in coding for each article’s primary topic only, or coding for primary topics as well as secondary ones.
Our approach essentially resembled the prior efforts that have coded for multiple topics. Although we did not assign secondary topics to the articles, per se, we did code for topics in a nonmutually exclusive manner, as initiated by Kim et al. (2010). This approach, we felt, could provide the most inclusive information regarding the scope of topics that the 2015 literature reflects. The number of articles listed in Table 1, therefore, exceeds the total number of articles that were included in the review. In addition, consistent with Wei et al. (2014) and others, a single code was used to reflect the primary topic of each article. Primary topic coding was based on the article’s overall conceptual model, research questions, the key outcomes or dependent variables of interest, and, in some cases, the publication source. These codes for primary topic are reflected in the parentheses in Table 1. Coders reached 95% agreement in primary topic coding.

Research design. Following in the tradition of prior reviews, we coded whether each study incorporated quantitative, qualitative, experimental, or mixed methodology. Like Kim et al. (2015), we further identified whether quantitative studies were cross-sectional or longitudinal. Hence, we used the following five categories: (a) correlational using cross-sectional data, (b) correlational using longitudinal data, (c) experimental, which included true experimental or laboratory designs using random assignment as well as quasi-experimental designs with intervention and comparison groups, (d) qualitative, which included studies using focus groups, case studies, and interviews, and (e) mixed methods, where both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed. The coding for this domain was not mutually exclusive. For instance, an article reporting on multiple studies that used different methodologies could be coded for multiple categories. The average agreement across coders for research design was 96%.

Participant characteristics (i.e., ethnicity). The first five annual reviews presented age as part of the domain of participant characteristics. However, as stated below, the sixth review by Kim et al. (2015) added a more nuanced system of coding for both age as well as developmental period. To better organize the presentation of these codes, we focus our discussion of participant characteristics on the ethnicity of the samples, and present age as part of a separate domain. In term of ethnicity, and largely consistent with prior reviews, the following ethnic groups were identified and coded: Chinese, Korean, Filipino, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Asian Indian. Other less-represented groups included Taiwanese, Pakistani, Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Bangladesh, Sri Lankan, Indonesian, Thai, Malaysian, Multiethnic Asian (within Asian groups), and Biracial/multiracial. As recommended by Kim et al. (2015), we did not code for “Muslim” because of its complex nature of representing both a cultural and/or religious group. Presumably, all of the articles that were reviewed included “Asian Americans” in the sample; hence, we tried to use this coding category only if there was no mention of specific Asian American subethnicities in the article itself. Notably, some of the prior reviews might have used the “Other Asian” category in a similar manner. Furthermore, several articles in the current review used pan-ethnic descriptors that were specific to a particular region (e.g., South Asian). These instances were also recorded. The coding for the ethnicity domain was also not mutually exclusive, and an average 94% coding agreement was reached.

Age ranges/developmental period. As done by Kim et al. (2015) in the latest and most developmentally focused annual review, we coded for both age range (0–17 years, 18–25, 26–64, over 65 years) and the following eight developmental periods: Infants and Toddlers (0–2 years), Early Childhood (3–4 years), Middle Childhood (5–9 years), Adolescence (10–17 years), Emerging Adults (18–25 years), Early Adulthood (26–39 years), Middle-Aged Adults (40–64 years), and Older Adults (65 and older). Articles that did not specify the age or developmental period of the sample were indicated as such. The coding was based on the target population of the primary topic (e.g., a study focusing on preschool development using mother report would be categorized as focusing on preschoolers). The coding was not mutually exclusive. However, to capture the spirit of the article, a particular study that focused on issues related to college students or emerging adults, for example, but that might have included some participants under the age of 18 would have been coded as focusing on 18–25 year olds and on Emerging Adults as the developmental period. We also coded for whether the sample focused on college or noncollege student populations, as has been the convention in all reviews to date. On average, coders reached 85% agreement for this coding domain.

Results

To maintain consistency with prior reviews, our first set of results center on describing basic trends and patterns in the topics, study design, and sample characteristics of studies that were included for review. We then provide a deeper review and synthesis of the empirical work that is relevant to the unique characteristics of Asian Americans as members of cultural, immigrant, and minority groups.

Topic Area

Although the nuanced differences in coding procedures used in prior reviews hinders a systematic evaluation of trends over time, some general patterns can be described. When examining the nonmutually exclusive topic codes, issues related to social development and cultural adjustment are particularly prevalent. For example, topics of Immigration and Refugees, Acculturation, Identity, Families, and Interpersonal Relationships are frequently represented, perhaps especially among Youths as an additional topical category. Research on Educational Experiences is also noteworthy in number. However, many of the studies did not focus on these topics as the primary category, which suggests that much of the literature examines these issues of immigration, acculturation, or family in relation to another key topic, such as Health or Health-Related Behaviors, which continues to dominate the field.

Arranged alphabetically, we provide a brief, thumbnail sketch of the types of articles that were grouped into each topic area. Table 1 tabulates the overall prevalence of each coded topic, also arranged alphabetically, alongside the frequencies found in prior reviews. Numbers in parentheses represent the number of articles with the topic as its primary classification. To facilitate comparisons across yearly reviews, percentages of article representation within each topic area were calculated based on primary topic assignments. Table 1, as well as other tables in this article, also include the particular articles that were coded in each category. Readers are encouraged to look more closely at the individual articles included in this review, which are numbered and identified in the reference list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation and Enculturation</td>
<td>31 (8)</td>
<td>21 (10)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52 (11)</td>
<td>37, 51, 82, 113, 137, 146, 193, 206, 263, 264, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptees</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4* (1)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Clinical Issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24 (20)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39 (16)</td>
<td>12, 30, 41, 47, 83, 122, 149, 191, 194, 200, 235, 236, 274, 276, 284, 322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Experiences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>211, 252, 302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27 (19)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17 (10)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants and Refugees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79* (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4* (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and Methodology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6* (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Masculinity</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldier Adults</td>
<td>16 (0)</td>
<td>15 (10)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28* (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49 (44)</td>
<td>36 (26)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism and Discrimination</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32 (24)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
As shown in Table 1, 52 articles were coded with Acculturation as a topic, but only 11 were assigned this topic as its primary classification, which suggests that many of the studies that do touch on acculturation are likely examining it as a predictor of other outcomes, such as Health or Education. These 11 articles tested models and frameworks of acculturation, or focused on acculturation constructs as key outcome variables. For example, parent–child acculturation profiles were examined by S. Y. Kim et al. (2015), and acculturation frameworks were central to Londhe (2015) and to Salo and Birman’s (2015).

There was only one article that dealt primarily with Adoptees, and this was a study comparing developmental delays among adopted Chinese twins and same-age unrelated adopted siblings (Segal et al., 2015). There were three additional studies that examined adoptees, but were classified elsewhere because of relevance to other topics.

Three articles focused primarily on Careers, one examining Asian Americans in STEM and health care fields (Min & Jang, 2015), another focusing on employment among the older population (Rhee et al., 2015), and a third studying mental health and work performance among Chinese immigrant food-service workers (Tsai & Thompson, 2015).

The seven articles in the Cognition category studied cognitive processes and attitudes (e.g., parenting cognitions, math skills, and problem solving). For example, Wang et al. (2015) examined autobiographical memory functioning among adults and children, and Ng et al. (2015) investigated inhibitory control and math schools among Chinese and other ethnically diverse children.

The 19 articles that were assigned the primary topic of Counseling and Clinical Issues mostly dealt with help-seeking attitudes and service utilization. For example, Thikeo, Florin, and Ng (2015) examined over 100 immigrants and refugees from Laos and Cambodia to uncover barriers to help-seeking and possible associations with acculturation and other demographic factors. Several articles also focused on evaluating the effectiveness of therapeutic programs. Notable examples are Kim-Goh et al. (2015) and Bernstein et al. (2015) who each reported on studies examining culturally adapted clinical and counseling interventions.

There were 16 articles that focused on Educational Experiences and these typically dealt with specific educational features (e.g., ethnic student organizations, experiences at historically Black colleges and universities), or the role of classrooms, teachers, and educational structures in Asian Americans’ achievement and success. Notably, one study by Smith and Maton (2015) used data from a national survey conducted by a task force developed by the American Psychological Association to examine higher education experiences among multiracial Asian American youth.

We identified 15 articles focusing on Families, which largely investigated issues such as parent–child relationships, parenting, marital relationships in general and interracial marriage in particular, as well as family support for populations with breast cancer or unintended pregnancy. For example, issues of language and communication were examined in various ways within the context of the family (Kim, Lee, & Lee, 2015; Tili & Barker, 2015; Yu, Cheah, & Sun, 2015).

The largest category, Health and Health-Related Behaviors, included 102 articles. These studies encompassed areas including...
general health and healthy behaviors (e.g., physical activities),
cancer treatment and screening, dietary health and eating disor-
ders, Body Mass Index (BMI) and obesity, diabetes and heart
diseases, substance use (e.g., drinking, smoking, and nonmedicinal
prescription drug use), and HIV. Research also investigated health
issues in vulnerable populations, including dementia and Alzhei-
mer’s among the older population, as well as breast cancer and
screening and HPV among women. Only one study examined
puberty development among youth (Tan & Camras, 2015).

There were 18 studies on Identity, which investigated identity
in general (e.g., self-esteem, sense of belonging, meaning in life)
and ethnic/racial identity in particular in both adolescent and adult
populations. One notable study examined intersecting identities of
sex and race/ethnicity (Haavind et al., 2015).

The five articles on Immigrants and Refugees examined the
economic and health consequences among immigrants and refu-
gees, as well as living conditions for immigrant workers from high
(e.g., engineering/technology industries) and low socioeconomic
backgrounds (e.g., dry cleaners; Lee, Chaudhuri, & Yoo, 2015;
Thomas & Ong, 2015). One study used large-scale data from the
American Community Survey to examine postmigration contexts
among Asian Americans (Flippen & Kim, 2015).

Interpersonal Relationships was identified for 13 articles,
covering topics such as the physical and psychological correlates
of social support and social networks in general, as well as inter-
cultural/interracial relationships among adults and cross-ethnic
friendships among adolescents. Two studies used network analysis
to investigate international communication (Corlew et al., 2015)
and mobile communication (Lee & Katz, 2015).

Among the four articles on LGTBQ, one investigated family
acceptance for this population (Ngo & Kwon, 2015), whereas the
others focused on the vulnerability of having multiple minority
statuses (e.g., gender, ethnic/racial minority, and sexual minority;
e.g., Sandil et al., 2015).

The 12 articles on Measurement and Methods examined a
variety of scales (e.g., health screening, work attitudes, gender
role, acculturation, and identity) from multiple perspectives, in-
cluding translation, reliability and validity, and measurement in-
variance. In relation to research methods, one article proposed a
longitudinal, transnational study of migrants using a dual-cohort
design (Gee et al., 2015), whereas another article discussed the use
of narrative research in understanding development (Wang et al.,
2015).

There were no studies that were assigned a primary code of
Media, and only one article that dealt with this topic at even the
secondary level (Cheng, McDermott, Wong, & La, 2016).

The three articles on Men and Masculinity examined the
-cultural and social determinants (e.g., cultural values, experiences
of discrimination) and health consequences (e.g., drinking behav-
ior) of gender stereotypes. For example, a study conducted by
Cuddy et al. (2015) focused on the association between cultural
values and gender stereotypes among Korean, American, and
Korean American men.

Seventeen articles were identified for Older Adults. These
studies typically investigated factors associated with the older
population’s physical and mental health, such as neighborhood
environment, socioeconomic factors, social support, and individ-
ual factors (e.g., coping, function limitation, and sleep problems).
One study examined the response biases among the older popula-
tion in reporting their psychological well-being (Kim et al., 2015).
Another study evaluated the educational programs of aging in
online and in-class forms (Jang et al., 2015).

The eight studies on Personality investigated perfectionism,
affective experiences, intrinsic motivations, and individualism ver-
sus collectivism among Asian Americans. One examined Asian
Americans’ response bias in personality assessment (Chang &
Smith, 2015).

Politics was identified for only one study (Na et al., 2015),
which compared competence judgments based on face appearance
in American and Korean elections.

There were 20 studies on Psychopathology. Most of these
studies examined risk and protective factors for a variety of psy-
chopathology symptoms, including psychological distress, depres-
sion, suicide, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and gambling
(e.g., Chan, Zane, Wong, & Song, 2015). Some studies investi-
gated stigma associated with mental health issues such as depres-
sion, schizophrenia, and psychosis (e.g., Cheng et al., 2015). Two
studies examined mental health service use and help-seeking be-
haviors (e.g., Han & Pong, 2015).

We identified 16 studies on Racism. The majority of these
studies examined the predictors and psychological consequences
of perceived racial/ethnic discrimination. A few studies investi-
gated model minority stereotypes and microaggressions (e.g., Ki-
ang et al., 2016; Nadal et al., 2015). One article investigated Asian
American adolescents’ discrimination experiences using a
narrative-linguistic approach (Kiang & Bhattacharjee, 2016).

The three studies on Spirituality examined spirituality as a
promotive factor for family and individual well-being, particularly
in the context of racism and discrimination (e.g., Kim, Kendall, &

Twelve studies were coded with a primary topic of Stress and
Coping. Many of these articles centered on social support as a
resiliency factor, as well as more general coping strategies (e.g.,
Guo, Li, Liu, & Sun, 2015; Li et al., 2015). Stressors in question
tended to stem from immigrant experiences and social stress (e.g.,
social anxiety, perceived discrimination).

There were seven studies on Violence, which investigated the
cultural and racial/ethnic factors associated with various forms of
violence, such as child abuse (Xiao & Smith-Prince, 2015), inti-
mate partner violence (Kim & Sung, 2016), sexual abuse (Koo et
al., 2015), and peer victimization (Hishimuma et al., 2015).

The seven articles on Women covered topics such as gender
roles (Abrams et al., 2016), child birth and care activities (Ed-
monds et al., 2015), postpartum depression (Ta Park et al., 2015),
and cervical cancer screening (H. Y. Lee et al., 2015).

Two articles were identified for the Youth category. One ex-
amined contextual predictors of youth problem behaviors (Davis et
al., 2015), and the other evaluated a two-arm, randomized, con-
trolled program which aimed to improve child diet and physical
activity and prevent excess weight gain (Novotny et al., 2015).

The Miscellaneous category included 10 studies that did not
seem to fit well with any of the prior topics. These articles
examined perceptions of police and community supervision of
offenders, multiculturalism and intercultural encounters, emotion
recognition, consumer behaviors, and business and innovation
(e.g., Chu & Song, 2015; H. E. Lee, 2015).
Research Design

Methodologically, correlational or quantitative designs continue to dominate (67.9%). Last year’s review was the first to further distinguish between cross-sectional and longitudinal designs and, consistent with Kim et al.’s (2015) findings, the vast majority of correlational research was based on cross-sectional data (see Table 2). An interesting find was that the proportion of studies represented across the major methodological approaches that were coded for appears relatively stable since the start of these annual reviews with, perhaps, a slight increase in experimental and mixed methods designs. One possible explanation for this trend is a greater emphasis on intervention and prevention programs targeting Asian Americans. Indeed, a quick search of the term “intervention” in the titles of the 316 articles included in the 2014 review revealed 8 articles, whereas 13 articles were found in the current review. Within this year’s review, in addition to a relatively small number of longitudinal studies, there was also a dearth of research using more sophisticated designs such as experience sampling methods. Our search only resulted in one such study (Sims et al., 2015). Given the increasing number of studies on Asian Americans, more work synthesizing the existing literature could be especially informative, such as in meta-analyses, of which we found only one 2015 study (Krieg & Xu, 2015). However, many notable studies in 2015 made important scientific contributions using more sophisticated designs such as experience sampling methods. Our search only resulted in one such study (Sims et al., 2015). Given the increasing number of studies on Asian Americans, more work synthesizing the existing literature could be especially informative, such as in meta-analyses, of which we found only one 2015 study (Krieg & Xu, 2015). However, many notable studies in 2015 made important scientific contributions using more sophisticated designs such as experience sampling methods. Our search only resulted in one such study (Sims et al., 2015).

Participant Characteristics (i.e., Ethnicity)

In terms of ethnicity, research continues to predominantly focus on Asian Americans from East Asian backgrounds, in particular, those with Chinese and Korean ancestry (see Table 3). Notable trends include an increase in the relative proportion of studies focusing on individuals with Taiwanese ancestry, as well as from some Southeast Asian backgrounds such as Laotian, Hmong, and Thai. There was also an increase in empirical work on bicultural or multicultural Asian Americans. One caveat, however, is that it is unclear whether any shifts in trends are because of actual differences in empirical focus over time, whether the differences rest in authors’ more detailed reporting of participants, or whether there is a methodological departure away from pan-ethnic samples and greater recognition of the need to study as well as to report Asian American samples as a highly heterogeneous group. Close to 10% of studies continue to focus on and/or describe a broad, pan-ethnic Asian American sample.

We also note a lack of studies using nationally representative samples of Asian Americans. We identified only six studies in 2015 that used nationally representative samples from projects such as the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS), National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC), Add Health, and Pew Research Center Asian American Surveys. These few studies often used a pan-ethnic label (e.g., NLAAS, NESARC) without further distinctions of ethnic variations. Recent methodological recommendations for studies of Asian American children and youth have called for more representation of Asian Americans in large scale studies, and oversampling of specific Asian groups, especially those underrepresented in the extant literature (Yoshikawa et al., 2016). Our review of the 2015 literature confirms this need, as well as more explicit recognition of Asian heritage subgroups when possible.

Age Ranges/Developmental Period

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, several age-related trends can be observed when examining sample characteristics over time. First, there seems to be a general increase in research focusing on older populations (single digit proportions to double digits in 2014 and 2015). This is an important trend given the general increase in the aged demographic, nationwide. Proportions representing other age ranges have fluctuated small amounts from 2009 to 2015. Samples focusing on children, or those age 17 or younger, continue to be underrepresented in the field. When comparing the more detailed developmental periods introduced by Kim et al. (2015), there appears to be a slight increase in research focusing on childhood (e.g., before the age of 10), which seems fitting considering that almost a quarter of the more

Table 2
Number and Proportion of Articles by Study Design Across Annual Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: Correlational</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectional*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: True or quasi-experimental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles reviewed</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a These categories were new for the 2014 review.  
*b Meta-analysis.  
These numbers were summed up for three topic areas (Health and Health-Related Behaviors, Immigrants and Refugees, and Racism and Discrimination).
### Table 3

**Number and Proportion of Articles by Ethnicity Across Annual Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asians</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi or Multi Racial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian/Mien</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montagnard</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cham</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawan</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than 18 million Asian Americans are younger than age 18 (Hoeffel et al., 2012), and a slight decrease in the proportions of samples representing adolescents and adults. The numbers, overall, are quite similar, however. We also compared across the different age groups by research design and participant characteristics (see Table 6). Studies on children and youth (age 17 or younger) are most likely to adopt a longitudinal perspective (24% of studies on this age group) compared with other age groups (6–7% of studies on other groups).

Thematic Synthesis of Empirical Work

We organize a more detailed discussion of some of the 2015 reviewed articles around the cultural, immigrant, and minority statuses with which Asian Americans must contend. Although the specific cultural heritages of the pan-ethnic Asian American population are extraordinarily diverse, Asian Americans do share similar cultural values, and the negotiation of such cultural values and background must be reconciled with the mainstream U.S. culture through the process of acculturation and immigration. Experiences of immigration around issues of pre- and postmigration status, stress, socioeconomic status (SES), and documentation are also important to consider. Despite the fact that Asians have been in the United States for many generations, as well as their more recent growth in number, many face the burden of being cast as a “perpetual foreigner” and, thus, must also navigate their status as an ethnic minority. The following discussion highlights notable scholarship from 2015 that touches on these key issues. Given that the experiences of culture, immigration, and minority status are oftentimes intertwined, some topics (e.g., acculturation, generation, and identity) are discussed in multiple sections and in multifaceted ways.

Asian Americans as a cultural group. Asian Americans are referred to as a group of individuals with Asian ancestry who share similar cultural worldviews and values. In considering Asian Americans’ experiences as a cultural group, we focused on articles in which the author(s) addressed some aspect of these individuals’ cultural values, ideologies, and behaviors, including processes of acculturation, immigration, and identity.

Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singaporean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taidam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles reviewed</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers were summed up for three topic areas (Health and Health-Related Behaviors, Immigrants and Refugees, and Racism and Discrimination). ** Presumably, all of the articles reviewed targeted Asian Americans in their sampling strategy. The specific category of “Asian American” was, therefore, reserved for articles that did not otherwise indicate any specific subethnicities. Upon request, an index of articles that were assigned to each category can be provided.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample characteristics</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-college</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤17 years old</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25 years old</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–64 years old</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥65 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not provided/available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles reviewed</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers were summed up for three topic areas (Health and Health-Related Behaviors, Immigrants and Refugees, and Racism and Discrimination). Upon request, an index of articles that were assigned to each category can be provided.
Table 5
Age and Developmental Period of Study Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age and developmental period (introduced by Kim et al., 2015)</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 0–35 months (0–2 years) (infants and toddlers)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36–59 months (3–4 years) (early childhood)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5–9 years (middle childhood)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 10–17 years (adolescence)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18–25 years (emerging adults)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26–39 years (early adulthood)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 40–64 years (middle-aged adults)</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 years and older (older adults)</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or not provided</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles reviewed</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: True or quasi-experimental</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles within age group</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: Correlational cross-sectional</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles reviewed</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Upon request, an index of articles that were assigned to each category can be provided.

Table 6
Research Design by Age Range in 2015 Study Samples: Counts and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>&lt;17</th>
<th>18–25</th>
<th>26–64</th>
<th>&gt;64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: Correlational longitudinal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11 (7.1%)</td>
<td>13 (7.3%)</td>
<td>5 (6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: Correlational cross-sectional</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>105 (67.7%)</td>
<td>110 (61.8%)</td>
<td>60 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>8 (11.9%)</td>
<td>13 (8.4%)</td>
<td>15 (8.4%)</td>
<td>10 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative: True or quasi-experimental</td>
<td>12 (12.9%)</td>
<td>27 (17.4%)</td>
<td>36 (20.2%)</td>
<td>11 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>6 (9.0%)</td>
<td>10 (6.5%)</td>
<td>13 (7.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles within age group</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
support groups; Chen et al., 2015). Medical terminologies and jargon may especially overwhelm Asian Americans with low mastery of the English language. Furthermore, Chinese American individuals with schizophrenia have reported leaving therapy sessions due to feelings of frustration and stigmatization (Kung, 2015). Future evaluations of culturally sensitive treatment programs should also examine compliance and maintenance rates both during and after treatment, and acknowledge Asian Americans as a unique cultural group with certain values, worldviews, and behaviors that might hinder, or perhaps even enhance, their treatment success.

Asian Americans’ residence in ethnic enclaves versus in communities with low Asian populations is another important but understudied factor contributing to their overall development and specific use of mental and physical health services (Kiang et al., 2016). Asian Americans who live in ethnic enclaves may be more isolated from the mainstream, but have more access to in-group social networks such as family and peers (Kung, 2015; Kuroki, 2015; Ryabov, 2015) that may serve as protective factors and foster help-seeking behaviors. For instance, more in-group social support was negatively associated with depression in Indian American students (Meghani & Harvey, 2016). Moreover, first-generation Asian Americans diagnosed with HIV expressed the importance of their social group in aiding them with locating health care and maintaining their treatment (Chen et al., 2015). Chinese American women with breast cancer also emphasized the importance of maintaining cultural ties for Asian Americans, and for social, community, and health care resources to respect Asian Americans’ cultural backgrounds and traditions.

Taking a different approach in the attempt to capture acculturation, specifically with regard to parenting cognitions, Cote, Kwak, Putnick, Chung, and Bornstein (2015) compared Korean immigrant mothers residing in the United States to South Korean mothers (i.e., in the culture of origin), and European American mothers (i.e., in the culture of destination). The authors revealed that Korean immigrant mothers’ attributions for parenting, their causal inferences for their parenting successes and failures, more closely resembled those of mothers in the United States. In contrast, Korean immigrant mothers’ self-perceptions of parenting (i.e., parents’ sense of investment in their children, satisfaction gained from caregiving, feelings of competence in the caregiving role, and their perceived ability to balance caregiving with their other social roles) more closely resembled those of mothers in South Korea. These findings indicate that different parenting cognitions may accrue at different rates.

Another way that researchers address the issue of culture in Asian Americans is through the assessment of their ethnic, racial or cultural identities, which can be seen as an aspect of psychological acculturation (Cheek et al., 1985; Phinney, 1996). Several studies examined Asian Americans’ ethnic/racial identity and its relation to well-being and psychological adjustment. Overall, findings revealed that higher levels of identification with their ethnic/racial group promoted well-being and decreased psychological distress (Chong & Kuo, 2015; Nguyen, Wong, Juang, & Park, 2015; Haavind et al., 2015). Relatedly, Asian American parents’ ethnic socialization practices (e.g., teaching children about their culture of origin and ethnic language, encouragement to learn about cultural traditions) promoted their young adult children’s ethnic identity, which in turn fostered greater psychological well-being (Nguyen et al., 2015).

One limitation of the majority of the reviewed studies that examined the associations between Asian Americans’ ethnic identity and their well-being or mental health was their focus on individuals who were 17 years of age and older. Thus, developmental differences were ignored (Ai et al., 2015; Cheng, Carter, & Li, 2015; Chong & Kuo, 2015), which is potentially problematic given that identity processes undergo significant changes before and after those ages (e.g., Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, Soenens, & Beyers, 2008). A more developmentally nuanced approach to the examination of ethnic identity processes and their implications for mental health and well-being is needed. Longitudinal examinations of cultural identity changes over time and related implications in Asian Americans are also lacking.

Similar to general trends in the identity literature (e.g., Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016), some authors have acknowledged the complexity of Asian American individuals’ group identity processes as being characterized by multiple social or cultural categories that are interconnected. For instance, a person-centered study revealed that Asian-White adolescents who had bicultural identities reported the lowest levels of psychological distress and internalized oppression, compared with youth who showed high levels of identification with either their White or Asian identities only (Chong & Kuo, 2015). Moreover, Nguyen and colleagues (2015) reported that Asian American emerging adults’ ethnic identity processes differed for males and females. In addition, Haavind et al. (2015) used a qualitative approach and found that the intersec-
tions of gender, ethnic identities, social contexts, and interpersonal interactions have important implications for the well-being of Chinese American girls even in the elementary school years.

Although the conceptual linking of the cultural characteristics of particular Asian American groups with specific research questions is essential for the accurate interpretation of research findings (Yoshikawa et al., 2016), only a few studies (e.g., Methikalam, Wang, Slaney, & Yueng, 2015; Tsong & Smart, 2015) directly examined cultural values theorized to be particularly relevant within the general Asian American population or subgroup. Instead, many studies appear to assume that membership in a cultural group reflected underlying cultural values and characterized Asian Americans as collectivistic or interdependent (e.g., Su et al., 2015).

Examinations of cultural values that motivate culturally emphasized practices were found more often in the area of parenting. For example, Zhou, Cheah, Van Hook, Thompson, and Jones (2015) found that Chinese American mothers used culturally emphasized feeding practices (e.g., spoon-feeding, using social comparison to pressure the child to eat, making an effort to cook specific foods) when interacting with their preschool-aged children. In another study, Chinese American mothers reported introducing solid foods to their infants before 6 months of age to promote their children’s bone and physical development, swallowing skills, and improved digestive system, because of traditional cultural beliefs (Lee & Brann, 2015). In comparing warmth behaviors, European American mothers emphasized physical demonstrations and verbal expressions of warmth, whereas Chinese immigrant mothers cited more physical nurturance and instrumental support practices than did European Americans (Cheah, Li, Zhou, Yamamoto, & Leung, 2015). One important effort compared Chinese American mothers versus pediatric nurses’ conceptualizations of physical discipline and the boundary that differentiates physical discipline from abuse, to address child maltreatment allegations stemming from cultural differences in parenting values and physical discipline use (Ho & Gross, 2015).

Cultural values might also interact with other constructs in complex ways to contribute to adjustment. For example, Chinese Americans who hold more interdependent values had better long-term cardiovascular health if they also sought out instrumental support from their social groups (Lee et al., 2015). These individuals may view supportive social groups as especially important as it reflects and promotes their values toward group harmony. In another study, Methikalam et al. (2015) examined perfectionism from both personal and perceived family perspectives as well as its association with adherence to specific Asian values, and found that Asian Indian American maladaptive perfectionists reported higher valuing of bringing honor to their families through their achievements than did nonperfectionists. Collectively, these studies illustrate the importance of understanding the underlying cultural values and culturally specific behaviors of Asian Americans. Further understanding of cultural beliefs and practices that are adaptive or maladaptive for specific groups of Asian American families would also highlight the significant variability in ethnic minority groups and lead to more targeted programs and interventions.

Asian Americans as an immigrant group. Considering Asian Americans as an immigrant group in the current historical context of 2015, several large-scale, societal trends are important to note to help situate understanding of the empirical literature. First, immigration rates from Asia to the United States increased. The number of individuals who emigrate to the United States from Asia overtook those emigrating from Latin America and the Caribbean in 2009. Part of this trend stems from declines in emigration from Mexico; currently, annual immigrants from China outnumber those from Mexico (Kiang et al., 2016; Waters & Pineau, 2016).

Second, Asian immigrants continue to show large variation in entering SES (Tseng et al., 2016). Some Asian ethnic groups show some of the highest levels of education among immigrant groups to the U.S., while others show quite low levels of education. Such levels of entering SES and job skills vary within region (e.g., on average if one compares immigrants to the United States from India vs. Bangladesh). They can also vary within country. The low-income wave of immigrants from mainland China in recent decades came mainly from Fujian province though also from the northeastern provinces, while those with higher incomes and levels of education have come from major urban centers, including the megacities of Beijing, Shanghai, and Hong Kong (Liang & Chunyu, 2013; Yoshikawa et al., 2016).

Third, in general immigrants from Asia show relatively strong patterns of incorporation, as reflected in social mobility, across generations. Children of immigrants from Asia, for example, generally achieve higher levels of education and earnings than their parents (Waters & Pineau, 2016). The most important single exception to this pattern may occur among the unauthorized and their family members. Children and youth who are unauthorized experience severe barriers to their educational and employment prospects. Recent policy developments such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) executive action have resulted in dramatic increases in aspects of incorporation in American society (e.g., obtaining drivers’ licenses, formal employment with higher wages, and easier access to sources of higher education and sources of financial aid for college attendance; Gonzales, Terriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014; Teranishi, Suarez-Orozco, & Suarez-Orozco, 2015). An even larger population lives in mixed-status families. In general, children of the unauthorized experience barriers to their educational and occupational progress, even if they themselves are U.S. citizens (Yoshikawa, Suarez-Orozco, & Gonzales, in press).

With these trends in immigration in mind, we noted several patterns in reviewing articles that were coded specifically with the theme “Immigration and Enculturation.” In general, research on acculturation appears to dominate the immigration literature. However, as noted in the previous discussion regarding Asian Americans as a cultural group, acculturation was conceptualized and indexed differently across studies. Typically, acculturation was measured through proxies such as years in the United States (e.g., Kuroki, 2015; Oakkar et al., 2015; Ro & Bostean, 2015) or generational status (e.g., Oakkar et al., 2015; Ryabov, 2015; Tsong, & Smart, 2015). Direct indicators of psychological and behavioral acculturation (e.g., Salas-Wright, Jang, Vaughn, & Sangalang, 2015; Shin et al., 2016) and acculturation style (i.e., assimilation, traditionalism, biculturalism and marginalized; e.g., Kane et al., 2015) were also assessed, with some studies using multi-item scales to capture different dimensions of acculturation or its variants of enculturation or transculturation (Kane et al., 2015; Krieg & Xu, 2015; Shin et al., 2016). In terms of implications, acculturation was linked to outcomes, and some of these outcomes might be more understudied than others. For example,
one study (Kim & Sung, 2016) examined whether indicators of acculturation predicted levels of intimate partner violence in first-generation Chinese immigrant couples. Another examined the link between acculturation and racial identity among Chinese and Korean Americans (Cheng, Carter, & Lee, 2015).

Other commonly studied constructs within the topic of immigration included immigrant stress. The more general stress and support paradigm in psychology and health continued to attract the interest of scholars who focused on these issues. One study examined how support buffered immigrant stress in the context of different levels of independent versus interdependent self-construal. Independent self-construal was associated with less adaptive cardiovascular response to an immigrant stress scenario, but less so when participants reported engaging in instrumental social support (Lee, Suchday, & Wylie-Rosett, 2015).

Notably, several articles advanced the study of moderators and mediators of long-observed trends in immigration among Asian Americans. One is the decline in positive health behaviors and mediators of long-observed trends in immigration among Asian Americans. This was explained by levels of increased English proficiency and discrimination. Another example is the finding from many studies that Asian Americans show lower levels of health care and mental health care utilization than other immigrant groups. For example, as described earlier, Carron and Baumeister (2015) examined how residential segregation patterns predicted health care utilization among different Asian American immigrant groups. For Korean Americans, higher concentration of Asian residents in the neighborhood was associated with more health care utilization, but the pattern was reversed (lower concentration associated with more utilization) for Chinese and Vietnamese Americans.

It is also noteworthy that studies that may be considered advances in intersectionality research continue to increase. However, in the context of immigration, these studies do not often distinguish immigration-related factors—most notably first-generation immigrants from their U.S.-born counterparts. For example, Sandil, Robinson, Brewer, Wong, and Geiger (2015) conducted a nuanced study of the interaction of enculturation, experiences of racism and heterosexism, and outness in predicting psychological distress among South Asian LGBQ individuals. They found interesting moderated associations, such that high experiences of racism were more predictive of psychological distress when members of their sample reported being more out to their networks. However, this study did not report whether these patterns differed by generational status, and the sample characteristics did not include whether participants were born in the United States. As a key demographic factor shaping psychological experiences of immigration or acculturation, generational status should more often be assessed, and psychological processes examined separately for those born in the United States versus those who immigrated themselves.

There was a striking lack overall in the studies reviewed on the consequences of the three trends of increased Asian immigration, variation in SES, and different patterns of incorporation depending on factors such as legal status for psychological outcomes and processes. We believe these consequences among Asian Americans are likely to be extensive and well worth examining in psychological research. They could incorporate traditional topics of research such as acculturation or immigrant stress, as well as identity, discrimination, and socialization. For example, the rapid increases in Asian immigrants to communities with historically very low representation of this group represents new patterns of acculturation in the sense of the host community acculturating to the entering community (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). This process is occurring in new immigrant destinations in suburban areas, for example, in ways that are much more widespread than in traditional Asian enclaves. A recent study examined how affluent White host communities acculturated to an influx of highly educated Asian immigrants. The study showed that stereotypes more typically applied to historically marginalized groups such as African Americans and Latinos (e.g., lazy, underperforming) are actually applied to Whites in these contexts, when compared with Asian immigrants (Jimenez & Horowitz, 2013), which illustrates the idea that immigration influences not only immigrants themselves, but also the communities in which they settle.

Transnational processes were also not represented in the studies reviewed. Patterns of transnational contact are almost certainly changing due to access to high-speed Internet and social media, which are rapidly spreading across even low- and middle-income countries in Asia and has achieved nearly universal utilization in some of the high-income countries in the region. Patterns of remittances might also be changing. Economic and psychological factors linking those in the United States to their kin and networks in Asia are potential productive avenues of research. Such processes might alter patterns of acculturation, enculturation, and transculturation. They might also affect trajectories of identity, responses to discrimination, and cultural consumption. As one recent example not uncovered from our review (because of its appearance in a largely sociological journal), Zhou and Li (2016) examined what remittances were buying in two different Chinese immigrant groups. Remittances were increasingly spent on community-level expenditures, which potentially raised the emigrant families’ social status in different ways than would household-level expenditures back in China.

Finally, undocumented status increasingly affects individuals and households of Asian Americans. Of the over 11 million undocumented or unauthorized immigrants in the United States, an estimated 1.4 million are from East, Southeast or South Asia, the largest single region of origin after Latin America (Waters & Pineau, 2016). The consequences of undocumented status for psychological processes and outcomes for Asian-origin people has been largely unstudied, with a few exceptions (Liang & Chunyu, 2013; Yoshikawa, 2011). As the largest single barrier to successful integration and incorporation of immigrants in the United States today, this status and its associated policy, community and household level impacts surely affects the psychological outcomes of Asian Americans.

The general lack of attention to linking large-scale trends in Asian American immigration to the United States to psychological outcomes and mechanisms may stem from the historic predominance in the field of immigration research of sociology as a discipline, rather than psychology. Because of the emphasis of psychology on intrapersonal processes, the analysis of demographic change or social forces has tended to be underemphasized.
There is, we believe, productive synergy in the application of psychological constructs and methods to such macrolevel structural contexts to boost our existing knowledge of Asian Americans as members of an immigrant group (Yoshikawa et al., 2016).

**Asian Americans as a minority group.** As members of the ethnic minority, Asian American development has always been naturally embedded among issues of social stratification, racism, and oppression. Yet, specific constructions of race and related racial stereotypes have evolved over time along with shifting social perceptions and social status hierarchies (Kiang et al., 2016). Based on their societal status, Asian Americans could experience stress from prejudice, discrimination, and hostility from the social environment which can, in turn, impact their developmental competencies (García Coll et al., 1996; Moritsu & Sue, 1983). The body of work examining the impact of such social stratification has proliferated in recent years, and Yeh et al. (2013) identified research on racism and discrimination as an emerging trend in Asian American scholarship. Although the minority experience involves a variety of topics such as ethnic or racial identity, racial socialization, and social and peer relationships, we focus our discussion on the articles that examined different forms of racism, discrimination, or stereotyping as key sources of minority stress.

To start with our general impressions of the literature, among the studies that were coded as dealing broadly with issues of racism, there was a range of methodological approaches used. The most common approaches were correlational and cross-sectional, but qualitative, mixed, longitudinal, and even experimental paradigms were also used. Many studies focused on behaviors or actions of perpetrators (e.g., differential treatment, behaviors based on prejudice and stereotypes; Kiang, Witkow, & Thompson, 2015; Sangalang, Chen, et al., 2015). Notably, some focused on a broader system of oppression (e.g., Colonial Mentality; Felipe, 2016; Museus & Park, 2015) or prejudicial attitudes (e.g., McIntyre et al., 2015).

While a basic and applied understanding of Asian Americans as a minority group continues to grow, we suggest that there needs to be greater attention to more nuanced forms of discrimination, such as microaggressions—a subtle variant of discrimination that often includes intentional slights and insults. Qualitative methods continue to dominate this scholarship, perhaps in a more exploratory way given its relative newness in the field. One example is an article by Haavind et al. (2015), which was discussed earlier in light of its targeting of acculturation, cultural identity, and intersectionality issues. Although this study was placed in the “Identity” category for its primary topic classification, the provocative title “Because nobody likes Chinese girls”: Intersecting identities and emotional experiences of subordination and resistance in school life’ highlights its focus on the “raw” emotional experiences around race and gender discrimination that young girls face in their school lives and peer relationships. Nadal et al.’s (2015) work offers some additional quantitative insight by surveying adult samples across the United States about the frequency of microaggressions in the past 6 months. However, to further extend this work, we need to better assess the frequency, development, and impact of microaggressions among larger samples. It is also important to explore microaggressions in new contexts (e.g., among classroom teachers; Endo, 2015). With the recent firestorm around media underrepresentation of Asian Americans (e.g., casting of White actress Emma Stone as a multiethnic Asian American) and the gaining popularity of mainstream TV shows that showcase the Asian American family (e.g., ABC’s Fresh Off the Boat and Dr. Ken), the media is one context where culture, race, and stereotypes could be further examined. It is notable that only one article in 2015 was coded as pertaining to media influences.

In the broader literature, reviews of racism and health outcomes—that found only 18% of studies examining vicarious/group discrimination in general—calls for more studies to examine vicarious discrimination as a determinant of health (Priest et al., 2013; Paradies et al., 2015). Only one study in our own review examined the role of vicarious racism (Museus & Park, 2015). In qualitative interviews, Asian American college students shared the belief that if discrimination could happen to other Asian Americans, it could also happen to them. These incidents were salient to students, and thus added to a sense of hostility and fear on campus, particularly when the University’s response to an incident seemed inadequate by students. It remains to be seen how prevalent vicarious discrimination is, particularly among Asian Americans in noncollege settings.

Another opportunity to fill a gap in the literature is to better examine how discrimination and racism transpire between (or within) ethnic minority groups. The increasing diversity of the United States provides a rich opportunity to explore diverse targets and perpetrators of discrimination. Although it is often assumed that the perpetrator is White, many have called for a closer examination of inter- and intraethnic discrimination. Palmer and Maramba’s (2015b) study of a relatively unique context found that Asian American students experience microaggressions from their Black peers at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Further scholarship is warranted on how the characteristics of the perpetrator might impact the effects of discrimination.

With regards to measurement, there is a pressing need to investigate processes of racism and discrimination in a culturally relevant and meaningful manner. For example, many studies used discrimination measures that include general experiences or perceptions of racial/ethnic discrimination (e.g., unfair treatment because of race/ethnic group membership). However, some studies on Asian American populations reported culturally unique forms of discrimination such as being made fun of because of language and dialect, clothing, physical appearance (e.g., physical weakness, lack of masculinity, girly appearance, and hair), and ethnic foods (e.g., smell of ethnic food; Cheng et al., 2016; Haavind et al., 2015). As such, measures that do not capture culturally unique forms of ethnic/racial discrimination may underestimate or not adequately reflect Asian American experiences with discrimination and its implications on their psychological adjustment and mental health. Some studies did use measures specific to Asian populations (i.e., Subtle and Blatant Racism Scale for Asian American College Students Asian American Racism-Related Stress Inventory; Cheng et al., 2015; Kim, Kendall, & Chang, 2016; Kim, Kendall, & Webb, 2015; Lee & Thai, 2015). Others created measures unique to their population (i.e., transnationally adopted Korean Americans; Lee et al., 2015; Cambodian adolescents; Sangalang & Chen, 2015). Creating measures that adequately assess the discrimination experiences of different Asian American communities is valuable, especially given their diverse migration histories (Kiang et al., 2016). Yet, the creation of new measures should be balanced with the need to replicate and validate existing measures to have a clearer understanding of how discrimination is
experienced by and impacts Asian Americans. Yoshiikawa et al. (2016) present an important discussion of recommendations for developing and using culturally and contextually relevant measures when working with Asian Americans.

Relatively, one understudied direction for future work is to more systematically examine the unique forms of racism that target Asian Americans. Distinct from other ethnic minority groups, Asian Americans are often placed in the precarious position of being perpetual foreigners as well as “Honorary Whites” (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Goto, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2002). Armenta and colleagues’ (2013) Foreigner Objectification Scale was designed to capture experiences of the perpetual foreigner stereotype and more work could be done to examine its prevalence and correlates. Asian Americans are also distinctive in that, unlike other ethnic minorities who have had to overcome deficit models of development, Asian Americans have the added model minority myth to undo (Tuan, 1998). Kiang, Witkow, and Thompson (2015) examined the dual effects of perceived model minority stereotyping and negative discrimination experiences among Asian American adolescents and found that the model minority stereotype is actually associated with positive outcomes over time. Consistent with the model minority construct, two studies in the current review experimentally examined the effects of positive stereotypes and performance, both finding that, under certain conditions, the activation of positive stereotypes can boost performance outcomes (Saad et al., 2015; Shih et al., 2015). Nevertheless, the backlash associated with the seemingly “positive” model minority image can have many social, psychological, and interpersonal ramifications that are still being uncovered and that deserve more targeted research attention (Kiang et al., 2016).

Although most studies on racism or discrimination in general—including those in this review—focus on its effects on health and mental health, it is notable that one study focused on body image among Asian American men (Cheng et al., 2016). This study was classified with a primary topic of Men and Masculinity, but it examined how racial stereotypes and discrimination, in part, contribute to Asian men’s drive for masculinity. It will be valuable to continue broadening the scope of how discrimination affects Asian Americans, particularly as predictors of less commonly studied outcomes and behaviors. For example, do experiences of discrimination or even the anticipation of discrimination affect interracial interactions, political views, civic engagement, or social and entertainment preferences? Previous research suggests that when Asian Americans are denied their American identity (i.e., identity threat), participants made extra effort to assert their American identity by demonstrating their knowledge of American popular culture (Cheryan & Monin, 2005) and choosing more American—and thus less healthy—foods over Asian foods (Guendelman et al., 2011). Another understudied area is in domain of health care utilization and potential barriers to treatment success. Asian Americans may be subjected to discrimination and microaggressions when seeking mental health care because of providers’ ignorance of unique group experiences.

There also need to be more studies that move beyond simply establishing a link between issues of racism and some outcome and instead focus on mediators and moderators. Some of the research included in this review has begun to move in this direction. For instance, Cheng et al. (2015) found that conflict with mothers mediated the association between racial discrimination and adolescent depressive symptoms, suggesting that discrimination can add strain to a mother–child relationship. This is interesting in light of previous studies that found that social support (Juang & Alvarez, 2010), including from family members, might buffer the negative effects of discrimination. Nadal et al. (2015) also examined possible mechanisms and found that some contextual factors came into play whereby microaggressions were differentially experienced by Asian Americans (e.g., individuals with at least a B.A. reported more workplace or school microaggressions; individuals without a B.A. were more exoticized or assumed to be part of a homogenous group). Nadal and colleagues also found differences by geographic region in frequency (Midwest and Northeast participants reported more microaggressions than did those from the West Coast) and type (e.g., Midwest and Northeast participants reported being seen as inferior whereas their West Coast counterparts did not).

Given that research has primarily focused on ethnic identity as a potential protective factor, it is promising that three studies examined other possible moderators. Rollock and Lui (2016) found that spousal support was protective in the face of general unfair treatment, but not racial discrimination. In another study, friend support, but not family support, moderated the effect of discrimination stress on distress (Singh et al., 2015). Religious coping might also play a role, but not in an expected way: negative religious coping (struggling with one’s faith), not positive religious coping (securely related to faith), appeared to be protective (Kim et al., 2015).

There were an increasing number of studies that include an intersectional lens in interpreting discrimination experiences. For instance, Endo (2015) explored how being Asian and female affected teachers’ experiences. Sandill et al. (2015) explored effects of heterosexism and racism on South Asian LGBQ people. Sangalang and Gee (2015) found that police discrimination on depressive symptoms was stronger among female than male Cambodian adolescents, perhaps because they are less accustomed to this type of discrimination and thus more affected by it. Research should continuing measuring intersectionality as some Asian Americans might represent multiple minority groups, and individuals do not experience their identities in isolation (Haavind et al., 2015).

Discussion

In this 7th annual review of research in Asian American psychology, there is evidence that the field continues to grow in breadth, depth, and rigor. The 332 articles that were included in the current review, which is likely an underestimation of existing research, spanned over 25 topic areas, with empirical work on health and related issues representing the most popular field of study. The frequency of research on health is consistent with prior reviews, as is the relative infrequency of research covering topics such as adoptees, media, politics, spirituality, and special populations such as the LGBTQ community. Culturally relevant areas of research (e.g., acculturation, identity, and racism) and work focusing on family and school contexts persist in gaining traction. Our sense is that the range of topics that are empirically addressed by scholars will continue to deepen and diversify, and it appears that targeting understudied topics or examining popular topics in new and innovative ways would be most effective in pushing the boundaries of the field as much as possible.
In terms of methodology, cross-sectional designs continue to dominate the research that was reviewed. While these approaches are informative, we suggest that researchers explore and incorporate more diverse research paradigms, particularly in terms of experimental work and the use of sophisticated research designs such as experience sampling. There also seems to be great value in continuing to develop studies that use innovative qualitative and mixed methods (e.g., narratives, focus groups).

Developmentally, research tended to focus on emerging and middle-aged adults. Although research samples did encompass the entire life span from prenatal issues to infants and toddlers to childhood and adolescents to older adult populations, younger age periods appear to be vastly understudied. Given that close to 25% of the Asian American population is under the age of 18 (Hoeffel et al., 2012), it seems particularly important to build our understanding of Asian American children. We also recommend that researchers make better use of longitudinal approaches in examining developmental processes and intrapersonal change over time, either through informed primary data collection or taking advantage of existing, multiwave data sets.

In terms of ethnicity, East Asians were the most frequently targeted research participants, but the studies that were reviewed collectively targeted a diverse range of Asian American subethnic groups. Although approximately 33 articles (close to 10% of the articles included in this review) described their sample as pan-ethnically Asian American and did not elaborate on the specific subethnicities of participants, over 27 Asian heritage groups were represented in the 2015 empirical literature. Asian Americans comprise an extraordinarily heterogeneous group with multilayered identities and flexible boundaries (Okamoto, 2014; Tseng et al., 2016). Indeed, many of the studies reviewed revealed heterogeneity within the larger Asian American population in terms of mental and physical health-risks, behaviors, mental disorders, and ethnic identity (e.g., Ai et al., 2015; Carreon & Baumeister, 2015; Oakkar et al., 2015). We recommend that researchers continue to target understudied heritage groups (e.g., Southeast and South Asian, particularly with refugee backgrounds) and to deeply and deliberately consider the methodological challenges and opportunities in sampling and recruiting Asian Americans in their work (Yoshikawa et al., 2016). As just one example, when examining factors that contribute to Asian Americans’ mental and physical well-being, it is important to consider the collective (e.g., Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986; Ryabov, 2015) and individual histories (e.g., colonialism and political wars) that subgroups of Asian Americans may have experienced, not only in the United States but also in their home countries than can contribute to shared and unique processes and outcomes (Kiang et al., 2016). By recognizing the complex issues related to pan-ethnic and heritage labels, scholars can continue to unpack what it means to be Asian American.

Recruitment strategies with respect to generational status should also be thoughtful and, relatedly, it might be interesting for future annual reviews to include generational status as an additional coding variable to learn more about the representation of different generations of Asian Americans in research. Indeed, as scholarship continues to build, we echo recent theoretical and conceptual perspectives and urge researchers to make informed choices about their research questions and overall empirical approach including study design and sampling (e.g., Special Section on Asian American Child Development; Kiang et al., 2016; Mistry et al., 2016; Tseng et al., 2016; Yoshikawa et al., 2016).

Above and beyond our analysis of topical, methodological, and sampling trends, our synthesis of the 2015 empirical literature focused on culture, immigration, and minority status as distinctive characteristics that shape the psychological experiences of Asian Americans. Within each of these themes, complex theoretical and empirical questions abound. The cultural status of Asian Americans is perhaps the most challenging with which to grapple due to its broad, multifaceted nature (e.g., research has focused on a range of issues including acculturation of values or behaviors; generational differences identity development; parenting goals, values, and practices). Clearly, there are diverse approaches in which the literature on “culture” can be synthesized, and our overall assessment is that more direct measurement of culturally relevant values and processes could help concretize some of the ways that culture is naturally embedded in the lives of Asian Americans. Similarly, the role of immigration has been examined among Asian Americans by way of multiple approaches such as, again, acculturation, generational status, or stress related to the process of immigration. More targeted approaches that examine historical and contemporary push-pull factors related to the immigration experiences of Asian Americans, especially with a longitudinal perspective, could be valuable. Throughout their immigration history, Asians Americans have long been viewed as part of the ethnic minority. Scholarship related to racism and discrimination has grown and diversified (e.g., examinations of microaggressions, model minority stereotyping), but more can be done as the face of racism changes along with changes in current societal structures and social stratification.

By explicitly recognizing that Asian Americans at, at once, members of cultural, immigrant, and minority groups, we believe that the field might be better poised to understand and recognized the distinctive processes that are relevant for Asian American well-being. Moreover, it is worth remarking that these statuses highly overlap. For example, there are certainly ways that acculturative issues or cultural dissonance, stress related to immigration, and perceived discrimination coalesce in affecting Asian American youth and families. Additionally, experiences of discrimination, either by way of negative treatment, the model minority stereotype, or foreigner objectification, could vary depending on individuals’ immigration status. Further, the way in which individuals might cope with such minority experiences could be moderated by their cultural values and social support. At the same time, individuals’ cultural adjustment and adaptation could change as a function of their family’s immigration history, or with their own personal encounters with racism. Research that incorporates such intersectionality to examine how Asian Americans simultaneously navigate these social statuses could be especially meaningful and informative.

Outlets for Scholarship

Consistent with Kim et al. (2015), who initiated a review of the most common publication sources of empirical work, our review found that AAJP published the most articles (n = 37) and continues to be an excellent outlet for empirical work focusing on Asian Americans. CDEMP (n = 12) also appears to be a key venue for dissemination. Other notable publication sources for 2015 articles,
the Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved (n = 13) and the Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health (n = 12), diverged from the more common sources from 2014, which suggests that some year to year variation in publication in light of more specialized journals is to be expected. Reflecting the need to conduct research with a more developmental focus, it is notable that there was only one article each that was published in Child Development and Developmental Psychology. There was also scarce representation in adolescent journals, with the exception of the Journal of Youth and Adolescence, which published six articles that were included in the current review.

On a related note, it is important to recall that, to date, annual reviews of Asian American psychology have centered on social and behavioral sciences articles archived in PsycINFO. While the dramatic increase in scholarship even within the confines of psychology makes providing a thorough, yearly review more and more challenging, there is a trend for the psychological field to be more much more integrative and interdisciplinary. Hence, it might be worthwhile for researchers to explore more inter- and multidisciplinary outlets (e.g., history, Asian American studies, and political science) for disseminating their work. Much could be gained by broadening the audience of Asian American psychological research, and by future reviews that consider scholarship from other fields. While PsycINFO does include some publications from related fields (e.g., American Sociological Reviews, American Anthropologist), it is still limited in that other top publications are not typically archived (e.g., American Political Science Review, Quarterly Journal of Economics, and International Migration Review).

It might also be worthwhile to begin incorporating theoretical articles and broader literature searches in future annual reviews, to better assess current scholarly thinking on Asian Americans. For instance, the series of articles that the Asian Caucus Steering Committee collaborated on for Child Development that helped guide this review is highly relevant to Asian American research. However, because they are not empirical they will likely not be included in next year’s annual review. We recognize that the logistics of managing a larger scale, more inclusive review that covers different types of scholarship on Asian Americans might not be feasible, but it is something that future reviews could consider.

Limitations and Future Reviews

The 332 articles that were included for review in the current article is likely an underestimation of the field. Published embargo periods where access to articles is restricted could have limited the inclusion of some articles in our review. Journals might also vary in how quickly they are archived in the PsycINFO database and, as already discussed, the use of this particular database also has its own limitations. Additionally, some articles with advanced online publication were included in this review, even though their print publication year might have ended up being 2016. Similarly, because of advanced publications, there could be some articles that were included in the current review that were also included in Kim et al.’s annual review of 2014 studies.

There were also some limitations with regards to domain coding that should be discussed. In particular, our sense is that articles covering Health and Health-Related Behaviors are likely overestimated in the current and in prior reviews. For example, 14 of the 102 articles that had a primary topic code of Health were also coded as having a focus on Acculturation. Many of these articles examined the effects of acculturation on health and other outcomes. If primary topic coding is based predominantly on the outcomes in question of the target article, it would make sense that the majority of articles would be coded as such, and are perhaps undercoded in the categories that reflect more process-based issues (e.g., acculturation, immigration). Moreover, the category of Health seemed particularly broad and it might make sense for future reviews to parse out the topic to reflect more refined research areas. One suggestion for future reviews is to distinguish physical health (e.g., cancer screening, diabetes) from behavioral health indicators (e.g., obesity, substance use) from factors related to service utilization.

We also suggest a revision of the topic, Psychopathology. Traditionally, it seems like this topic has been used to categorize studies that include a wide range of psychological disorders, including depression, anxiety, suicidality, and “other psychopathology.” However, our coding experience suggests that there were many studies that focused on depressive symptoms or more general psychological distress, which did not seem to fit best with “Psychopathology” per se, especially because nonclinical samples were often used. Although our coding efforts were generally reliable, there was some inconsistency in terms of how to classify articles that dealt with externalizing behaviors (e.g., Health vs. Psychopathology), as well as those that incorporated both health and psychopathology outcomes (e.g., substance abuse and depression). There was also a substantial number of articles that examined general well-being and other positive outcomes such as self-esteem. Indeed, a forthcoming special issue in AJP focuses specifically on positive psychology among Asian Americans, and this topic is not clearly reflected in the current coding categories. To maintain consistency with prior reviews, we opted to retain the former categories used, but a future review might consider an overhaul of topic coding, potentially distinguishing between topics such as physical and mental health, psychopathology (as defined by clinical diagnoses), outcomes that focus on general psychological distress, and positive outcome variables such as well-being, self-esteem, or positive adjustment. Perhaps an open-coding process could be conducted first to undercover new areas or revised groupings that could be more relevant for current research.

If target areas or categories are revised for future reviews of the literature, we also suggest removing populations (e.g., youth, women) from topic codes entirely. Rather, it might make sense to follow Kim et al.’s (2015) strategy of introducing a new, and separate, coding domain to focus explicitly on the target sample of the primary topic. We considered population in both topic and target sample, and ultimately presented just one set of information given the substantial overlap. Our view is that information about study samples seems to be a better fit in light of constituting its own target population code, rather than as embedded as actual topical areas of study. For example, classifying a particular study as focusing on the topic of “Health” seems qualitatively different from classifying a study as focusing on “Women” as a thematic topic of interest. We recommend that topic themes focus on thematic issues, which should be considered independent from categories that might be better housed under sample characteristics.
In terms of other aspects of coding, although we did not find an overwhelming representation of articles that utilized national surveys, it might be worthwhile for future reviews to delineate articles that conducted secondary data analysis, especially as scholarship continues to grow and researchers increasingly use existing large-scale surveys in their work. With an increased emphasis on international scholarship and cross-national research programs, it could also be valuable to consider and compare research on Asians who immigrate to other parts of the world, including Canada or Australia. In fact, the 2014 annual review (Kim et al., 2015) specifically discussed the utility of expanding future reviews to include Asian Canadians, which we agree could be worthwhile in gaining a more comprehensive view of the field. It might also be useful to consider research among different countries within Asia. For example, many of the articles that were excluded in the current review investigated psychological issues among within-Asia immigrants (e.g., Chinese migrants to Korea). Again, the scope of such a review would surely be challenging, but perhaps helpful in building a more global perspective on current empirical work.

There are inherent limitations in any literature review that aims to summarize the current milieu of the field due to the fact that scholarship is so dynamic. Prior reviews have questioned the utility of an annual review, suggesting that they be conducted less frequently or with more depth focusing on specific topics, rather than on providing a broad snapshot of empirical work. Our approach attempted to address this latter suggestion, balancing the potential knowledge gained from making comparisons with prior reviews with a more comprehensive discussion of empirical work organized around Asian Americans as a unique cultural, immigrant, and minority group. We do echo the recommendations of our predecessors and agree that the opportunity to evaluate existing research with more focused, in-depth interpretations could pave the way toward concrete recommendations and specific suggestions for filling literature gaps that remain. Our hope is that our approach allowed readers to gain a glimpse into the tremendous science that exists in the field, to easily reference existing work that is relevant or of interest, and to see specific areas where promising progress can be made.

Conclusions

In 2015, research on Asian Americans covered over 25 topics that targeted applied domains (e.g., health, psychopathology, counseling/clinical, education, stress, and coping), distinct populations (e.g., immigrants, older adults, women, youth, LGBTQ, and men), and culturally specific constructs (e.g., acculturation, racism, and identity). Researchers have studied participants from over 27 ethnic groups and who spanned the entire life span. Despite such breadth and vastly growing scope in Asian American research, scientific progress still lags behind that of other ethnic groups in the United States (Cabrera & the SRCD Ethnic and Racial Issues Committee, 2013; Tseng et al., 2016). Asian Americans are currently the fastest growing group in the United States and these numbers are only expected to increase with a projected growth rate of 79% from 2000–2050 (Hoeffel et al., 2012; Ortmann & Guarneri, 2009; Pew Research Center, 2013). As members of the SRCD Asian Caucus, we recognize the impressive research that has transpired this past year, and look forward to seeing and supporting continued growth in the science and scholarship of this distinctive population.
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List of 2015 Reviewed Articles

1. Abrams, Javier, Maxwell, Belgrave, and Nguyen
2. Ahn and Kim
3. Ai, Nicdao, Appel, and Lee
4. Almeida, Phene, and Li
5. Arat
6. Aratani and Liu
7. Baron-Epel, Hofstetter, Irvin, Kang, and Hovell
8. Becerra, Herring, Marshak, and Banta
10. Bernstein, Park, Hahn, Lee, Seo, and Nokes
11. Bohra-Mishra and Massey
12. Braswell
13. Braun, Thomas, Domingo, Allison, Ponce, Kamakana . . . Tsark
14. Brice, Warner, Okazaki, Ma, Sanchez, Esseling, and Lynch,
15. Brown, Cohen, and Meznak
16. Brzeczka, Satra-Hoang, Goertz, Reyes, Gunuganti, Gallagher, and Carter
17. Bujarski, Lau, Lee, and Ray
18. Carlisle
19. Carreon and Baumeister
20. Casado, Lee, Hong, and Hong
22. Chan, Zane, Wong, and Song
23. Chang, Chan, and Han
24. Chang
25. Chang and Smith
26. Chang, Han, Lee, and Qin
27. Cheah, Li, Zhou, Yamamoto, and Leung
28. Chen, Kim, Sherman, and Hashimoto
29. Chen, Hung, Parkin, Fava, and Yeung
30. Chen, Main, Zhou, Bunge, Lau, and Chu
31. Chen, Guthrie, Shiu, Wang, Weng, Li, . . . Lau
32. Chen and Graham
33. Chen and Fouad
34. ChenFeng, Knudson-Martin, and Nelson
35. Cheng, Lin, and Cha
36. Cheng, McDermott, Wong, and La
37. Cheng, Carter, and Lee
38. Cheng
39. Cheng, Tu, Li, Chang, and Yang
40. Cho, Park, Bernstein, Roh, and Jeon
41. Choi, Hsin, and McLanahan
42. Choi
43. Choi
44. Chong and Kuo
45. Chu and Song
46. Chung, Caine, Barron, and Badaracco
47. Chung
48. Chung and Robins
49. Claudat, White, and Warren
50. Coffey, Javier, and Schrager
51. Cook and Sim
52. Cook, Karriker-Jaffe, Bond, and Lui
53. Corlew, Keener, Finucane, Brewington, and Nunn-Crichton
54. Cote, Kwak, Putnick, Chung, and Bornstein
55. Cuddy, Wolf, Glick, Crotty, Chong, and Norton
56. Daga, Raval, and Raj
57. Davis and Kiang
58. Davis, Vakalahi, and Smith
59. Day, Godon-Decoteau, and Suyemoto
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60. de Gagne, Oh, So, Haidermota, and Lee
61. de Pillis, Kim, Thomas, and Kaulukukui
62. Dewell and Owen
63. Dhingra, Chen, and Chu
64. Dhingra, Lam, and Chen
65. Dhingra, Lam, Cheung, Shao, Li, Van de Maele . . . Portenoy,
66. DiYanni, Corriveau, Kurkul, Nasrini, and Nini,
67. Dobbs, Park, Jang, and Meng
68. Dong, Bergren, and Chang
69. Duncan, Lasserret, VanServellen, Brown, Clark, Morgan . . . Hanohano
70. Edmonds, Hawkins, and Cohen
71. El Khoudary, Shin, Masaki, Miura, Budoff, Edmundowicz, . . . Sekikawa
72. Elliot, Xiao, and Wilson
73. Endo
74. Eng and Woo
75. Fagan, Pohkrel, Herzog, Pagano, Vallone, Trinidad . . . Moolchan
76. Fang, Friedlander, and Pieterse
77. Felipe
78. Fialkowski, Delormier, Hattori-Uchima, Leslie, Greenberg, Kim, . . . Novotny
79. Fitzpatrick and Kostina-Kitchey
80. Flippen and Kim
81. Fu, Morris, and Hong
82. García Coll, Crnic, Lamberty, Wasik, Jenkins, Garcia, and McAdoo
83. Garver and Noguera
84. Gee, de Castro, Wang, Crespi, Morey, and Fujishiro
85. Geerlings, Verkuyten, and Thijs
86. Gelber, Redline, Ross, Petrovitch, Sonnen, Zarow . . . White
87. Gonzalez, Lim, Wang-Letzkus, Flores, Allen, Castañeda, and Talavera
88. Gonzalez, Nuñez, Wang-Letzkus, Lim, Flores, and Nápoles
89. Grinker, Kang-Yi, Ahmann, Beidas, Lagman, and Mandell
90. Guo, Li, Liu, and Sun
91. Guo, Nguyen, Weiss, Ngo, and Lau
92. Haavind, Thorne, Hollway, and Magnnsson
93. Han, Cao, and Anton
94. Han and Pong
95. Hanna, Lee, and Lindamood
96. Harris, Battle, Pastrana, and Daniels
99. Higuchi, Chen, Abbott, Bell, Launer, Ross . . . Masaki
100. Hishinuma, Chang, Goebernt, Helm, Else, and Sugimoto-Matsuda
101. Ho, Tran, and Chesla
102. Ho and Gross
103. Hou, Kim, Wang, Shen, and Orozco-Lapray,
104. Huang and Zheng
105. Huh and Leventhal
106. Hwang, Myers, Chiu, Mak, Butner, Fujimoto . . . Miranda
107. Islam, Kwon, Wyatt, Ruddock, Horowitz, Devia, and Trinh-Shevrin
108. Jang, Park, Chiriboga, Yoon, An, and Kim
109. Jang, Yoon, Marti, and Kim
110. Jensen, and Dost-Gözkân
111. Jin and Jones-Smith
112. Jun and Oh
113. Kane, Johnson, Robinson, Jernigan, Harachi, and Bass
114. Kang, Chang, Chen, and Greenberger
115. Katie Lee and Knobf
116. Katigbak, Van Devanter, Islam, and Trinh-Shevrin,
117. Kelly, Cotter, Tanofsky-Kraff, and Mazzeo
118. Kerridge, Saha, Chou, Zhang, Jung, Ruan . . . Hasin
119. Keum, Wong, DeBlaere, and Brewster
120. Kiang and Bhattacharjee
121. Kiang and Witkow
122. Kiang, Witkow, Gonzalez, Stein, and Andrews
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123. Kiang, Witkow, and Thompson
124. Kim-Goh, Choi, and Yoon
125. Kim, Lee, and Lee
126. Kim and Park
127. Kim, Linton, and Lum
128. Kim and Choi
129. Kim, Lee, Sangalang, and Harris
130. Kim and Sung
131. Kim and Im
132. Kim, Prouty, Smith, Ko, Wetchler, and Oh
133. Kim
134. Kim, Park, La, Chang, and Zane
135. Kim and Zane
136. Kim, Kim, Han, and Chin
137. Kim, Malonebeach, Heo, Kim, and Kim
138. Kim, Kim, Choi, Song, and Han
139. Kim, Kim, Han, Huh, Nguyen, and Lee
140. Kim, Kim, Huh, Nguyen, Han, Bone, and Levine
141. Kim, Lee, Ko, Yoon, Kim, and Jang
142. Kim and Kendall
143. Kim, Kendall, and Chang
144. Kim, Kendall, and Webb
145. Kim and Knight
146. Kim, Wang, Chen, Shen, and Hou
147. Kim, Wang, Shen, and Hou
149. Kim, Wang, and Michaels
150. Kim, Kim, Fang, Kwon, Shelley, and Ziedonis
151. Kim, Kang, and Kim
152. Kimel, Lopez-Duran, and Kitayama
153. Koo, Nguyen, Andrasik, and George
154. Krieg and Xu
155. Kulkarni
156. Kung
157. Kuroki
158. Kwon, Choi, Mittman, Bharmal, Liu, Vickrey, . . . Sarkisian
159. Kwon, Rideout, Patel, Arista, Tepporn, Lipman, . . . Trinh-Shevrin
160. Kwong, Du, and Xu
161. Lasseter, Clark, Morgan, Brown, VanServellen, Duncan, and Hopkins
162. Le and Proulx
163. Lee-Lin, Nguyen, Pedhiwala, Dieckmann, and Menon
164. Lee and Brann
165. Lee
166. Lee, Choi, and Lee
167. Lee, Kwon, Vang, DeWolfe, Kim, Lee, and Yeung
168. Lee, Rhee, Kim, and Ahluwalia
169. Lee and Vang
170. Lee, Yang, Lee, and Ghubre
171. Lee and Mason
172. Lee
173. Lee, Kim, and Han
174. Lee
175. Lee, Lee, Hu, and Kim
176. Lee, Bank, Cause, McBeath, and Newell
177. Lee, Yamada, Kim, and Dinh
178. Lee and Thai
179. Lee, Friedmann, Kverno, Newhouse, Zhang, and Thomas
180. Lee and Casado
181. Lee and Knobf
182. Lee, Martins, and Lee
183. Lee and Katz
184. Lee, Choi, Proulx, and Cornwell
185. Lee, Chaudhuri, and Yoo
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186. Lee, Suchday, and Wylie-Rosett
187. Li
188. Li, Zhou, and Hou
189. Li, Hofstetter, Wahlgren, Irvin, Chhay, and Hovell
190. Li, Kao, and Dinh,
191. Liang
192. Liu, Giallo, Doan, Seidman, and Tronick
193. Londhe
194. Louie, Wang, Fung, and Lau
195. Lu, Man, You, and LeRoy
196. Luk, Patock-Peckham, and King
197. Ma, Fang, Tan, Feng, Ge, and Nguyen
198. Maffini, Vaughan, and Wong
199. Malik and Rohner
200. Maramba, Palmer, Yull, and Orzuna
201. Maskarinec, Jacobs, Morimoto, Chock, Grandinetti, and Kolonel
203. Matsumoto, D., and Hwang
204. McElfish, Bridges, Hudson, Purvis, Bursac, Kohler, and Goulden
205. McIntyre, Constable, and Barlow
206. Meghani and Harvey
207. Methikalam, Wang, Slaney, and Yeung
208. Meyer, Nguyen, Dao, Vu, Arean, and Hinton
209. Meyer, Saw, Cho, and Fancher
210. Miller, Alvarez, Li, Chen, and Iwamoto
211. Min and Jang
212. Mistry, Li, Yoshikawa, Tseng, Tirrell, Kiang, Mistry, and Wang
213. Miyawaki
214. Miyawaki
215. Moon, Lee, and Oh
216. Morgan
217. Museus and Park
218. Muto, M., Kugihara, N., and Kohara
219. Na, Kim, Oh, Choi, and O'Toole
220. Nadal, Wong, Sriken, Griffin, K., and Fujii-Doe
221. Nakagawa, Vento, Ing, and Set
222. Nam, Lee, Huang, and Kim
223. Nehl, Han, Lin, Nakayama, Wu, and Wong
224. Ng, Tamis-LeMonda, Yoshikawa, and Sze
225. Ngo, B., and Kwon,
226. Nguyen-Truong, Leo, Lee-Lin, Gedaly-Duff, Nail, Gregg, . . . Tran
227. Nguyen, Wong, Juang, and Park
228. Nguyen, Choi, Park
229. Nguyen and Goel
230. Nguyen and Fussell
231. Nguyen, Smith, Reynolds, and Freshman
232. Nigg and Amato
233. Nitta, Tanner, Narvarte, Luces, Silverio, Zabala, . . . Palfox
234. Novotny, Nigg, Li, and Wilkens
235. Oakkar, Stevens, Bradshaw, Cai, Perreira, Popkin, . . . Quinn
236. Oh, Jun, Zhao, Kreps, and Lee
237. Palmer and Maramba
238. Palmer and Maramba
239. Palmer and Maramba
240. Parisian
241. Park, Joo, Quiroz, and Greenfield
242. Park
243. Park, Jang, Lee, and Chiriboga
244. Park, Jang, Lee, Ko, Haley, and Chiriboga
245. Patel, Kwon, Arista, Tepporn, Chung, Chin, . . . Trinh-Shevrin
246. Paulino, Leon Guerrero, Uncangco, Rosadino, Quinene, and Natividad
247. Perera and Chang
248. Perera and Chang
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249. Peyrot, Egede, Funnell, Hsu, Ruggiero, Siminerio, and Stuckey
250. Porter
251. Prins and Monnat
252. Quach, Tsoh, Le, Le, Pham, Fu . . . Reynolds
253. Reich and Wang
254. Rhee, Chi, and Yi
255. Rhodes, Song, Nam, Choi, and Choi
256. Ro, A., and Bostean
257. Roh, Lee, Kim, Park, and Chaudhuri
258. Roh, Lee, Lee, Shibusawa, and Yoo
259. Rollock and Liu
260. Rosas, Sanchez-Vaznaugh, and Sánchez
261. Rudy, Sheldon, Li, Kamble, Bi, and Palermo
262. Ryabov
263. Saad, Meyer, Dhindsa, and Zane
264. Sabado, Jo, Kagawa-Singer, and Juhn
265. Salas-Wright, Lee, Vaughn, Jang, and Sangalang,
266. Salo and Birman
267. Samuel
268. Sandil, Robinson, Brewster, Wong, and Geiger
269. Sangalang, Chen, Kulis, and Yabiku
270. Sangalang and Gee
271. Sangalang, Ngouy, and Lau
272. Schuster, Frick, Huh, Kim, Kim, and Han
273. Segal, Tan, and Graham
274. Sentell, Ahn, Miyamura, and Juarez
275. Sentell, Miyamura, Ahn, Chen, Seto, and Juarez
276. Seol, Yoo, Lee, Park, and Kyeong
277. Shah, Clayman, Glass, and Kandula
278. Shen
279. Shih, Wout, and Hambarchyan
280. Shih, Tucker, Miles, Ewing, Pedersen, and D’Amico
281. Shin, Wong, and Maffini
282. Shultz, Magnussen, Kreidman, Oneha, Iannce-Spencer, and Hayashi-Simpliciano
283. Sims, Tsai, Jiang, Wang, Fung, and Zhang
284. Sin
285. Singh, McBride, and Kak
286. Smith and Maton
287. Soon, Elia, Beckwith, Kaneshiro, and Dye
288. Strong, Hur, Kim, Pan, Tran, and Juon
290. Sun, Gao, and Coon
291. Sun, Sarma, Moyer, and Messina
292. Sung, Szymanski, and Henrichs-Beck
293. Suyemoto, Day, and Schwartz
294. Ta Park, Goyal, Nguyen, Lien, and Rosidi
295. Tam, C., and Freisthler
296. Tam and Camras
297. Telzer, Ichien, and Qu
298. Thikeo, Florin, and Ong
299. Thomas and Ong
300. Tili and Barker
301. Tran and Sangalang
302. Tran, Wong, Cokley, Brownson, Drum, Awad, and Wang
303. Trinh, Hails, Flaherty, Chang, Fava, and Yeung
304. Tsai and Thompson
305. Tsai, Lau, Niles, Coello, Lieberman, Ko, . . . Stanton
306. Tseng, Wright, and Fang
307. Tsoh, Burke, Gildengorin, Wong, Le, Nguyen, . . . Nguyen
308. Tsong and Smart
310. Wagner, Kong, Kuoch, Scully, Tan, and Bermudez-Millan
311. Walton
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312. Wang, Koh, and Song
313. Wang, Koh, Song, and Hou
314. Wang and Lau
315. Wang and Yu
316. Wei, Liang, Du, Botello, and Li
317. Wennerstrom, Bui, Harden-Barrios, and Price-Haywood
318. Whealin, Nelson, Stotzer, Guerrero, Carpenter, and Pietrzak
319. Wu and Blazer
320. Wu, Swartz, Brady, and Hoyle
321. Wu and Lin
322. Xiao and Smith-Prince
323. Xu, Farver, and Pauker
324. Yamamoto and Black
325. Yang and Wang
326. Yeh, Borrero, Lusheck, Plascencia, Kiliona, Mase, . . . Tito
327. Yoo, Miller, and Yip
328. Yu, Cheah, Hart, Sun, and Olsen
329. Yu, Cheah, and Sun
330. Yu
331. Zacharias, Wang, Dao, Wojciechowski, Lee, Do, and Singal
332. Zambonang, Iwamoto, Pesigan, and Tomas
333. Zhang and Seo
334. Zhou, Cheah, Van Hook, Thompson, and Jones

2015 Best Paper Award

Asian American Journal of Psychology

Each spring, the editorial board of the Asian American Journal of Psychology reviews all the papers published in the journal in the previous years and selects the winner of the Best Paper Award. The winner is recognized at the annual convention of the Asian American Psychological Association in August. We are proud to announce the winner of the 2015 AAJP Best Paper Award: Matthew R. Lee and Christina J. Thai, for their article “Asian American Phenotypicality and Experiences of Psychological Distress: More Than Meets the Eyes” (2015, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 242–251).

Bryan S. K. Kim, PhD
Correction to Kiang et al. (2016)

In the article “Annual Review of Asian American Psychology, 2015,” by Lisa Kiang, Charissa S. L. Cheah, Virginia W. Huynh, Yijie Wang, and Hirokazu Yoshikawa (Asian American Journal of Psychology, 2016, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 219–255. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aap0000055), the last author’s name was misspelled. The online version of this article has been corrected.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/aap0000084